MANI-003
Practicing Anthropology

Indira Gandhi
National Open University
School of Social Sciences

Block

1

INTRODUCING PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

Expert Committee

Prof. R.K. Pathak
Department of Anthropology
Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Prof. P.Venkata Rao
Department of Anthropology
School of Social Sciences
University of Hyderabad
Andhra Pradesh

Prof. D. K. Behera
Head, Department of Anthropology
Sambalpur University, Odhisa

Dr. V. K. Kashyap
Chief Forensic Scientist
Directorate of Forensic Science (DFS)
Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi

Mr. Viraf Mehta
Former Chief Executive
Partenrs in Change, New Delhi

Dr. Rajiv Dasgupta
Associate Professor
Centre of Social Medicine and Community Health
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

**Faculty of Anthropology
SOSS, IGNOU**

Dr. Rashmi Sinha, Reader
Discipline of Anthropology
IGNOU, New Delhi

Dr. Mitoo Das
Assistant Professor
Discipline of Anthropology
IGNOU, New Delhi

Dr. Rukshana Zaman
Assistant Professor
Discipline of Anthropology
IGNOU, New Delhi

Dr. P. Venkatramana
Assistant Professor
Discipline of Anthropology
IGNOU, New Delhi

Dr. K. Anil Kumar
Assistant Professor
Discipline of Anthropology
IGNOU, New Delhi

Academic assistance provided by Dr. N.K. Mungreiphy, Research Associate (DBT) for the Expert Committee Meeting.

Programme Coordinator: Dr. Rashmi Sinha, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi
Course Coordinator: Dr. Mitoo Das, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi

Content Editor

Prof. Vinay Kumar Srivastava
Department of Anthropology
University of Delhi, Delhi

Blocks Preparation Team

Block Introduction

Dr. Mitoo Das
Asstt. Professor
Anthropology
SOSS, IGNOU
New Delhi

Unit Writers

Dr. Mitoo Das (Unit 1,2 & 3)
Asstt. Professor
Anthropology
SOSS, IGNOU
New Delhi

Authors are responsible for the academic content of this course as far as the copyright issues are concerned

Print Production

Mr. Manjit Singh
Section Officer (Pub.), SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi

Cover Design

Dr. Mitoo Das, Asstt. Professor
Anthropology, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi

Further information on Indira Gandhi National Open University courses may be obtained from the University's office at Maidan Garhi. New Delhi-110 068.

Printed and published on behalf of the Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi by the Director, School of Social Sciences.

Laser Typeset by : Tessa Media & Computers, C-206, A.F.E.-II, Okhla, New Delhi

Printed at :

BLOCK 1 INTRODUCING PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

Introduction

The block introduces the learner to what practicing anthropology is, how it developed and the nuances followed in the practice of anthropology. The block has been divided into three units. The first unit is called *Evolution of Practicing Anthropology*. This unit looks into how anthropology and its application began and depicts the paths it followed to exist as practicing anthropology in present times. The unit is divided into stages providing a historical description of how applied anthropology started off as a collector of data to know societies better and gradually evolving into studying societies to design and implement changes. In this description, the debates related to academic and non academic practice and application has been looked into and how finally today terms like applied anthropology and practicing anthropology only lie in aspects of nomenclature but not in usage.

The second unit is called *Approaches to Practicing Anthropology*. This unit talks about the gamut of research methods and theoretical knowhow used to face and provide solutions for current social, economic, political and health concerns faced by societies and organisations. In these methods rather than looking for what is anthropological or what is not, the main aim is the understanding of reality and action provided accordingly. The unit informs the learners that collection of information, creation of policy and putting such policies and plans into action are the core agendas of practicing anthropology. Thus the methods are designed and manipulated in such a way to provide best solutions to communities.

In all these, ethics plays a vital role as what the practicing anthropologist does is directly connected to a group of people or communities, and it is necessary that the sensibilities of those researched are respected. The last and final unit of this block thus deals with the ethical concerns associated with practicing anthropology. The unit is called *Ethical Challenges and Dilemmas in Practicing Anthropology* and the unit describes what ethics is, why it is needed, where it is needed, and how in practicing anthropology it influences the final product of the research conducted by an anthropologist. To highlight the importance of ethics, the unit elucidates the use and misuse of it in the history of anthropological research. It then progresses with a discussion of the debates in the application of ethics and finally it advices on the kind of ethical concerns a practicing anthropologist should bear in mind while conducting research in communities. This introductory block on practicing anthropology will help the learners have a complete idea about the practical usages of anthropology in everyday life and also in different careers.

UNIT 1 EVOLUTION OF PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

Contents

Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you will be able to know:

➢ how anthropology has an applied or practicing aspect to it;

➢ how applied anthropology developed and passed through different stages; and

➢ that finally practicing anthropology and applied anthropology are two sides of the same coin.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose for a compulsory course on practicing anthropology arose so as to acquaint and guide you about the many vocations that anthropologists can take in the modern world. You will be glad to know that after formal training in anthropology, a person can apply anthropological knowledge in different arenas. This is not something new and it started many years ago with what we call applied anthropology. The many processes it went through, brought out a part in it, what we today call practicing anthropology. However one should not forget the fact, that both stemmed out from the same objective, i.e., to pragmatically use anthropology for society.

In this lesson, we will specifically talk about how applied anthropology came into being, what routes it followed after its inception and how it branched out as practicing anthropology (See **Box 1**), while retaining its main focus. As part of the course we plan to provide a detailed, in depth and critical evaluation of the pragmatic applications of anthropology. It would hopefully assist you in future, when you would want to associate yourself with government, non-government organisations or as individual consultants and provide valuable inputs by practicing as anthropologists in pragmatic arenas. With this as the core idea, this lesson will be of help to you as you will, before learning about the involvement of anthropology as a practice in diverse fields in the next blocks, equip yourself with knowledge of its growth and progress.

