



Anthropologists and Development

Author(s): Allan Hoben

Source: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 11 (1982), pp. 349-375

Published by: Annual Reviews

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155786>

Accessed: 11/03/2009 07:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=annrevs>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Annual Reviews is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND DEVELOPMENT

Allan Hoben

Department of Anthropology, Boston University African Studies Center,
Boston, Massachusetts

INTRODUCTION

Anthropologists have long been concerned with processes of social and cultural change and have made significant contributions to their understanding. This review, however, is primarily concerned with the involvement of anthropologists in the deliberately planned bilateral, multilateral, and private efforts to foster economic development and social change in low income countries that have flourished since the close of World War II. General anthropological theories of development and underdevelopment which have been reviewed by Schneider (128) and Nash (109) are dealt with only insofar as they illuminate or are illuminated by anthropologists' experience with development assistance activities.

The review also emphasizes work done in the past decade, a period which has witnessed a renewed and expanded involvement of anthropologists in development. As Hinshaw notes in his review of administration and policy, the results of this recent work are not generally available to academic audiences and have not previously been reviewed or assessed (66, pp. 498-99).

Anthropologists working in development have not created an academic subdiscipline, "development anthropology," for their work is not characterized by a coherent or distinctive body of theory, concepts, and methods. Development anthropology has, however, become an incipient profession and a field of study. Through their common experience over the past decade and their more and less formal networks, anthropologists working in development have begun to develop a shared understanding of the organization, "professional culture," and the bureaucratic and political decision making

processes that characterize development assistance programs. They have also found common ways of identifying and synthesizing relevant information from a variety of sources within a limited time and of presenting it in a way that will effectively bring their insights to bear in different kinds of decision making contexts. At the same time, anthropological involvement in development has produced a body of technically informed, substantive findings on different types of development initiatives such as pastoral livestock projects and basic health care delivery systems that crosscut traditional academic functional and ethnographic categories. Finally, the role of the development anthropologist is becoming institutionalized in several development agencies.

This review does not attempt to provide a comprehensive catalogue of this increasing anthropological involvement in development or a detailed description of its impact or substantive contribution to anthropological research. Rather it is addressed to four underlying questions: (a) Why has it been difficult for anthropologists to make an effective contribution to development work? (b) In what ways and to what extent have recent changes both in development theory and practice and in anthropology overcome this difficulty? (c) What has anthropology contributed to development work and what is its potential? (d) What has anthropological work in development contributed to anthropology?

To anticipate, the central thesis of this essay is that the difficulties anthropologists have had in making theoretical and practical contributions to development work is related to both the well-recognized short-term political uses of development assistance programs and ethnocentric tech-fix orientation of the dominant development paradigm, and to the less widely acknowledged fact that anthropologists have had little understanding of policy formation or implementation processes and have, until recently, had relatively little positive and nontrivial contribution to make.

Second, it is argued that recent changes in the development paradigm, the conceptual model of and for development used by planners, and in anthropology have begun to lay the basis for a more fruitful relationship between anthropologists and development practitioners. The most important of these changes in the development paradigm are increased awareness: (a) that low income rural people's economic behavior is based on pragmatic choice as much as tradition; (b) that local technologies and institutions are often adaptive and generally must be built upon, not merely swept aside; (c) that equitable income and asset distribution are not only desirable ends but contribute to sustained growth; and (d) that programs will succeed in promoting equitable growth and access to services only if they are fine-tuned to local situations, needs, and interests. The change in anthropology which has contributed to this reorientation in the development paradigm

and to more effective anthropological work in development planning is the increasing sophistication with which the behaviorally oriented branches of the discipline can analyze patterned behavior of many kinds as the result of choices made within a specified social, historical, ecological, and economic setting.

The discussion falls into three parts. The first outlines the major structural and cultural features that have informed the United States foreign aid enterprise from its inception after World War II, and sketches the role played by anthropologists in this enterprise from 1950 to the mid-1960s. The second is concerned with the progress and contributions made by anthropologists since their reentry into development work in significant numbers nearly a decade later. The third provides a short assessment of the distinctive contribution of anthropology to development planning.

DEVELOPMENT AND ANTHROPOLOGISTS: THE FIRST TWO DECADES

Despite the apparent appropriateness of anthropological skills for work in technical assistance, the relative prominence of anthropologists in public policy circles during the 1940s (54, 55, 102), early high level involvement in the Truman administration's planning for foreign aid, the involvement of several distinguished academic anthropologists (5, 49, 56, 132), and the full-time participation of many younger anthropologists in the field, anthropology had little lasting impact on development theory or practice, and anthropologists had virtually disappeared from the ranks of agency personnel by 1970. This peripheral role and eventual disappearance of anthropologists must be understood in relation to the diverse political, economic, and bureaucratic interests, and the axiomatic assumptions or paradigm that shaped the development effort, as well as to the state of anthropological theory and method.

The Rise of Foreign Assistance

Many of the contradictions that have frustrated anthropologists and others working in development programs can be traced to their dependence on multiple constituencies with differing objectives and expectations. Effective policy—what agencies do—is seldom a reflection of any one constituency's interests. As will be seen, this pluralism of objectives also provides opportunities or entry points for anthropologists and others who wish to influence resource allocation decisions.

United States development assistance programs took shape in the early years of the cold war as a policy response to the spread of communism in war-ravaged or formerly colonial countries. It was generally believed that

this primary objective of stopping communism was consistent with the mutually beneficial expansion of trade between rich and poor nations, the pursuit of humanitarian goals, and the fostering of democratic political institutions.

Support for foreign aid, which has never been popular with the electorate, has thus come from an unlikely and unstable coalition of conservative, military, business, humanitarian, and liberal interest groups. The enabling legislation and funding forged by these interest groups in the legislature is used selectively by the administration in power to pursue short-term foreign policy objectives that may conflict with long-term developmental goals. To make matters still more complex, different branches of the executive, such as USDA, DOD, Treasury, and the State Department, often have conflicting objectives in regard to specific countries and programs (137). Finally, over time, development agencies and their personnel have generated their own goals and standards for measuring success—goals which are not necessarily consistent with those of the legislature, the administration, or other special interest lobbies.

For the present discussion the significance of understanding the complex institutional environment within which donor agencies must operate is twofold. It accounts for the lack of continuity in foreign aid in regard to funding levels, regional emphasis, and program content. It also means that the decision making field or arena in which a development anthropologist must function is characterized by a pluralism of objectives that enables forceful individuals and coalitions, particularly in overseas missions, a surprising degree of creative leeway in what they do.

Regardless of the constellation of objectives that motivated foreign aid at any particular time and place, the approach taken has been informed by variants of the same underlying paradigm. This paradigm is based on a positivistic and ethnocentric interpretation of a particular historical process, the emergence of capitalism, and the industrial revolution in Western Europe. According to this interpretation, development is not merely an economic phenomenon; instead, it requires a far-reaching and fundamental transformation of society from “traditional” forms which constrain economic growth to “modern” forms which promote it and which resemble our own (16). The process of “modernization” entails the progressive erosion of traditional values, institutions, and practices and their replacement by those that are more rational, scientific, and efficient. In this view, traditional values are seen as more particularistic, arbitrary, and less pragmatic than our own. Traditional institutions such as the extended family, kinship-based organizations, and communal control over natural resources are viewed as stifling individual initiative, experimentation, and accumulation through their collective orientation. Traditional behavior is thought to be governed

by custom and tradition. To be sure, there are variations on these themes in development theory, particularly in regard to "peasant rationality," but they do not, as is noted in the last section, break out of the ethnocentric and atomistic framework that holds existing indigenous institutions to be constraints on, rather than the building blocks of, development.

At times these underlying paradigmatic assumptions about development are expressed explicitly. More often, however, and more significantly, they remain implicitly embedded in the way those engaged in development work perceive problems and their solutions as they perform routine tasks.

The Anthropologist's Role in Community Development

At its inception, then, the United States foreign assistance program was launched with naïve optimism and enthusiasm, reinforced by the political and economic success of the postwar Marshall Plan in Europe, that the major economic, technical, and social transformation entailed in development could be readily and quickly achieved. This optimism was generally shared by leaders in developing countries. It was assumed that the financial resources made available through the Development Loan Fund would be catalytic and that the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) would be able to use American know-how to develop appropriate technical and organizational solutions for the problems of rural development. These would be accepted, once their advantages were correctly understood by traditional peoples.