1.2 HISTORY

1.2.1 Proto-Anthropology and Use of Applied Knowledge

The practice of using anthropological skills for useful purposes sprouted from conducive studies conducted in the United States of America and other countries during the World Wars. These fieldworks were done to understand human behaviour and provide solutions to concerns and afflictions which existed in human societies. However it was as early as the late nineteenth century that anthropology may be said to be used for pragmatic causes. It can be noted that the founder of the Anthropological Society of London, James Hunt, used the phrase, "practical anthropology" in the 1860s to express the pragmatic use of anthropological skills. But before all these took shape, we can still go back to even older stages where events depict to prove that anthropology is fundamentally a science concerned with practice and application. Herodotus (485- 325 BC), a philosopher, who has influenced the beginnings of anthropology as a discipline, is undoubtedly one of the original documenters of "cross-cultural description". He and his contemporaries, believed in providing information having practical intention, through their writings. Much later, in a completely different period, the same methodology of gathering information about a population was used to facilitate proper administration of an area. The appointment of Francis Buchanan in 1807 to the East India Company is a good example (Sachchidananda, 1972). His task was to learn and document material on the ways of life in Bengal, India. During the period of the British regime, such methods of studying the natives became quite popular as it professed to use the knowledge for the betterment of the local inhabitants. Establishments [like Aborigines Protection Society (1838)] were started in London which through investigation of native culture offered them social service (Keith 1917; Reining 1962).

Initial ethnological work like that of Father Joseph Lafitau who documented the life of people (Mohawks) residing in New France in North America, led to a rich collection of custom and rituals (Fenton and Moore 1974). In terms of policy research, an early example may be that of Henry R. Schoolcraft who was assigned by the United States government to collect data on the history, condition and prospects of the Indian Tribes in the U.S. The material is a report from 1852 to 1857 based on which the United States government made policies for the Indians. Though professionally Schoolcraft was an administrator, with the development of anthropology as a discipline, he came to be known as an ethnologist as well. In fact he is one of the initiators of the American Ethnological Society. William Duncan, another missionary, worked significantly towards social reform of the Indian tribes. One such program was to provide training to colonial officers by giving them ethnological knowledge of the Indians for better administration (Barnet 1969 [1942]). European countries like Great Britain and Netherlands too offered such programmes in 1806 and 1819 respectively.

In this proto-anthropology stage of application, though we have learned about the above examples, as anthropologists of today, there is little we can gain in terms of methodology of real research. Their documentation was inadequate and includes nothing to be taken as a base on how applied studies are to be conducted. The only part which cannot be denied is its applied aspect thus proving that anthropology has its beginnings in application and practice.

1.2.2 Applied Ethnology to Applied Anthropology (1860-1945)

Applied anthropology in its formative years as a distinct discipline started with anthropologists as research experts offering their knowledge of findings to government or private funded administrative initiatives. This was done for the establishment of administration of power in colonies. But the same design of working was used later for development programmes. Anthropologists provided information to the government in policy making and solving of issues. Therefore it is not surprising that it was the British, during their colonial regime, who formally employed anthropologists for practical purposes (Forster 1969). At the same time it was the anthropologists who also realised that in the absence of funds, they can approach the administration/ government for money. In this way they were able to conduct their research in the field and also provide the rulers with the data they needed (Kuper 1983). However in the process of training administrators in anthropological and ethnographical know how, the department of anthropology at Oxford University was started. It was only in 1908, under the rule of the British, that anthropologists were financially supported for proper academic research. This research was done under Northcote Thomas in Nigeria, and was called a government anthropologist (ibid). Even anthropologists like A.R. Radcliffe Brown and Branislow Malinowski, in the 1920s and 1930s gathered monetary donations from the government with a view to advertise how pragmatic anthropological and ethnographical representation of colonies studied can tackle issues that the colonisers encountered. But Kuper (1983) is of the view that this was a garb really and the main intention of the anthropologists was to assure themselves a good research funding. Nevertheless it worked on both fronts.

As far as the United States of America was concerned, it was only in 1934 that anthropologists got involved in actual official administrative applied work with the Indian Reorganisation Act of the New Deal and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Anthropologists at that time offered their service on how the government should work on reservations for the Indians and also gave suggestions on the creation of tribal charters and constitutions (Foster 1969). John Collier, the then commissioner of the BIA, can be said to be the man behind involving the anthropologists' proficiencies in the public sector. In the 1920s when the government got interested in projects related to the public, applied work in archaeology began (Fiske and Chambers 1997). So from the above deliberations, we can clearly state that applied anthropology acts as the basis for the growth of the discipline's set up. The term applied anthropology was used for the first time as an explanation of an agenda in Oxford University. During this period the approach used by the anthropologists was "value-free". This can also be seen as the application of the first professional code of ethics in anthropology (Mead, Chapple and Brown, 1949).

Before World War II the debate that anthropologists put forward was that they could not put themselves in any role other than acting as consultants for administration. It meant compromising with the "value free" stance that they advocated.

Colonial service training like the kind introduced in the Netherlands in the late nineteenth century by the British was also started in the then Union of South Africa in 1905 (Forde 1953), Anglo- Egyptian Sudan in 1908 (Myres 1928), Belgian territories in 1920 (Nicaise 1960) and Australian- mandated New Guinea in 1925. The British employed anthropologists as consultants and they were found in the military, foreign office, colonial office and India office, thus increasing interest in ethnological learning. So we find considerable growth of applied anthropology in the applied ethnology period. The literature too which were published during this time were the result of applied research. We can cite ethnographies written by British anthropologists on Africa and the Pacific and American anthropologists on North and South America.

United States: In the United States, applied anthropologists employed in abundance with the setting in of the Great Depression and the New Deal as the need for data by the government increased manifold. But anthropological employment reached a boom with the coming of the World War II. During all these periods, anthropologists became involved in many problem spheres and political backgrounds. In the process, other than focusing on the collection of general ethnography, they also concentrated on research on nutrition, education, migration, culture contact, etc. and many more areas. This occurred both in the United States and in Britain.

Many applied research organisations came into existence in the United States in the 1930s. To name a few, anthropologists were associated with the Applied Anthropology Unit (which researched the American Indians settlement patterns, education policy, economic development etc), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (which researched issues related to economic and resource development), the Department of Agriculture's Rural Life Studies (which involved the classic study of political economy of agribusiness in California by Walter Goldschmidt), etc.

In the early 1940s, action research methodology was employed by an anthropologist named Laura Thompson. She used it to bring about changes in Hopi administration. This method is still used in the study of development. During this period, in the United States, two research committees were created for policy research by the National Research Council. The Committee on Food Habits had anthropologists like Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict and Rhoda Metrax and the Committee for National Morale had anthropologists like Gregory Bateson, Elliot Chapple, and Margaret Mead, etc.

These committees looked into the nutritional and psychological aspects of people along with anthropological perspectives. This involvement of anthropologists was accentuated by the Great Depression and World War II. The American Anthropological Association made a commitment to the country by passing a declaration which mentioned that the "specialized skill and knowledge of its members, was at the disposal of the country for the successful prosecution of the war" (American Anthropologist, 1943). Anthropologists were mostly involved as liaisons with the War Relocation Authority which looked after the internment

camps that were built to put in prison Japanese Americans. Other initiatives that American anthropologists of that time were involved in were the Far Eastern Civil Affairs Training School (created by the University of Chicago) to train officers assigned to areas recaptured from the Japanese; the Foreign Morale Analysis Division where anthropologists gave information about the Japanese to the Departments of War, State and the Navy. Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (1946) came out from this initiative. The Institute of Social Anthropology of the Smithsonian Institute was started in 1943 which conducted both fundamental and applied research. Early work included research on health. This was done under the leadership of George M. Foster, a pioneer in the establishment of present day applied medical anthropology.

Applied anthropology blossomed during this time as many employment opportunities were made available by the federal government connected to the Great Depression and the war. Many publications (like handbooks related to the war) came out. The most noteworthy result of this growth of anthropologists was the creation of the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA). This development has been mentioned by Spicer as, "one of the most important events in the development of anthropology in the twentieth century" (1976: 335)".

When SfAA started, it concentrated on basically bringing together anthropologists who had done considerable applied work where they propagated the use of anthropological theories pragmatically. They published the much popular journal *Applied Anthropology* which later came to be known as *Human Organization*. SfAA aimed at working towards creating professional identity for anthropologists. However if we look at the entire scenario of the roles anthropologists played, they did not extend beyond being a policy researcher or trainer. This meant that there was no significant change in terms of roles from the earlier applied stage.

Great Britain: In Britain, with the coming of the World War II and also substantial changes in the colonial policies, the environment of the 1930s and 1940s saw clear modifications. The British were being touted for not giving attention to the economic development of the colonies. To rectify the situation, they involved themselves in new affirmative administrative planning (Mills 2002). For this purpose funding poured in from The Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation which allowed anthropologists to study subjects in a better way.

Moreover with the introduction of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act (CDWA) in the 1940s, proper funding was allocated by the government to conduct social science research in the colonies. An organisation by the name of Colonial Social Science Research (CSSRC) was established. Raymond Firth and Audrey Richards from the London School of Economics followed the progressive agenda of the CDWA and used scientific and pragmatic research ideas in their investigations (ibid). The members of CSSRC, with its support, as intellectual leaders sought to bring forth to the public social research problems in untouched parts of Africa and thus in the process created inter-disciplinary sciences concerned with issues of all kinds, be it social, economic or political. In the process of researching social problems associated with being a colony, anthropology altered such researches into creations with theoretical meaning. This increased its validity in academy, with the creation of new anthropology departments all over Britain (ibid). An association named Association for Social Anthropology (ASA) was founded in 1946 as part of this progress.

The British also employed native anthropologists in the Third World nations including India, who were trained to study their own nations and states in order to bring out an insider's perspective on effects of policies. This was before the Second World War. These applied anthropologists did pure research in the hope that it will change the course of their nations. They hoped to build a strong new modern nation-state. However their participation in policy creation and reformation or pragmatic research and involvement, did not help in the establishment of applied anthropology in academic institutions or other arenas. This was mainly because, even though the colonisers employed native researchers/ anthropologists for local intervention, when it came to the possession of the realms of pure anthropology, it was in the hands of the British anthropologists.

However there were clashes between the intellectuals of LSE and those at Oxford, as the latter believed that funding of social academic research should not be controlled by a colonial body such as CSSRC but by academics themselves. These clashes did not find any solution and with the demise of the British colonies by 1961, funding stopped and alternate funding agencies came by in the 1970s.

1.2.3 Applied Anthropology to Practicing Anthropology (1945 – Present)

That anthropology as an applied and a theoretical science could not be one was emphasised by the European scholars. Instead of removing the label of being recognised as service providers of the colonisers and arguing for other scholarly and academic goals, they preferred to dispute the non-possibility of anthropology existing as an applied science. So when application of anthropology in Europe drew to closure with the colonies becoming independent near about the time when World War II ended, in the United States, application of anthropology expanded to international areas due to its association with different concerns during World War II. With the United States developing as a super power in all fields of economy, polity and military, anthropologists in America took this opportunity to provide applied anthropology with authentic institutional recognition. It is obvious from this that a separation between pure anthropology and applied anthropology too occurred in America, however it did not have the similar reasons as that seen in Europe.