It soon became apparent that technical solutions often met puzzling resistance. In 1951, in response to this problem, a team of distinguished social scientists recommended that a social scientist should be attached to ICA overseas missions (94). Although their recommendations were not directly implemented, soon afterward the ICA began to recruit anthropologists (104).

From the ICA's perspective, the task of the anthropologist was to facilitate the diffusion of improved technology by overcoming resistance to change grounded in traditional values, institutions, and practices. In keeping with this perception of their role, ICA placed its anthropologists in the Community Development Division and assigned them to its overseas missions, where they served in program evaluation, planning, operations support, or community development efforts (94, 127).

The role of anthropologists and the problems they faced have been discussed by Schaedel (127), Boggs (24), and Hamilton (61). Their usefulness from an administrator's perspective is summarized by Miniclier (104), while aggressive attacks on their utility are summarized by Langley (94). The anthropologists suggest that their role was too limited, that they were not given time to carry out adequate investigations, and that their advice was

often not heeded. The administrators, for their part, complained that anthropologists were too narrowly trained, were interested only in long-term research, and were hypercritical Cassandras who made too few constructive suggestions.

A number of distinguished academic anthropologists, including Arensberg & Niehoff (5), Goodenough (56), Mead (101), and Spicer (132) addressed themselves to the problems of cross-cultural communication in technical assistance for community development. A review of this literature with the advantage of hindsight indicates that the theoretical and methodological bias of midcentury American anthropology appears, rather paradoxically, to have limited anthropologists' role and *to have reinforced the development paradigm's stereotype of traditional society*. In keeping with their commitment to cultural diversity and relativity, anthropologists accepted the role of helping technicians and planners understand the uniqueness of each ethnic group's customs, perceptions, and goals. This sustained the idea that the anthropologist's place is in the village and that his only contribution to development is to serve as interpreter in direct action programs.

At the same time, anthropology's role in developmental theory and policy was limited by its reliance on arbitrary cultural values, traits, and patterns to explain behavior, and its emphasis on diversity of cultural forms tended to obscure similarities in social, economic, and political processes. This reinforced the dominant development paradigm's narrowly diffusionist, patronizing top-down model of development as a process of induced enlightenment. Even more damaging was anthropology's failure to focus on the complexity of the local community, individual decision making processes, class interests and class formation, and the relationships of local communities and institutions to the wider political and economic institutions within which they were embedded. This conservative orientation of applied anthropology in community development was noted and analyzed at the time by Mexican anthropologist Batalla (13a). Finally, as Bastide has argued (13), applied anthropologists of this era appear to have given little thought to the multiple objectives and contradictions of development initiatives or their ethical implications for the anthropologist working in development.

The Departure of Anthropologists from Development Work

The ICA, predecessor of AID, was once the nation's largest employer of anthropologists (94). Yet by the early 1970s, only a handful remained, and virtually none of them were serving in their professional capacity as anthropologists. There were a number of reasons for this departure. Work in development had proved to be frustrating and had always lacked prestige within the profession. The rapid expansion of academic positions and de-

partments and the lure of ample research funds thus tended to pull anthropologists away from all kinds of government work (53). Finally, there was growing disenchantment with interventionist United States foreign policy in Cuba, Guatemala, Brazil, and Indochina—disenchantment that came to a head in the ethical crises triggered by anthropological involvement in counterinsurgency efforts by the Defense Department in Project Camelot and in Thailand and was galvanized by the protracted war in Vietnam.

The anthropologist's role in development was also marginalized by theoretical shifts in the development paradigm that began well before the escalation of the war in Vietnam. As the second development decade opened, in the early 1960s, there was a general sense of frustration that the task of development was proving intractable. The political and economic engine driving the development effort had not lost its force, but it was in need of a revised doctrine. Anthropologists had neither the vision of a better society nor a theory of how to create it. Nor were they seriously represented in policy circles.

The economists' theories of economic takeoff, the "big push," the "great spurt," or minimum critical effort that provided the needed doctrine did not abandon the end of fostering a far-going institutional transition—a process of Westernization—but they differed on the best means to this end. They held, rather paradoxically, that because of the long delay in industrialization and the lack of entrepreneurship, as well as a number of other inhibiting institutional factors, the development of a modern economy required a substantial, deliberate, planned, subsidized, and protectionist effort to increase the rate of savings and of capital formation and foster the development of an entrepreneurial class. In keeping with this belief, the development effort in the 1960s increasingly concentrated on the urban, industrial sector, on infrastructure and capital intensive technological innovation, rather than on programs intended to benefit low income groups directly, since their lot, it was believed, would eventually improve as the benefits of rapid economic growth trickled down. Programs in rural and community development, with which anthropologists had been associated, were increasingly neglected, except in connection with counterinsurgency efforts.

The disengagement of anthropologists from development lasted nearly a decade. During this period, however, theoretical and methodological advances were made in academic anthropology that broadened the contribution of anthropologists when they returned in the mid-1970s. Among the most important of these were: (a) a shift in theory toward analyzing enduring patterns of behavior and changes in them as the cumulative product of recurrent decisions in specific contexts; (b) a concomitant increase in the

more rigorous use of quantitative methods in designing sample frames, survey work, the analysis of variance within and between different segments of groups that had previously been treated as relatively homogeneous, and hypothesis testing; (c) the emergence of anthropological subfields focusing on problems such as health care delivery, education, resettlement, and the adoption of new agricultural technologies; (d) the publication of monographs documenting processes of economic and social change.

The salutary events of the late sixties and early seventies signaled the end of political innocence for anthropologists and stimulated a critical reexamination of the role of anthropology in public policy of all kinds. One expression of this awakening was a rather belated outburst of moral outrage at the evils of colonialism and its passive acceptance by anthropologists. Another was the attraction for many anthropologists of theories of development and underdevelopment that challenged the underlying assumptions of the development paradigm by maintaining, in one way or another, that the growth of industrial capitalism and the concomitant expansion of north-south trade was the major cause of the marginalization and immiseration of the world's poor (109). A third expression of this awakening was the growth of research on bureaucratic process and public policy formulation (14, 66). All of these changes had a bearing on the role played by anthropologists when shifts in policy and theory brought them once again into development work.

ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND THE THIRD DEVELOPMENT DECADE

In response to renewed concern with the impact of development on low income peoples, anthropologists were brought into development work in greater numbers and in a wider variety of decision making roles than ever before during the second half of the 1970s. While this increase in the participation of anthropologists did not bring about a dramatic reorientation of the development paradigm or overcome all of the bureaucratic impediments to the use of social science information in planning (66), it did have a modest cumulative impact on resource allocation decisions that resulted in greater sensitivity to the needs and desires of low income groups and to the potential benefits of taking the strengths as well as the weaknesses of their present social organization into account in planning and executing development assistance programs. Their broad involvement in decision making for development gave anthropologists new insights into bureaucratic processes and strategies for making an effective contribution as anthropologists. It also challenged them to articulate and validate findings from academic anthropology to other professionals in development with complementary skills and insights and provided both the stimulus and the

funding for a considerable body of anthropological field research and comparative analyses on a variety of topics pertinent to development.

New Directions in Foreign Aid

By the end of the second decade of development assistance in the early 1970s it was clear that the "big push" and "trickle down" approach was not working as anticipated. The least developed nations were making little headway, and even in countries that were achieving high growth rates in their gross domestic product, the trickle-down effects were not working as well as had been anticipated. The poor were as badly off as ever in terms of underemployment, income, infant mortality, and nutrition—in some cases, even worse.

It was also evident that the gap between the urban and rural sectors was being exacerbated by donor-advocated development policies designed to trigger economic takeoff by subsidizing capital-intensive urban industrial growth at the expense of the traditional and rural sectors.

These findings might not have brought about a change in development policy had it not been for political backlash from the Vietnam war that gave prominence to the humanitarian and liberal democratic objectives and constituencies of foreign aid (70, pp. 356–57).

In the prestigious World Bank this policy change was signaled by Robert MacNamara, who had been Secretary of Defense during the Vietnam buildup, in a speech in Nairobi in 1970 (99). Its impact on the use of anthropologists by the World Bank has been modest, due in large part to the opposition of leading bank economists who felt that the discipline lacked a rigorous methodology.

For USAID the change was mandated by the Congress through amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act in 1973 and 1975 (70, 88, 105). These amendments, which came to be called the New Directions or Congressional Mandate, like MacNamara's new policy initiative, required that greater emphasis in policy and budgetary allocations be given to promoting more equitable income distribution and employment opportunities for the "poor majority," to agriculture and rural development, to food crops, and to the use of more labor intensive "appropriate" technologies in agriculture and in capital projects such as road construction. The AID legislation, unlike World Bank policy, required that the poor majority participate in the "decisions that shape their lives" (48, Sect. 102a), as well as in the benefits of assistance. This participatory goal was linked to the need to pay greater attention "to interrelationships among technology, institutions, and economic, social, environmental and cultural factors" (48, Sect. 103a).

As is often the case with legislation, the New Directions amendments were drafted by a small group of congressional staffers and did not neces-

sarily represent a matter of great concern to most congressmen. Nevertheless, the amendments, which were closely modeled on recommendations made in a book by Owens & Shaw (113), provided the necessary though not sufficient condition for the recruitment of anthropologists by USAID.

The Role of Anthropologists in USAID

In response to the new legislation, USAID introduced a formal requirement for "social soundness analysis" on all projects. This requirement had little immediate effect on substantive aspects of project design. The very need to do the analysis, however, forced the Agency to incorporate professional social scientists, mostly anthropologists, to whom it had previously been hostile. As increasing numbers of anthropologists were brought into the agency on a full-time basis, they were able to influence project design and policy formulation before choices had been made and before the stage was reached at which only justification for decisions already taken was desired.

The official Social Soundness Guidelines (138) drafted by Robert Berg (20) from material prepared by Glynn Cochrane, went into effect on September 1, 1975. They call for a wealth of information concerning local groups, how their members will be affected by a proposed project, and whether it is likely that the project innovations will spread spontaneously to other areas. At first analyses were carried out by anthropologists on short-term contracts or by unqualified AID employees.

The new requirement was not popular with AID personnel, for it added to their workload, did not seem necessary, raised complex issues that threatened project approval, and in general did not seem to contribute to the bureaucratic objective of designing projects and obligating funds within the congressionally set budget cycle (70, 137).

The quality of the analyses was uneven. Often they did not focus on key issues relevant to the project at hand. Even when the analysis was excellent, its recommendations were not always reflected in project design. There were also problems of differing expectations and mutual frustration between anthropologists and personnel. These difficulties have been discussed at length by Hoben (70), McPherson (100), and Perrett (115). In a recent review of AID's experience with social analysis over the first 5 years, based on documents from 48 projects selected from all major geographic regions, Ingersoll et al (84) found that, despite some improvement, analyses were still uneven in quality and utility. Documentary evidence indicated that social analysis had significantly influenced the design of only 25% of the projects.

In part these problems with social analysis were due to its newness and to the lack of AID personnel with appropriate training, but there were other

sources of difficulty that arose from the nature of the decision making process in AID. One of these was that the requirement for social analysis was placed too late in the process of project design, after major choices and commitments to host country officials had been made (133). As Hoben (70) has shown, detailed information was brought to bear only at the later stages of project design and approval cannot be taken into account, a fact that frequently puts the expert, be he anthropologist, economist, or agronomist, in an uncomfortable adversary role. Moreover, as Hoben (70), Ingersoll (84), and P. Morgan (in preparation) have noted, the project paper is an advocacy document prepared to justify the obligation of funds. It is bureaucratic common sense that serious problems should be ironed out before the paper is written and not aired in it. Consequently, even when experts have greatly influenced project design, their contribution may not be highlighted in project documentation.

The other aspect of the decision making process in AID and other development agencies that blunted the impact of anthropological insights is development planners' reliance on past projects or parts of them as models for future projects. This practice is common because of the complex and time-consuming nature of design work and the bureaucratic incentive to avoid "unprecedented failure." The project design process, therefore, consists in large part of the team leader or project design officer choosing between alternative models brought to his attention by experienced and trusted individuals. Hoben has discussed the cognitive, symbolic, and conservative functions of project models in an analysis of decision making in foreign assistance (70, pp. 354-56) and in an evaluation of pastoral livestock projects in Africa (69).

Though the direct contribution of the requirement for Social Soundness Analysis should not be discounted altogether—in many instances it did make a difference—its most important contribution was indirect. It created an effective demand for anthropologists and other social scientists and legitimized their presence in the Agency. In the last analysis, the institutionalization and impact of anthropologists in development work depends on their ability to demonstrate their utility by participating as trusted insiders playing many roles in a broad range of decision making processes and on their success in validating insights from academic research through praxis, by building them into elements of innovative projects that will serve as cynosures for others.

The number of anthropologists working for AID on a full-time basis in positions that drew on their professional skills increased from 1 in 1974 to 22 in mid-1977 (70) to at least 50 by July 1980 (9). Though exact data are not available, the number of other anthropologists who worked for AID on short-term contracts can be conservatively placed at well over 100.

These anthropologists served under a variety of contractual arrangements, including: regular employment in the foreign service, civil service, and the International Development Internship program; personnel loan arrangements with other federal agencies; long-term personal service contracts; one to four year loans from universities under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act; and contracts with consulting companies. Other things being equal, anthropologists in permanent career positions were most subject to cooptation and goal displacement but, to the extent they avoided these dangers, have had the most influence within the agency. At the other end of the continuum, short-term consultants have been able to express themselves freely—AID reports, unlike those done for private companies, are in the public domain—but have had the least influence. Other things are not, of course, always equal, and there have been many exceptions to these structural generalizations.

The Agency's new complement of anthropologists, unlike their predecessors in the 1950s and 1960s, has served in many parts of the organization and has participated in a wide range of tasks. In mid-1980, according to Atherton (9), at least 20 anthropologists were employed on a full-time basis in AID's overseas missions and regional offices. For the most part, these anthropologists do not conduct original research but rather bring to bear existing data and an anthropological perspective on a wide range of bureaucratic tasks, including social analysis, project design, project supervision, evaluation, and analysis of host country conditions. They also help identify the need for additional social research by American or host country contractors and participate in its supervision. Two of these, Mailloux (97) and Greeley (59), have described their roles with the Nepal mission and the AID's Regional Office for East Africa, respectively.

Twelve anthropologists served in Regional Bureaus of AID in Washington, where they were responsible for helping to review all projects, draft bureau policy guidelines, and sponsor contract research. Their roles have been described by Seymour (130).

The other 18 full-time anthropologists worked in functionally specialized support units, including: the rural development office (95), the nutrition office, and the agriculture office of the Development Support Bureau; the evaluation office and program review office of the policy bureau; and the midcareer Development Studies program. The role of the short-term consultants who participate in the design and evaluation of several hundred projects a year has been discussed by Brokensha (26).

The organization and functions of the AID bureaucracy have been discussed by Atherton (9) and their dynamics described by Hoben (70) and Tendler (137).

Wherever they are placed in the organization, career anthropologists face a difficult choice between remaining specialists who keep up their reading

and contacts with other members of the discipline, or becoming "generalists" with greater opportunities for upward mobility and influence. Langley (94) and Steinberg (133) argue that anthropologists must maintain their identity and gain recognition for their disciplinary background, as economists have done, and that AID must reform its career system to accommodate this change. Benedict (17, 18) asserts that it is essential to bureaucratize the presence of social scientists and their perspective by building it routinely into high level decision making processes. Benedict himself has been extremely successful in accomplishing this task in the Bureau for the Near East, where anthropologists and other social scientists in the Social Analysis division have regularly had a measurable influence over the design and implementation of major capital projects, as well as in more traditional "social" programs. Recently Benedict became the first PhD anthropologist to be appointed an AID Mission Director.