The reasons for the split in America can be said to have occurred due to: 1) An increase in the need to learn "pure" anthropology which eventually led to the rise of theoretical anthropology; 2) Questions related to knowledge, meaning, moral, ethical and political concerns connected to application of anthropology; and 3) Development of organisations which allowed job opportunities for non-academic practitioners with anthropological skills, which also somewhat made a faint shift in the description of what applied anthropology meant in the United States. These new vistas did not allow pure and applied anthropology to solve contemporary problems of society together. Thus slowly a separation between what is called applied anthropology and practicing anthropology was emerging, with the practicing anthropologists working purely non-academically.

After the war anthropological knowledge was mostly used in government and private sectors. This shift was an important move towards practice from a purely academic field. The demand for applied anthropologists kept on increasing and led to the formation of many programmes providing new degrees and

organisations like Local Practitioners Organizations (LPOs), associations like the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA) by the American Anthropological Association, groups like the Coalition of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA), journals like Practicing Anthropology and Napa's bulletin series, etc. (van Willigen 2002) came up. This also brought home the point that the creation of applied anthropologists for external work would need anthropologists from the academic field. Hence, during this time we find academics who also acted as applied anthropologists work both in academics and also outside. As applied anthropology got institutionalised, which clearly occurred in the 1970s and 1980s, the meaning of "applied" saw a slow transformation. Initially applied anthropology tried hard to keep a connect between theoretical and practical objectives, but this 'new applied anthropology' of the late 20th century was completely concentrated on utilising anthropological knowledge in the arena of policy making. The difference between theory and practice was however unlike what was seen in Great Britain. The distinctiveness was in the ability of the American anthropologists to sustain a separate identity and focus on contemporary concerns. This allowed the growth of applied anthropology in an extraordinary way in the United States in the later part of the 20th century.

With the end of the cold war, new structures of economy developed and boundaries were broken to create a new system in economy which is known as globalisation. In the process both humanitarian conflicts and varied intercultural meetings took place. Such a situation where people and states were being connected across the world gave anthropology a fascinating area to practice its skills. Globalisation led to the differences or distinctions between pure academic and non-academic practices to become distorted. Now research was oriented towards more present issues-related interdisciplinary investigations with the use of methodologies which were both collective and participatory. This new kind of research also concentrated working more on policy-making.

A term called 'institutional anthropologies' (Bennett 1996) came up in the last part of the 20th century. These though not strictly applied in form connected the discipline to other areas of study with professional dealings. For example, legal anthropology, medical anthropology, organisational anthropology, etc. focus on contemporary issues. However the institutional anthropologists do work in similar ways used by applied anthropologists and eventually influence the distortion between theory and pragmatics. When academically connected anthropologists started using participatory methodology, a huge change was observed in practice.

The first person to use such participatory method in order to work for the community was Paulo Freire from Brazil (Greenwood and Levin 1998, Wallerstein and Duran 2003). Through his work he wanted to create a new area to generate knowledge and in the process, break the myth that it was only academic organisations which had the power to produce knowledge and distribute it (Elden and Levin 1991, Taylor 1993). This method of participatory research was deemed as a novel tactic in anthropological investigation.

Practicing anthropology at the end of the day is all about bringing changes in people's lives through research, formulation of plans and policies and finally action. Anthropology as an applied science has been involved with framing of public policies for more than a hundred years now. Anthropology and more so

11

the arena of practicing anthropology is no more about just accumulating knowledge of cultures and have an understanding of them. It is now more a collection of knowledge and information to cater to concerns which require immediate attention. This accumulation of knowledge and finding solutions for communities and their transformation is to be seen as a global process as it involves serious issues of different societies and affects all. In this setting the students would learn skills that will allow them to use as methodologies and techniques in future when they opt for careers other than academics. This may include knowledge related to medicine, economy, education etc. where they can utilise their expertise to create policies and schemes for communities. Such situations will hopefully take away disputes related to "applied" versus "practice". With practicing anthropological methodologies, the use and help of multidisciplinary subjects can also be seen to be of immense utility as concerns and issues can only be solved by collaborating with different levels of knowledge.

1.3 SUMMARY

To summarise, this unit is about how anthropology developed as an applied science and in this how it followed various paths to build itself as applied anthropology and later on as both applied and practicing anthropology, finally blurring the differences in ideology and technique by coming out of trivial beliefs of applied being part of academics and practicing being part of everyday pragmatic life and issues. Both today, compliment each other and exist as one with only the difference being in the use of nomenclature. This unit shows how applied anthropology was initially about collecting information about societies to know more about them and if possible to offer them assistance. Gradually it became a way to study societies to help administrators or colonisers manage their colonies conscientiously. This kind of collection of data, as time went by, led people with a background in anthropology being offered jobs, like for example, after the Great Depression and the World Wars to understand the situation of effected people and offer them assistance by governments concerned. In this entire process, debates and arguments started arising between academics and practitioners where, academics considered themselves to be superior in the dissemination of knowledge. However with changing scenarios and the need for tackling varied global concerns in present times has made the separation between applied and practice indistinct.

References

————————. 1943. "Proceedings of the American Anthropological Association for the Year Ending December, 1942". *American Anthropologist*. 45 (2) 256- 264.

Barnet, H. G. 1969 (1942). *The Yakima Indians in 1942*. Eugene, Oregon: Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon.

Benedict, R. 1946. *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Bennett, J. 1996. "Applied and Action Anthropology". *Current Anthropology*. 36 (Supplement): S23-S53.

Elden, M and M. Levin. 1991. "Co-generative Learning: Bringing Participation into Action Research". W. F. Whyte (ed.). *Participatory Action Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Fenton, W. N. and E. L. Moore. 1974. "Introduction". Joseph Francois Lafitau. *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times*. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

Fiske, S. J. and C. Erve. 1997. "Status and Trends: Practice and Anthropology in the United States//The Global Practice of Anthropology". Marietta L. Baba and Carole E. Hill (eds.). *Studies in Third World Societies*, No 58. Williamsburg, VA: College of William and Mary Press.