To sum up, considerable progress was made in institutionalizing the role of anthropologists in AID decision making processes between 1976 and 1980. Requirements for social analysis have been broadened to cover all stages of policy, program, and project design and evaluation. The number of anthropologists working in the Agency increased exponentially. There were, to be sure, many problems in the way anthropologists have been assigned to roles and tasks and with the way they have carried them out. Nevertheless, anthropologists working in AID have generally adapted their skills to the bureaucratic environment and have made a positive contribution to development assistance programs. Several members of AID's senior management have made thoughtful assessments of this contribution and suggestions for making a more effective use of anthropologists (6, 92, 131, 133).

At the time of writing it remains to be seen to what extent the gains of the past decade will survive the Reagan administration's shift in policy concerns and anti social science bias. On the negative side USAID has abolished virtually all direct hire social science positions for anthropologists in its regional bureaus in Washington, and has greatly reduced the number of positions in the overseas missions. In part, however, this is the result of severe restrictions on AID's personnel ceiling and is being compensated for by the recruitment of additional anthropologists on fixed term contracts.

The congressionally mandated concern with rural and low income people is still in AID's enabling legislation, and the requirement for social analysis is still in effect, but an increasing proportion of all United States foreign assistance is being channeled through the Economic Support Fund and other mechanisms that do not entail detailed consideration of social or local conditions.

On a more positive note, most of the direct hire anthropologists brought into the Agency and initially placed in behavioral science positions have

merely been moved into generalist positions such as Rural Development Officer where they continue to bring their professional expertise and disciplinary perspective to bear on day-to-day decisions. Indeed, several anthropologists have moved into mid and upper level management positions since the present administration took office.

In other development agencies the role of anthropology has remained the same or been enhanced. The World Bank, for example, recently introduced a new requirement for the anthropological analysis of all projects affecting people who are culturally, economically, socially, and politically marginal within their native lands (148).

In the long run it seems likely that development anthropologists will continue to be involved in foreign assistance programs to the extent that they prove their worth and that effective policy seeks to promote broadly participatory development.

Anthropological Analyses of Development Work

Academic anthropologists working in AID and other donor organizations have been subject to the kinds of norm conflicts analyzed by Bernard (21), Chambers (35), Ford (47), and Hinshaw (66). While these problems persist, they have been partially overcome as anthropologists have met the challenge of using their professional perspective to analyze and respond to the bureaucratic environment in which they work as "participant observers."

Analyses of the difficulty of integrating site-specific social science information into bureaucratic decision making processes have been presented by Bledsoe (22, 23), Bryant (31), and Hoben (70). Perhaps the most important characteristic of this literature is that it seeks to transcend the naïve negativism characteristic of much anthropological writing on development and public policy, exemplified in many of the essays in Hymes (82) and Sanday (126), by examining differential decision-making processes in relation to the structural and cultural settings in which they occur.

Several authors have drawn upon their experience in development work to suggest ways that anthropology can be used more effectively. Cochrane, who has written extensively on anthropology and development (36–38), has recently elaborated his approach to social analysis in a book addressed to development practitioners (39). Unfortunately, this work, which is intended to help bureaucrats know when and how to seek help from anthropologists, is flawed by its use of dated and questionable anthropological insights.

In a piece that is somewhat more narrowly focused, Perrett (116) has made an extremely effective case for using social and behavioral analysis to an audience within the World Bank. Problems and techniques of making rapid assessments in rural areas have also received increased attention (1).

Addressing himself to anthropologists who wish to work with donor agencies, Greeley (59) stresses the need to be familiar with documents and

procedures, get involved early, be constructive, and be realistic about facing data constraints. Hoben (70), drawing on 3 years' experience as Senior Anthropologist for AID, outlines a strategy by which anthropologists can enhance their effectiveness by using their professional skills to understand the contexts in which they work. These are presented as questions about the organization and objectives of the donor agency and its constituent parts and about the specific decision making field or context in which the analyst finds himself. Hoben also discusses strategies for gathering information in a timely manner and making an effective presentation of findings.

In light of the number of anthropologists involved in development work, it is to be expected that this literature on anthropological praxis, which builds on earlier work by Almy (2), Brokensha (25), Pitt (120, 121), and Stevens (134), will continue to grow.

The Substantive Contribution of Anthropologists to Development Work

The substantive contribution of anthropologists to development work has varied greatly with the donor agency, geographic region, and development problem. On a worldwide basis, anthropology has had its greatest influence on the Swedish development programs, SIDA and SAREC, though these programs are modest in scale. Within the United Nations agencies anthropologists have made their greatest contribution in the FAO, WHO, and UNDP. In the World Bank anthropologists and sociologists have made effective contributions in rural development, agricultural production and extension, social forestry, Indonesian transmigration, tourism, health, and education. Anthropologists in developing countries have also become more effectively involved in development (34a). By comparison, the regional development banks have made little use of anthropologists. In the United States it is in AID, once again, that anthropology has had the greatest influence.

Not surprisingly, anthropologists were called in initially to work among peoples who are strikingly "different," on types of project in which the "human" or social dimension is perceived to be particularly intractable, and at times when there is pressure to act quickly despite these problems. To the extent that they have demonstrated their potential contribution to managers, however, anthropologists have become involved in a wide range of more traditional capital projects, particularly in AID's Near East Bureau.

The extensive involvement of anthropology in the Sahelian programs during and since the drought illustrates both the appeal to anthropology in an unfamiliar emergency relief effort and the critical interpretive role of development anthropologists working as managers and advisors within the donor organizations. An anthropologist, Michael Horowitz, was included

on a planning team based in Abidjan from 1974 to 1975 and headed by a gifted scholar, planner, and administrator, David Shear. Much of the impetus for the subsequent widening involvement of anthropologists in West Africa came from Horowitz's thoughtful and patient demonstration to key AID managers that the findings of social anthropology could speak directly to a variety of developmental issues. In his planning team role and later through grant and contract work carried out with his colleagues in the Institute for Development Anthropology, Horowitz was instrumental in obtaining funding for dissertation research by several students on development-relevant topics. One of these students, John Lewis, subsequently carried out research on Fulbe transhumance as anthropologist with the International Livestock Center for Africa in Mali and is presently employed by AID in Washington. Another, John Grayzel, is currently employed as mission anthropologist in Mauritania.

Through a similar grant from AID to conduct research on the long-term social effects of the drought, E. P. Skinner obtained funds for dissertation research by four students, Sutter, Waldstein, Hemmings, and Ware, all of whom were required to work with African research counterparts from relevant government offices and all of whom have continued an active involvement in the application of social science to development.

In addition to participating in numerous design and evaluation efforts, Horowitz's Institute also received a contract to organize a colloquium to assess research findings on the effects of the drought on the productive strategies of herdsmen and farmers (73), to develop research proposals for anthropological work on Sahelian problems (27), and to conduct training workshops on social analysis for AID personnel (75).

During the years between 1975 and 1980 scores of other anthropologists carried out short and longer term studies in support of planning efforts, project design, and evaluation in West Africa. Unfortunately, AID's far-flung bureaucracy does not keep systematic records of work of this type, though much of it is incorporated in official documents. The Institute for Development Anthropology library at Binghamton, N.Y. appears to have the best collection of this fugitive material.

Fortunately, a number of the anthropologists involved in West African development are beginning to publish work based on their experience. A useful collection of essays of this type (58, 71, 93, 96, 106, 111, 114, 124, 136, 141, 143, 144), providing case studies of the use of anthropology in development work, are presented in a forthcoming book edited by Horowitz and Painter (76).

Aronson, who followed Horowitz as AID's full-time staff anthropologist for West Africa, commissioned reports by several anthropologists, in which he asked them to draw out longer range policy implications from their

previous research experience. Four of these (42, 110, 122, 140) have been published in a volume edited by Reyna (123), who also commissioned a study of the development of commercial agriculture in West Africa by Keith Hart (63).

Aronson also played a lead role in initiating a fundamentally new type of pastoral livestock project in Niger (8), built on the assumption that it is necessary to understand and build on existing ecological, sociopolitical, and economic systems instead of introducing technical solutions on models derived from American, Australian, or French commercial livestock production. The project is also providing dissertation research material for four anthropologists. Finally, Aronson was instrumental in designing a project to strengthen social science research capabilities in Cameroon through in-country field research and long training for host country nationals (7).