Forde, E. D. 1953. "Applied Anthropology in Government: British Africa". A. L. Kroeber (ed.). *Anthropology Today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster, G. M. 1969. *Applied Anthropology*. Boston: Little Brown.

Greenwood, D. and M. Levin. 1998. *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Keith, A. 1917. "How Can the Institute Best Serve the Needs of Anthropology?" *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Society*. 47:12–30.

Kuper, A. 1983. *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mead, Margaret, E. D. Chapple and G. G. Brown. 1949. Report of the Committee on Ethics. *Human Organization.* 8 (2):20–21.

Mills, D. 2002. "British Anthropology at the End of Empire: The Rise and Fall of the Colonial Social Science Research Council, 1944-1962". *Revue d'Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 6:161-188.

Myres, J. L. 1928. "The Science of Man in the Service of the State". *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.* 59:19–52.

Nicaise, J. 1960. "Applied Anthropology in the Congo and Ruanda-Urandi". *Human Organization*. 19:112–117.

Reining, C. C. 1962. "A Lost Period of Applied Anthropology". *American Anthropologist*. 64:593–600.

Sachchidananda. 1972. "Planning, Development and Applied Anthropology". *Journal of the Indian Anthropological Society*. 7:11–28.

Spicer, E. H. 1976. "Beyond Analysis and Explanation? The Life and Times of the Society for Applied Anthropology". *Human Organization*. 35(4):335–343.

Taylor, P. V. 1993. *The Texts of Paulo Freire*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

van Willigen, J. 2002. *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. Westport, Conn: Bergin and Garvey.

Wallerstein, N. and B. Duran. 2003. "The Conceptual, Historical, and Practice Roots of Community Based Participatory Research and Related Participatory Traditions". H. M. Minkler and N. Wallerstein (eds.). *Community Based Participatory Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suggested Reading

van Willigen, J. 2002. *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. Westport, Conn: Bergin and Garvey.

Baba, M. L. and C. E. Hill. 2006. "What's in the Name 'Applied Anthropology'? An Encounter with Global Practice". Carole E. Hill and Marietta L. Baba (eds.). *The Globalization of Anthropology*. NAPA Bulletin #25. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Sample Questions

1) Discuss the development of applied anthropology from the period 1860 to 1945.

2) What role did anthropology have to play during the World Wars? Did it help in the growth of the subject as an applied science?

3) Can anthropologists play the role of policy makers? If so, how can they contribute?

4) Is there a demarcation between applied anthropology and practicing anthropology today? Elaborate.

UNIT 2 APPROACHES IN PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

Contents

Learning Objections

After going through this unit, you will:

➢ get an idea about applied and practical aspects of anthropological praxis;

➢ learn about the different methods applied by practicing anthropologists;

➢ learn about the different roles practicing anthropologists take as professionals; and

➢ learn about the difficulties they face in their areas of work.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The first evident purpose of anthropological studies for both students and academicians is the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. Hence the practical importance of anthropological work is never mulled. Nevertheless, ever since anthropology has existed as a research discipline, it has had a practical aspect, in which anthropologists used their skills and knowledge to solve practical problems. By and large, this facet of anthropology has been named practicing anthropology. Robert Chambers says that knowledge and procedures utilised by anthropologists are not only for the attainment of further knowledge, but they also include actions in order to achieve some pragmatic purpose. This is understood as practicing anthropology (1989). These disciples of anthropology are concerned with human welfare, not with abstract knowledge alone. Although traditionally anthropology is divided into four subfields (cultural, biological, archeology, and linguistics), many experts see practicing/applied anthropology as a fifth subfield, reflecting a growth of the discipline in professional realms and scholarly activity.

Conventional anthropology and practicing anthropology differ from each other in various aspects. Practicing anthropology applies the discipline's knowledge to tackle contemporary social, economic, or health problems facing communities or organisations (Kedia and Bennet, 2005). Practitioners apply a large range of research methods and theoretical tactics to embolden people together to focus upon actual problems of the world and guarantee the continued existence of groups or communities which are at stake.

2.2 PRACTICING VERSUS APPLIED

Applied anthropology is anthropology put to use. It is usually observed that whenever innovative means of using anthropology are introduced, new nomenclatures come into practice, and they are compared to applied anthropology. This is done so as to keep the distinctive features intact and to guard the creator's intellectual vision. However this does not last long (van Willigen, 2002). Early writing about action anthropology and practicing anthropology drew this contrast even though all were involved in the use of anthropology and the various practitioners of different approaches shared many common interests. Differences in the career and work setting can produce new terms for such activity. Practicing anthropologists often conceived of themselves as being something different from applied anthropologists. In the late 1980s, it was generally understood that applied anthropology was conducted by anthropologists who are fundamentally academics but offering their consulting services to help solve pragmatic issues and whereas the term practicing anthropology was more regularly associated with people who had training in anthropology but were employed in offices and organisations on a steady basis.

Hence when distinction is made between practicing anthropology and applied anthropology, employment circumstances seem to be the most important factor in defining this contrast. Applied anthropologists are thought to be primarily academically employed, while practicing anthropologists are those working outside of academia or have little, if any, ties with academia. The anthropologist who rather than working in the traditional academic roles of teaching and research in a college or university, started working for many other kinds of organisations (such as government agencies, non-government agencies, and firms in a wide range of content areas) became the practitioners. The kind of work they take may include policy researcher, evaluator, impact assessor, needs assessor, planner, research analyst, advocate, trainer, culture broker, expert witness, public participation specialist, administrator/manager, change agent, and therapist (van Willigen, 2002).