In Nepal, where AID officials with New Directions objectives were confronted, as in the Sahel, with a dearth of data and with culturally distinctive peoples, anthropologists once again were involved in both research and planning efforts (1a, 19, 32, 57, 97).

In addition to clarifying the unique features of the social and cultural landscape or the institutional context of developmental issues in particular regions like the Sahel or Nepal, anthropologists are beginning to do comparative studies of the same problem in differing social and cultural settings. This has enabled them to focus their attention on emergent lessons and recurrent issues that are invariant to regional differences, to confront incorrect assumptions in subsectoral development project paradigms more effectively, and to demonstrate to other experts working in development that the anthropological perspective has more to offer than merely good data collection techniques and a penchant for celebrating the uniqueness and internal complexity of each case.

For example, a number of anthropologists, including Aronson, Dyson-Hudson, Haaland, Horowitz, Jacobs, Lewis, and Swift, have worked extensively with AID, the World Bank, FAO, UNDP, and the Consultative Group's International Livestock Center for Africa on pastoral livestock development, a subsector that is considered by developers to be plagued by intractable human problems. Their findings on the underlying sociological and ecological problems in pastoral livestock development have been summarized by Horowitz (74), Hoben (69), and Galaty et al (50). Equally important is the fact that AID, the World Bank, and other donors have held workshops and training sessions to disseminate these findings to their personnel (85).

Other development topics on which donor-sponsored comparative anthropological studies are yielding results of interest to planners and anthropologists include: forced relocation (40, 68, 129a), agricultural research

and extension (3, 11, 33, 34b, 44, 51, 62, 65, 119, 133, 145, 146), marketing (4), fuelwood (43, 77), health (86, 117–119), nutrition (46, 87), tourism (41a, 108), and population and family planning (64). This list is illustrative, not comprehensive, and does not attempt to include the growing body of academic anthropological research on these problems.

The World Bank and AID have also commissioned policy background state-of-the-art papers on selected development issues by leading anthropologists (11, 34, 60, 80, 131a, 147). Anthropological contributions are routine on AID project and program evaluations, and are prominent in the Impact Evaluation reports of AID's Office of Evaluation, Studies Division, first organized by A. Hoben and currently headed by anthropologist Twig Johnson.

While the foregoing discussion has focused on anthropological contributions to development sponsored by development agencies and addressed to development practitioners, a number of anthropologists working in development are addressing themselves, in edited volumes, to an anthropological audience, as well. Unlike older works, such as Mathur's (98), these newer collections are organized more coherently on a single theme, which may be regional (e.g. 76), topical (50), subdisciplinary (10, 15, 28–30, 35, 41, 45, 52, 67, 78, 79, 89, 91, 103, 107, 112, 125, 128, 135, 142), or a combination of both (11, 12). This literature, useful for heuristic as well as theoretical purposes, can be expected to continue growing rapidly over the next few years.

THE DISTINCTIVE CONTRIBUTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY TO DEVELOPMENT

In light of the greatly increased involvement of anthropologists in all phases of development work, reviewed in the previous sections, it is essential to ask whether anthropology as a discipline has a distinctive contribution to make to development theory and practice and whether this involvement is contributing to the development of anthropology.

Despite the often polemical and morally contentious burden of much anthropological commentary on development, it appears that the discipline's theoretical contribution lies in the elucidation of means-ends relationships, rather than in the choice of ends themselves. It is not evident from this literature that anthropologists, by virtue of their professional training or knowledge, have a distinctive or even a shared vision of degree, direction, and pace of social, technological, economic, or political change that is to be desired. To be sure, there is a broad commitment to liberal democratic and humanitarian values, including the political and economic empower-

ment of less advantaged segments of society, but this commitment is not peculiar to anthropologists, and it is not clear how substantive progress toward these goals is to be reconciled with the equally prevalent anthropological commitment to the preservation or at least protection of diverse indigenous beliefs, values, and practices. Nor is it clear whether the anthropologist's proper role is to advocate what people say they want or what he or she thinks is best for them.

Paradoxically, the most important contribution of anthropology to theories of development lies not so much in anthropological theories per se as in the way that anthropological findings have confronted key assumptions in both the earlier, antirational "tradition bound" and the more recent "rational peasant" variants of the dominant development paradigm, and their corollary assumption that economic development and its benefits requires the Westernization of institutional forms and cultural beliefs.

High-resolution, participant-observer, in-depth microstudies by anthropologists have undermined the deep seated ethnocentric assumptions that "non-Western" people's behavior is more tradition bound than our own and that their productive systems are often poorly adjusted to their natural and economic environment. Like a magnifying glass, these studies showed village life in greater detail and thereby revealed far more complexity of organization, thought, and behavior than was apparent from afar on a different scale. They have made it clear, for example, that peasants' agricultural and economic behavior must be understood as the product of recurrent decisions about the use of productive assets, the organization of labor, marketing, savings, and investment; that experimentation with new crops and crop mixes are commonplace, and attempts to introduce major technical innovations are not unusual, even in communities beyond the reach of extension services (70, pp. 341-42).

In-depth studies by anthropologists have also shown that many indigenous small scale farming systems are sensitively adjusted to local ecological, economic, and political conditions and their fluctuations, and that, in demographic terms, far from being static, most low income rural communities are dynamic and have undergone major changes, particularly during the present century. They have revealed that the apparent uniformity of poverty in rural communities often masks differences of power, honor, and wealth that are of the utmost significance to members of the community and play a vital role in determining who will have access to new developmental resources and who will reap the benefits; and that patron-client ties, far from being bound by fixed tradition, are subject to continued testing and renegotiation in response to changing market conditions (72).

In sum, they have shown that if development programs are to succeed

in promoting economic growth in a way that engages and benefits "the poor majority," they must take account of the strengths as well as the weaknesses of existing local and regional institutions and recognize that they persist because they meet real needs. They must recognize that new technologies and organizational forms will be accepted only if they meet these needs more effectively without introducing unanticipated risks and costs.

Partly as a result of the findings from seminal and influential work by Tax and Epstein on the New Household Economics, state-of-the-art versions of development theory now portray the peasant as an economic maximizer constrained only by his access to factors of production, market, and by risk. This approach fails to break out of the rationalistic and atomistic model characteristic of the positivistic social sciences. Typically models are built and policies formulated by the direct logical extrapolation of this putatively rational household level decision making behavior without any systematic attempt to take into account "exogenous" variables, such as household formation and structure, supra-household forms of community organization, ecology, or the whole range of local-national-international linkages subsumed under the study of political economy. It is recognized, of course, that these kinds of exogenous factors exist, but they are not incorporated into theory or practice in development economics, on the usually implicit assumption that either they are not susceptible to orderly analysis or that they vary randomly and tend to cancel one another. Experience, illuminated by anthropologists, among others, has shown this "other things being equal" assumption does not work very well.

Anthropological studies have shown that, though it is indeed necessary to recognize that low income rural peoples are reasonable decision makers, this recognition does not simplify the task of the development theoretician or planner. On the contrary, it makes planning far more complex because the ecological, social, microeconomic, and political contexts in which peasants make decisions are highly variable through time and among regions. From the development planning perspective, the effects of such variation are crucial; without taking account of them, it is not possible to predict the impact of a program. Identical policies, programs, and projects may have very different impacts in differing contexts.

If the anthropological contribution is limited to pointing out once again that the real world is very complicated, it is unlikely to have much impact on development planning. Fortunately, a convergent theoretical trend in behaviorally oriented branches of anthropology holds out promise for a more positive anthropological role. This is the synthesis of the detailed and quantitative analysis of behavior patterns as the result of choice that emerged in the sixties, with local institutional analysis characteristic of

British social anthropology on the one hand, and the focus on regional, national, and historical linkages characteristic of neo-Marxist and other political economic approaches on the other. This emergent common approach has been ably summarized for political anthropology by Vincent (139), for economic anthropology by Barlett (11, 12), and for household and demographic studies by Carter & Merrill (34).

Drawing upon this increasing methodological sophistication, the new development anthropology has the potential for making a positive contribution to development work in a broad range of planning and policy contexts.

1. It can improve program planning and project design by providing a view of development, or the lack of it, from below—from the vantage point of its projected low income clientele. This view casts in bold relief the problems, prospects, and costs of obtaining government services. It provides a perspective that shows the way intended beneficiaries perceive their problems and the strategies by which they pursue their interests.
2. It can provide highly reliable data for small, meaningfully stratified samples that can be used to judge the plausibility of data that have been collected by census and sample survey techniques concerning potentially sensitive topics, such as income, access to land, community power relations, stratification and leadership, and factors affecting demography.
3. It can help to design a sample frame for survey research, to formulate more meaningful questions, to interpret puzzling data and explain apparent anomalies, and to generate new hypotheses for testing.
4. It can clarify in detail decision making processes and individual decision making strategies that can only be inferred from other sources, and hence,
5. It can reveal the actual constraints on the production processes, marketing, access to credit, education, or health services facing different socio-economic groups; and
6. It can explain linkages between phenomena in formally different “sectors” or domains that are not intuitively obvious from a macro perspective and that vary from group to group.
7. It can bring to bear on particular program or project design efforts lessons derived from previous development experience of all kinds in the same region and from experience with the same type of problem or project from other regions and countries.
8. It can facilitate design and implementation of programs and projects by illuminating the organization, interests, and strategies of local elites and bureaucrats at all levels, whose cooperation is essential for success.

9. It can provide sensitive, continuous, and rapid feedback on project impact to help management monitor projects.
10. It can play an integral role in the evaluation of past experience to improve policy guidelines.

To sum up, development anthropology as a profession is grounded in general anthropology. Its unique perspective on development planning derives from its understanding of bureaucratic decision processes and its use of in-depth knowledge of a country's culture, institutions, and historic trends, as well as insights from the comparative study of similar institutions in other countries, to help clarify and anticipate the consequences of resource allocation decisions. The main characteristic of this perspective is that it focuses on the culturally patterned perceptions, goals, interests, strategies, and organization of intended beneficiaries and of members of other groups, including elites and administrators, whose cooperation is a prerequisite to change.

Its most valuable contribution to development work is to challenge and clarify, and hence to help revise, explicit and implicit assumptions made by those responsible for planning and implementing development policies about problems to be solved and about the institutional linkages between proposed policy interventions and their impact on income, asset distribution, employment, health, and nutrition.

There is mounting evidence, though its review is beyond the scope of this article, that the timely examination of policy, program, and project assumptions by development anthropologists and other kindred social scientists is well worth the cost for a broad range of activities on environmental, technical, economic, and financial grounds, as well as on the more generally recognized social grounds. It can help planners to avoid costly mistakes and build upon the strengths of existing forms of production and organization.

Development anthropology has only begun to achieve its potential in terms of its contribution and its acceptance. The pace at which it will continue to mature will undoubtedly depend, in the short run, on the policy objectives of the administration in power. In the longer run, however, the participation of anthropologists in development work seems destined to increase and to prove mutually beneficial for both development and anthropology.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Dan Aronson, Susan Hoben, and Michael Horowitz for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

Literature Cited

1. Agriculture Administration. 1981. 8(6): 405-92
- 1a. Agricultural Projects Services Centre. 1978. *Report of Seminar/Workshop on People's Participation in Rural Development in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Agric. Proj. Serv. Cent.
2. Almy, S. W. 1977. *The anthropologist at the international agricultural research center*. Presented at Rockefeller Found. Meet. Teach. Anthropol. Agric. 17 pp.
3. Almy, S. W. 1977. Anthropologists and development agencies. *Am. Anthropol.* 79(2):280-92
4. Appleby, G. 1980. *The A.I.D. marketing development project: Anthropological collaboration in planned change*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Soc. Appl. Anthropol., 40th, Denver
5. Arensberg, C., Niehoff, A. H. 1964. *Introducing Social Change*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 229 pp.
6. Arndt, T. M. 1981. Some observations on anthropology in AID. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):25-26, 64
7. Aronson, D. R. 1977. *Tech. Rep. No. 1: Cameroon Social Science Research and Training Project*. Washington DC: USAID. 63 pp.
8. Aronson, D. R. 1977. *Tech. Rep. No. 4: Niger Range and Livestock Project*. Washington DC: USAID. 226 pp.
9. Atherton, J. 1981. Anthropologists and the present AID structure. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):11-12, 55-58
10. Barker, D. 1980. Appropriate methodology: Using a traditional African board game in measuring farmer's attitudes and environmental images. See Ref. 29, pp. 301-6
11. Bartlett, P. F. 1978. *What Shall We Grow? A Critical Survey of the Literature on Farmers' Decision Making*. Washington DC: USAID. 64 pp.
12. Bartlett, P. F. 1980. Adaptive strategies in peasant agricultural production. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 9:545-73
13. Bastide, R. 1973. *Applied Anthropology*. Transl. A. L. Morton. New York: Harper. 226 pp.
- 13a. Batalla, G. B. 1966. Conservative thought in applied anthropology: a critique. *Hum. Organ.* 25(2):89-92
14. Beckman, N. 1977. Policy analysis in government: Alternatives to 'muddling through.' *Public Adm. Rev.* 37:221-27
15. Belshaw, D. 1980. Taking indigenous knowledge seriously: The case of intercropping techniques in East Africa. See Ref. 29, pp. 197-203
16. Bendix, R. 1967. Tradition and modernity reconsidered. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 9:292-346
17. Benedict, P. 1978. Social analysts and analysis in the Near East Bureau. See Ref. 100, pp. 33-57
18. Benedict, P. 1981. The bureaucratization of anthropology in AID. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):19-20, 62-63
19. Bennett, L. 1979. Tradition and change in the legal status of Nepalese women. *The Status of Women in Nepal*, Vol. 1, Pt. 2
20. Berg, R. J. 1981. PA comments. More on anthropologists in the Agency for International Development. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(4):21-22
21. Bernard, H. R. 1974. Scientists and policy makers: An ethnography of communication. *Hum. Organ.* 33(3):261-76
22. Bledsoe, C. H. 1980. Defining and analyzing the rural poor. Washington DC: USAID. 26 pp.
23. Bledsoe, C. H. 1981. *Current uses of anthropology in USAID: Confessions of a former native*. Presented at Dep. Anthropol., Princeton Univ., Princeton, NJ
24. Boggs, S. T. 1964. The organization of anthropology in action. *Hum. Organ.* 23(3):193-95
25. Brokensha, D. W., ed. 1969. *The Anthropology of Development in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Soc. Appl. Anthropol. Monogr. No. 10. Lexington: Univ. Kentucky Press. 100 pp.
26. Brokensha, D. W. 1981. The anthropologist and project consultancies. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):23-24, 64
27. Brokensha, D. W., Horowitz, M. M., Scudder, T. 1977. *The Anthropology of Rural Development in the Sahel: Proposals for Research*. Binghamton, NY: Inst. Dev. Anthropol. 157 pp.
28. Brokensha, D. W., Riley, B. W. 1980. Mbeere knowledge of their vegetation and its relevance for development (Kenya). See Ref. 29, pp. 113-29
29. Brokensha, D. W., Warren, D. M., Werner, O., eds. 1980. *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Development*. Lanham, Md: Univ. Press America. 466 pp.
30. Brush, S. 1980. Potato taxonomies in Andean agriculture. See Ref. 29, pp. 37-47
31. Bryant, C. 1979. Organizational impediments to making participation a reality: "Swimming upstream" in AID. *Rural Dev. Participation Rev.* Washington DC: USAID. 5 pp.