While the above discussed distinction holds up imperfectly in use, there are some very important differences in the working conditions of these two kinds of people that lead to differences in knowledge, attitudes, and reference group. Yet we can take a view here that these all represent kinds of applied anthropology. To die down the distinction between the two terms practicing and applied it can be said that practicing anthropologists are those applied anthropologists who work in private sector.

2.3 METHODOLOGIES IN PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

The methodologies of practicing anthropologists map the relationships between information, policy, and action, and the context of application which includes the knowledge relevant to a particular problem area and work setting. Therefore it includes the practices associated with producing and communicating information to solve practical problems. It can also involve various skills associated with being an interventionist, policy researcher or a change agent. In sum, the application methodology consists of the intellectual operations by which practicing anthropologists produce their products and have their effects.

2.3.1 General Methodology

The general methodology of practicing anthropology can be understood in three activities. These are obtaining information, formulating policies or plans, and action. These three activities are interrelated. Information is obtained through research. This information is used to formulate policy, and finally the policy guides action. Of course, nothing is ever that neatly rational; everything is subject to state of the problem. The relationship also operates in the opposite direction. The needs of action and policy often result in information being collected through research. Typically, in fact, there is a cycling back and forth through research, policy making, and action. We can call this situation the domain of application.

i) *Obtaining Information*

Information is seen as the foundation of the other two activities and can exist in a number of forms. Obtaining information is the diagnostic step of practicing research where the situation is defined or problem is identified through hypotheses and information is gathered using interview and focus group. The information which we deal with can range from raw data to general theory. Mostly, practicing anthropologists deal with information between these two poles. Through these methods of research we are able to move from observation, through various levels of abstraction, to more general theoretical statements. While the goal of practicing work is not the production of theory, the patterns of research logic are similar to those used in theoretical pursuits.

ii) *Formulating Policy/Plan*

The second activity of practicing anthropologists is formulating/shaping effective policy/plan on the basis of information obtained. Formulating plan is the goal setting and analysis step which formulates a guide for action. Therefore by policy here we mean the guides for consistent action which can be developed in reference to a wide variety of situations. Usually the practitioners as researchers provide information to policy makers, or as an analyst evaluates research data for policy makers and help make/shape effective policy. However they can also be directly involved in policy making.

iii) *Action*

The third activity is action. The action tool is used in decision/plan implementing step where action is directed at some practical goal. This includes various interventions carried out by practicing anthropologists to

bring change. The information obtained and the plan/policy formulated consists of a set of related ideas about role, procedures, and values. This is finally used to guide action.

The methods described above are applicable to all branches of practicing anthropology which use the knowledge gained from anthropological research to solve real life problems.

2.3.2 Traditional Methods

The methodology of application in the early stage of practicing anthropology was not well defined. Also the documentation during this period was poor. Therefore it was difficult to develop a sense of the nature of the approaches used by the early practitioners. In the early cases, the cross-culturally informed administrators used their knowledge to facilitate better "culture contact." Social reformers, ministers, and administrators made use of the cultural knowledge to accomplish their tasks. The practicing anthropologists of this stage worked as training or research specialists in support of government or private foundation supported administrative programs. It was mostly observed that the dealings of the applied anthropologists assisted and encouraged the domination of the state over indigenous populations under colonial conditions.

2.3.3 Participatory Approaches

As time passed the aspects of a particular applied problem with which the practitioners dealt increased. The anthropologists became more occupied with application and intermediation taking increasing responsibility for problem solution. This necessitated that the roles for practicing anthropologists expanded beyond the researcher-instructor-consultant core. With role expansion the practicing anthropology methodology took an important shape. As a first product the role extension brought an increased intensity of participation. In this role anthropologists were no longer merely monitors and predictors of change but came to actually work as participatory agents of change with the help of the community with which they were working.

This new role involved participation and action. In this action involved roles the anthropologists were directly engaged in change-producing behaviour with the help of the community they were involved. This change did not result in a single new approach, but a multiplicity of new approaches for applying anthropological knowledge. These include *action research and participatory action research, collaborative research and cultural action*. In this mode the anthropologist works with the community to understand the conditions that produce the problems the people face.

i) *Action Research and Participatory Action Research*

Action research is practice oriented, problem solving method carried out by practitioners where action is undertaken to understand and evaluate problem and bring change. It is therefore a reflective process of problem solving where action is taken to initiate change. Also when individuals of an area extend their hand to help a practicing anthropologist with a view to inquire about and create changes in their own community, we call it, participatory action research (PAR). Action research can be conducted in a village, education centre (like school or college), an organisation, a neighborhood,

etc. All these places possess the characteristics of a community. While talking about action research and participatory action research, it can be noted that sometimes many scholars make a sharp distinction between the two whereas for some the two expressions are identical. However the term action research came first and participatory action research historically emerged from the former. PAR methods involve the detection of problem, collection of data, preparation of collective plan, and finally action. These are the characteristic methods which most often transpire concurrently.

a) *Identify Problems and Constraint*

The PAR process begins when members of a community recognise some problems they want to solve by bringing change. The themes for evaluation can be identified by the practitioner himself/herself working with key informants within the community by constructing basic questions about community needs, regarding health, agriculture, environment, economy, education, etc. Once the problem has been identified, the practicing anthropologist begins communication with community members. At this preliminary stage, the practitioner works to gain thorough knowledge of the community in question by doing literature review and answering a few basic questions about the context of the community and its capacity. Anthropological research methods (such as ethnography, participant observation, interviews, field notes, archival analysis, and case studies) often form the basis of this initial exploration. The practitioner can conduct formal, in-depth interviews with community members for important information. Focus group discussions can be also carried out to help gauge the level of interest, resources, and constraints for various problems.

b) *Obtaining Information, Formulating Policies/Plans, and Action*

Data collection is an important way of obtaining information which begins with the first conversation about the PAR. During data collection, participants become researchers as they continue to dialogue with other community members and begin to gain a deeper awareness of the problem. Planning/policies emerge from the solutions proposed by participants. Plans for action also include discussions of how much participation is needed, how to obtain necessary resources, and plans for continuous evaluation. Action occurs when local participants and other collaborators begin to put the plan into action such that the social situation improves.