32. Campbell, J. G., Shrestha, R., Stone, L. 1978. *The Use and Misuse of Social Science Methods in Nepal*. Kathmandu: USAID/Nepal. 147 pp.
33. Cancian, F. 1977. Can anthropology help agricultural development? *Cult. Agric.* 2:1-8/ Bull. Anthropol. Study Group Agrar. Syst.
34. Carter, A. T., Merrill, R. S. 1979. *Household Institutions and Population Dynamics*. Washington, DC: USAID. 100 pp.
- 34a. Cernea, M. 1981. Indigenous anthropologists and development-oriented research. In *Indigenous Anthropology in Non Western Countries*, ed. H. Fahim. Durham: Caroline Academic
- 34b. Cernea, M. 1981. Sociological dimensions of extension organization: The introduction of the T & V system in India. In *Extension Education and Rural Development, Volume 2. International Experience in Strategies for Planned Change*, ed. B. R. Crouch, S. Chamala, pp. 221-35, 281. Chichester: Wiley
35. Chambers, E. 1977. Public policy and anthropology. *Rev. Anthropol.* 4(6): 543-54
36. Cochrane, G. 1971. *Developmental Anthropology*. New York: Pergamon
37. Cochrane, G. 1974. What can anthropology do for development? *Finance Dev.* 11(2):20-23
38. Cochrane, G. 1976. *What We Can Do for Each Other*. Amsterdam: Gruner
39. Cochrane, G. 1979. *The Cultural Appraisal of Development Projects*. New York: Praeger. 138 pp.
40. Colson, E., Scudder, T. 1982. Conclusions. In *Involuntary Migration and Settlement*, ed. A. Hanson, A. Smith. Boulder: Westview. In press
41. Custred, G. 1980. Ethnolinguistics and the formulation of agricultural and population censuses. See Ref. 29, pp. 233-43
- 41a. de Kadt, E., ed. 1979. *Tourism—Passport to Development? Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries*. London: Oxford Univ. Press. 360 pp.
42. Derman, W. 1980. Cooperatives, initiative, participation and socioeconomic change. See Ref. 123, pp. 605-702
43. Devres, Inc. 1979. *The Socio-Economic and Environmental Context of Fuelwood Use in Rural Communities: Issues and Guidelines for Community Fuelwood Programs*. Washington DC: USAID. 293 pp.
44. Doherty, V. S. 1979. *Human Nature and the Design of Agricultural Technology*. Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh, India: ICRISAT. 29 pp.
45. Fink, D. R. 1980. The Bono concept of measure: An essential factor in formal and non-formal education programs (Ghana). See Ref. 29, pp. 245-69
46. Fleuret, P. 1979. *Nutrition, Consumption and Agricultural Change: A Review of Community-Level Trends and Policy Implications*. Washington DC: USAID. 27 pp.
47. Ford, T. R. 1977. The production of social knowledge for public use. *Soc. Forces* 56(2):504-17
48. *Foreign Assistance Act. 1979. Legislation on Foreign Relations through 1978: Current Legislation and Related Executive Orders*, Vol. 1. Washington DC: US Senate-House of Represent. Joint Committee
49. Foster, G. M. 1973. *Traditional Societies and Technological Change*. New York: Harper & Rowe. 286 pp.
50. Galaty, J. G., Aronson, D., Salzman, P. C., Chouinard, A., eds. 1981. *The Future of Pastoral Peoples*. Ottawa: IDRC. 396 pp.
51. Gladwin, C. 1980. Cognitive strategies and adoption decisions: Study of non-adoption of an agronomic recommendation (Mexico). See Ref. 29, 9-28
52. Gladwin, H. 1980. Indigenous knowledge of fish processing and marketing utilized by women traders of Cape Coast, Ghana. See Ref. 29, pp. 131-50
53. Goldschmidt, W. 1977. Anthropology and the coming crisis: an autoethnographic approach. *Am. Anthropol.* 79(2):293-308
54. Goldschmidt, W., ed. 1979. *The Uses of Anthropology*. Washington DC: Am. Anthropol. Assoc. 280 pp.
55. Goldschmidt, W. 1979. Introduction: on the interdependence between utility and theory. See Ref. 54, pp. 1-13
56. Goodenough, W. H. 1963. *Cooperation in Change*. New York: Sage. 543 pp.
57. Gow, D. D. 1980. *Participation and rural development: Some lessons from Nepal*. Presented at Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 79th, Washington DC. 29 pp.
58. Grayzel, J. 1983. Libido and development: the importance of emotions in development work. See Ref. 76
59. Greeley, E. H. 1981. An anthropologist in a regional field office. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):15-16, 59-61
60. Greenwood, D. J. 1978. *Community-Level Research, Local-Regional-Governmental Interactions, and Development Planning: A Strategy for Baseline Studies*. Washington DC: USAID. 70 pp.

61. Hamilton, J. W. 1973. Problems in government anthropology. In *Anthropology Beyond the University*, Proc. South. Anthropol. Soc. No. 7, ed. A. Redfield
62. Hansen, A. 1981. *Farming systems research: Theory and practice in Malawi*. Presented at Chitedze Res. Stn. Malawi. Washington DC: USAID. 14 pp.
63. Hart, K. 1979. *The Development of Commercial Agriculture in West Africa*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Dep. Anthropol. 357 pp.
64. Heiby, J. R., Ness, G. D., Pillsbury, B. L. K. 1979. *AID's Role in Indonesian Family Planning: A Case Study with General Lessons for Foreign Assistance*. Washington DC: USAID. 79 pp.
65. Hildebrand, P. E. 1976. *A Multi-Disciplinary Methodology for Generating New Technology for Small Traditional Farmers*. Guatemala: Inst. Cienc. Technol. Agric./Socioecon.
66. Hinshaw, R. E. 1980. Anthropology, administration, and public policy. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 9:497-522
67. Hirabayashi, E., Warren, D. M., Owen, W. Jr. 1980. That focus on the "other 40%": A myth of development. See Ref. 29, pp. 359-68
68. Hoben, A. 1976. *Social Soundness Analysis of the West Benoue Integrated Rural Development Project*. Washington DC: USAID
69. Hoben, A. 1979. *Lessons from a critical examination of livestock projects in Africa*. AID Program Eval. Work. Pap. No. 26. Washington DC: USAID
70. Hoben, A. 1980. Agricultural decision making in foreign assistance: an anthropological analysis. In *Agricultural Decision Making: Anthropological Contributions to Rural Development*, ed. P. F. Barlett, pp. 337-69. New York: Academic
71. Hoben, A. 1983. Assessing the social feasibility of a settlement project in North Cameroon. See Ref. 76
72. Hoben, A., Timberg, T. A., 1980. Micro and macro data in village India: A note. *Econ. Polit. Weekly*, Nov. 29:2019-22
73. Horowitz, M. M., ed. 1976. *Colloquium on the effects of drought on the productive strategies of Sudano-Sahelian herders and farmers: Implications for development*. Niamey, 1975. Binghamton, NY: Inst. Dev. Anthropol. 96 pp.
74. Horowitz, M. M. 1978. *The Sociology of Pastoralism and African Livestock Projects*. Binghamton, NY: Inst. Dev. Anthropol. 102 pp.
75. Horowitz, M. M. 1979. *Report on Sahel Social Analysis Workshop, Contract No. AID/afr-C-1469*. Binghamton, NY: Inst. Dev. Anthropol.
76. Horowitz, M. M., Painter, T. M., eds. 1983. *The Anthropology of Rural Development in West Africa*. Philadelphia: Ishi. In preparation
77. Hoskins, M. W. 1979. *Community participation in African fuelwood production, transformation, and utilization*. Discuss. pap. Workshop Fuelwood Other Renewable Fuels Africa, Paris, Nov. 63 pp.
78. Howes, M. 1980. The uses of indigenous technical knowledge in development. See Ref. 29, pp. 341-57
79. Howes, M., Chambers, R. 1980. Indigenous technical knowledge: Analysis, implications, and issues. See Ref. 29, pp. 329-40
80. Hunt, R. 1978. *The Local Social Organization of Irrigation Systems: Policy Implications of Its Relationship to Production and Distribution*. Washington DC: USAID. 46 pp.
81. Deleted in proof
82. Hymes, D., ed. 1974. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage. 470 pp.
83. Deleted in proof
84. Ingersoll, J., Sullivan, M., Lenkerd, B. 1981. *Social Analysis of AID Projects: A Review of the Experience*. Washington DC: USAID. 105 pp.
85. Institute for Development Anthropology. 1980. *The Workshop on Pastoralism and African Livestock Development, Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, September 23-26, 1979: A Report Submitted to the Agency for International Development*. Binghamton, NY: Inst. Dev. Anthropol. 81 pp.
86. Jansen, W. H. 1978. *Socio-cultural factors affecting malaria control programs in Sri Lanka*. Presented at Int. Congr. Anthropol. Ethnolog. Sci., 10th, New Delhi.
87. Jansen, W. H. 1980. *The "nutrition" connection: The role of an anthropologist in the planning of a Philippine nutrition project*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Soc. Appl. Anthropol., 40th, Denver
88. Jansen, W. H. II. 1981. Overview. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):7-8, 53-54
89. Johnson, A. 1980. Ethnoecology and planting practices in a swidden agricultural system (Brazil). See Ref. 29, pp. 49-66
90. Deleted in proof
91. Knight, C. G. 1980. Ethnoscience and the African farmer: Rationale and strategy (Tanzania). See Ref. 29, pp. 205-31
92. Koehring, J. W. 1981. The performance of anthropology in AID: the view of a