To sum up, action research and participatory action research methodologies represent a useful array of practices that address problems in a constructive, capacity-building way. The action research links research and action and shows the community-orientation of practicing anthropologists.

ii) *Collaboration Approach/Collaborative Research Approach*

In the collaborative approach, the researchers, programme developers, and community members are networked to do research for "joint problem solving and positive social change" (Schensul and Schensul 1992:162). Collaboration here means using one's research skills to support the attainment

of community goals. Therefore, this is a research activity where the practitioner is involved in change producing action. The practicing anthropologist here is not a direct change agent but an auxiliary to community leaders. However, it is important for the success of the process that the relationship between the community and the collaborating practitioner must be direct. Hence in collaborative research approach practitioners are well adapted to working in direct relationship with the community organisation as opposed to working through an intervening agency. The role of the collaborative practitioner is focused on the expressed needs of the community, usually expressed through its leadership. Collaboration does not usually call for a practicing anthropologist to be directly involved in change-producing decision making.

a) *The Components of Successful Collaboration*

For collaborations to be fruitful, many finite rules are to be adhered. The community control of research operations makes the collaboration successful. Here the informed and involved community should determine if a specific research project (and its related methods), is appropriate to community needs. The research results should be reviewed by community activists. Thus, real collaboration is only possible where there is substantial ideological sharing and agreement between the practitioner and the activist. The quality of collaboration is evaluated through analysis of its positive impact on the community.

Research based on collaborative objectives should be worked out in such a way that is beneficial to community requirements. Hence the techniques used in such research should take time into consideration. Both time effectiveness and the fundamental idea of collaboration are coherently associated with the involvement of the community to the research process. The most significant aspect of this process is the way instruction is provided to the community members to make them proficient investigators.

b) *Steps in collaborative approach*

The collaborative methodology is conceived as having a series of steps as mentioned by Schensul (1973). They are:

1) Development of Rapport and Credibility of Applied Research

2) The Identification of Significant, Indigenous Action Programs

3) The Negotiation of Relationships (Cooperative and Reciprocal) between the Applied Researchers and the Action People

4) Initial Participation in Specific Action Programs

5) The Identification of Specific Informational Needs of the Action People

6) Meeting the Needs of Long-Range Research Plans

7) Formalised Research and Data Collection Operations

8) Analysis of Data

9) Data Dissemination, Evaluation, and Interpretation.

To sum up, collaborative method implies the continued involvement of the practicing anthropologist in problem solving where achievements are measured with reference to the community's achievement of its goals.

iii) *Cultural Action*

Cultural action is a method directed at changing the relationships between poor people and power elite. In this method, a community, through reflection and study, can understand those factors which cause their predicament. It is highly participatory and focused on increasing self-determination in the context of cultural dominance and oppression. While it was developed in the context of poor communities, the ideas have been applied to several settings.

The basis of this technique is to have an exchange of ideas and communication between the community members which is created with the assistance of a mediator. The objective of this discussion is to comprehend the issues at hand. This feat helps them understand their problem better and in turn find better solutions.

Thus this methodology involves people defining problems based upon their view of the world and their situation. It involves a team composed of a facilitator, who acts only to guide the activities, a number of investigators (or educated experts) who are typically from social sciences such as practicing anthropology or sociology, and the local people who act as co-investigators at all stages of the process. Such groups which are formed in this manner are called "culture circles" or "reflection groups". People meet and talk about their issues in these "culture circles".

2.3.4 Cultural Brokerage Approach: An Advocacy Approach

In cultural brokerage approach practicing anthropologists often mediate between people of different cultures. The most common is the situation where the practitioners serve to mediate between health care providers and individuals or communities that are ethnically distinctive. In such a scenario the practicing anthropologist either becomes the mediator or sometimes trains others to be one. The processes used to train include research and creation of media. Examples of cultural brokerages can also be cited from cultural resource management in which the practicing anthropologist connects government run bodies in the building of a project with the affected community (Downum and Price 1999).

Cultural brokerage methodology is an intervention strategy of research, training, and service that links persons of two or more socio-cultural systems through an individual, with the primary goals of making community service programs more open and responsive to the needs of the community, and of improving the community's access to resources. Interestingly in cultural brokerage the interventions affect the agencies working towards change more than the communities themselves. The cultural broker with his/her determined and deliberate atribute is an important mediator between two halves of a bigger cultural set up.

2.4 BEING A PROFESSIONAL: HOW TO DO PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY?

Practicing anthropology is seen in various categories like action anthropology, advocacy anthropology, social impact assessment research, needs assessment, cultural brokerage, etc. Practicing anthropologists face different working conditions depending on the location and nature of the organisation they work for and their role in that organisation. The combination of background, anthropological training, and prior work/internship experience provides the skills that assist in making the transition from either academics to practice, or from one practice job to another. NAPA[1] defines practicing anthropologists as having keen observation and interpersonal communication skills, which is of complete value and assists in fitting into any new work environment.

i) *Looking for a Profession*

   For practicing anthropologist the most important step is the process of finding a profession. Earlier the job market for practicing anthropologist was based on demand for persons with skills in social science research methodology. Though this is now changing, yet some job markets are not aware of practicing anthropologists. This sometimes creates a situation where there are opportunities for professional work but very few are available for "practicing anthropologists only." It is because of these conditions that the practicing anthropologist seeking work must be ready to deal with employers who are unfamiliar with the true capabilities of well-trained, contemporary anthropologists, or who hold grossly inaccurate stereotypes of the practicing anthropologist's capabilities. The practitioner should be able to adapt to such situations and should be able to enlighten the employer about his/her credibility towards work and this may be displayed through an acute presentation of one's experiences and competencies.