- nonanthropologist within the agency. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):27, 65
93. Koenig, D. 1983. Research for rural development: experiences of an anthropologist in rural Mali. See Ref. 76
 94. Langley, G. 1981. The use of social scientists in the United States foreign aid program: a retrospective. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):9-10, 54-55
 95. Lewis, J. Van D. 1981. The growth of an anthropological presence in an AID Washington functional bureau. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(3):23-34, 44
 96. Lewis, J. Van D. 1982. Economic anthropology and the development anthropology of peasant farming systems in Mali. See Ref. 76
 97. Mailloux, L. 1981. Anthropology in AID: A case study of the Nepal mission. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):17-18, 61-62
 98. Mathur, H. M. 1977. *Anthropology in the Development Process*. New Delhi: Vikas. 560 pp.
 99. McNamara, R. S. 1973. *Address to the Board of Governors, Nairobi, 1970*. Washington DC: World Bank
 100. McPherson, L., ed. 1978. *The Role of Anthropology in the Agency for International Development*. Binghamton, NY: Inst. Dev. Anthropol. 84 pp.
 101. Mead, M., ed. 1955. *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*. New York: New Am. Libr.
 102. Mead, M. 1979. Anthropological contributions to national policies during and immediately after World War II. See Ref. 54, pp. 145-57
 103. Meehan, P. 1980. Science, ethnoscience, and agricultural knowledge utilization. See Ref. 29, pp. 383-92
 104. Miniclier, L. 1964. The use of anthropologists in the foreign aid program. *Hum. Organ.* 23(3):187-89
 105. Morton, A. L. 1981. Anthropologists and AID: new directions. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):21-22, 63-64
 106. Murphy, J. 1982. Monitoring and evaluation of agricultural projects. See Ref. 76
 107. Murtaugh, M. 1980. "See for yourself": some problems in the use of demonstration tours to promote agricultural development (Mexico). See Ref. 29, pp. 29-36
 108. Nash, D. 1981. Tourism as an anthropological subject. *Curr. Anthropol.* 22(5):461-81
 109. Nash, J. 1981. Ethnographic aspects of the world capitalist system. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 10:393-423
 110. Netting, R. McC., Cleveland, D., Stier, F. 1980. The conditions of agricultural intensification in the West African savannah. See Ref. 123, pp. 187-505
 111. Nolan, R. 1982. Anthropology and the Peace Corps: notes from a training program. See Ref. 76
 112. O'Keefe, L., Howes, M. 1980. A select annotated bibliography: Indigenous technical knowledge in development. See Ref. 29, pp. 399-413
 113. Owens, E., Shaw, R. 1972. *Development Reconsidered: Bridging the Gap Between Government and People*. Lexington, Mass: Heath. 190 pp.
 114. Painter, T. 1983. In search of the peasant connection: spontaneous cooperation, introduced cooperatives, and agricultural development in southwestern Niger. See Ref. 76
 115. Perrett, H. E. 1978. *Social Analysis and Project Design in the Agency for International Development: Review, Recommendations, Guidelines*. Washington DC: USAID. 66 pp.
 116. Perrett, H. E. 1980. *Social and Behavioral Factors in Project Work*. Washington DC: World Bank, PAS
 117. Pillsbury, B. L. K. 1977. *Indigenous health practices: Obstacle or opportunity?* Presented at Am. Anthropol. Assoc. Ann. Meet., 76th, Houston
 118. Pillsbury, B. L. K. 1978. *Traditional Health Care in the Near East*. Washington DC: USAID. 147 pp.
 119. Pillsbury, B. L. K. 1979. *Reaching the Rural Poor: Indigenous Health Practitioners are There Already*. AID Program Eval. Discuss. Pap. No. 1. Washington DC: USAID. 55 pp.
 120. Pitt, D. C., ed. 1975. *Development from Below*. The Hague: Mouton
 121. Pitt, D. C. 1976. *The Social Dynamics of Development*. Oxford: Pergamon. 162 pp.
 122. Reisman, P. 1980. The Fulani in a development context. See Ref. 120, pp. 71-186
 123. Reyna, S. P., ed. 1980. *Sahelian Social Development*. Abidjan: USAID/ REDSO West Africa. 702 pp.
 124. Reyna, S. 1983. Donor investment preference, class-formation and existential development: articulation of producer relations in Upper Volta. See Ref. 76
 125. Richards, P. 1980. Community environmental knowledge in African rural development. See Ref. 29, pp. 183-96
 126. Sanday, P. R., ed. 1976. *Anthropology and the Public Interest*. London/New York: Academic

127. Schaedel, P. 1964. Anthropology in AID overseas missions: Its practical and theoretical implications. *Hum. Organ.* 23:190-92
128. Schneider, H. K. 1975. Economic development and anthropology. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 4:271-92
129. Scott, M., Gormley, B. 1980. The animal of friendship: An indigenous mode of sahelian pastoral development in Niger. See Ref. 29, pp. 93-111
- 129a. Scudder, T. 1981. *The Development Potential of New Lands Settlement in the Tropics and Subtropics: a Global State-of-the-Art Evaluation with Specific Emphasis on Policy Implications.* Washington DC: USAID
130. Seymour, J. M. 1981. An anthropologist in a regional bureau in Washington. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):13-14, 58-59
131. Shakow, A. 1980. *The policy perspective: Anthropology in the Agency for International Development.* Presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 79th, Washington DC. 14 pp.
- 131a. Southall, A. 1978. *Report on Small Urban Centers in Africa with Complementary Perspectives from Asia and Latin America.* Washington DC: USAID
132. Spicer, E. H., ed. 1965. *Human Problems in Technical Change.* New York: Sage
133. Steinberg, D. 1981. Problems of anthropology in AID as viewed from the periphery of anthropology. *Pract. Anthropol.* 3(2):28-30, 65
134. Stevens, P. Jr. 1978. *The Social Sciences and African Development Planning.* Waltham, Mass: Crossroads. 110 pp.
135. Swanson, R. 1980. Development interventions and self-realization among the Gourma (Upper Volta). See Ref. 29, pp. 67-91
136. Swanson, R. 1983. Agricultural anthropology and farming systems research: household composition, rainfall, and household labor time allocation for planting and weeding. See Ref. 76
137. Tendler, J. 1975. *Inside Foreign Aid.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. 140 pp.
138. USAID. 1975. *Project Assistance Handbook 3.* Appendix 5A, Social Soundness Analysis. Washington DC: USAID
139. Vincent, J. 1978. Political anthropology: Manipulative strategies. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 7:175-94
140. Waldstein, A. S. 1980. Development for whom. See Ref. 123, pp. 507-603
141. Waldstein, A. S. 1983. Reflection on irrigated agriculture as an archetypal development project. See Ref. 76
142. Warren, D. M. 1980. Ethnoscience in rural development. See Ref. 29, pp. 369-81
143. Warren, D. M. 1983. The role of the anthropologist in rural development projects in Ghana. See Ref. 76
144. Weil, P. M. 1983. Land use, labor, and intensification among the Mandinka of Eastern Gambia. See Ref. 76
145. Werge, R. W. 1977. *Anthropology and Agricultural Research: The Case of Potato Anthropology.* Lima, Peru: Centro Int. Papa. 20 pp.
146. Werge, R. W. 1980. *Potatoes, Peasants, and Development Projects: A Sociocultural Perspective from the Andes.* Washington DC: World Bank. 21 pp.
147. World Bank. 1981. *Economic Development and Tribal Peoples: Human Ecologic Considerations.* Washington DC: World Bank. 103 pp.
148. World Bank. 1982. *Tribal people in Bank-financed projects.* Operational Manual Statement No. 2.34. Washington DC: World Bank. 1 p.