   Success in seeking a profession requires special preparation and tactics. At the very onset it is important to assess who s/he is and what s/he wants to accomplish in the future. This requires continual self-assessment. Reading of employment advertisements in newspapers and specific profession based newspapers helps in getting ideas about a profession to be chosen and taken up. There are, what we call anthropological newsletters which put up a long list of careers outside of the academia. Though government agencies have a rather complex system of disseminating employment information, yet their employment offices should not be overlooked.

   Relatively few employers have a clear conception of what practicing anthropologists can do. This relates to some basic conditions which practicing anthropologists face while seeking any profession. They compete with persons who are not trained in anthropology, for example, social workers, sociologists, and urban planners. They are hired on the basis of what they can do, not what they are. The practicing anthropologist needs to work to overcome stereotyped potential employers. This will require that s/he focuses on her/his skills in her/his presentation of self. The acquisitions of skills which are appropriate to the goals of the potential employing organisations

---

[1] http://practicinganthropology.org/practicing-anthro/

are very important. A skill such as doing statistical analysis using a computer program such as SPSS can make the difference. This is why training and the profession seeking are coincidental.

ii) *Selling the Practice in the Job Market*

The job market for practicing anthropologists is difficult to characterise. The requirement to know the market is absolutely crucial in practicing anthropology where so few employers are aware of the potentials and nature of practicing anthropology. It will be necessary to "sell" practicing anthropology by showing the usefulness of the skills one has learned. A practicing anthropologist is in a better position because of her/his acquired anthropological perspective in problem solving. The employers need practitioners but they just do not know it yet. A practitioner must know enough about the organisation to be able to identify its problems and to associate her/his skills with solutions to its problems. A practitioner is not hired on the basis of her/him being the best anthropologist. S/he is hired when employers see her/him as a skills-possessing problem solver that relates to the organisation's need and is more efficient, more sensitive, more effective, more responsive, and in the end more profitable.

iii) *Practicing in Research Market*

The research support obtained through grants and contracts is highly marketable and the most important means of a practice development. Research support for practicing anthropologist can be obtained through either grants or contracts. Both are subject to their own special kind of procedures and regulation. Although at times it is difficult to distinguish between grants and contracts, it is possible to point out certain differences. Contracts provide a means of paying for an activity which meets a specific need identified by an agency. One finds that contracts have stricter and bounded rules than grants. This is because, grants are regularly utilised in researcher developed experiments and investigations aimed at positive changes. Researches with grant allotments do not face severe updating or apprising obligations.

Funding is made available for various types of research activities. These include basic research, applied research, and development programs which have a research component. It is often necessary to have the support of specialists who continually search for research opportunities, provide preliminary support, assist in proposal preparation, and negotiate contracts properly in order to be consistently successful. It must be made clear that all these processes are highly competitive and that success is based upon competence in both research and the funding process. A means to enable procuring funds for research is by building one's own non-profit research organisation. Such institutions are generously supported by the government and other mentors if they are designed keeping in mind interests of the public. Many anthropologists by training tread this path, open such non-profit agencies and become successful and invaluable practitioners.

iv) *Practicing as Consultant*

Due to special skills of the practitioners, the special needs of the client organisation, and the limitations of the client organisation, the practicing anthropologists are hired as consultants. In some cases the fact that the

practicing consultant is an outsider is essential to his or her contribution. In other words, he or she may be hired as an outsider, and less as an expert.

When the practicing anthropologist engages a client's problem, he or she must to some extent conceptualise the problem in anthropological terms. This allows the practitioner to deal with the problem, but it also causes the need for translation of the results back to the meanings which are significant to the client. This process can result in an effective use of the anthropologist's skills, and therefore, a potential for improving the efficiency of meeting client needs.

v) *Reasons for using Practitioners as Consultants*

van Willigen gives the following reasons for the use of practicing anthropologists to work as professional specialists, i.e. consultants (2002):

1) The practitioner's knowledge of a specific region or aspect of culture may not be available within the organisation.

2) The practitioner's special research skills may not be available within the organisation. These skills may be derived from the generalised pool of social science techniques (e.g., questionnaires and survey techniques) as well as techniques specific to anthropology (e.g., excavation, participant-observation).

3) The practitioner's special problem-solving skills are not available within the organisation. This may relate to the goal of improving the organisation functioning of the client's group.

4) The practitioners as consultant may possess skills which, although available in the client organisation, are required to meet temporary short-falls in manpower.

5) The practitioners as consultant may be "certified" to have the skills necessary to meet certain legal requirements which the client must satisfy.

6) The practitioner's status as a credible outsider may allow him or her to provide a noninvolved, and therefore objective, evaluation of the client group's functioning.

7) The practitioner's status as a credible outsider may be used by the client to reduce the social cost of certain organisational or policy changes. That is, the interventions for change may be designed by the client for application by the consultant.

8) The practitioner's teaching skills coupled with her/his knowledge may allow her/him to contribute to the development of the client organisation's knowledge and skill levels.

9) The practitioners as consultant may provide the client with a mechanism for increasing organisational prestige, or a "headliner" attraction for a conference or other meeting.

2.5   ENLISTING SOME PRACTITIONERS

There are two major types of anthropological practice viz. intervention anthropology and policy research (van Willigen, 2002). Policy research combines the methods of social impact assessment, evaluation research, and technology development research while intervention anthropology combines the approaches of action anthropology, research and development anthropology and advocacy anthropology. For example practitioners with the knowledge of design anthropometry knowledge are employed in technology development research where they provide measurement of humans for making work stations, cockpits, improved clothing size, machinery and other industrial design.

Typical practicing anthropology practices will consist of many roles. Sometimes the practice title reflects the role and at other times, it does not. There is a general tendency for the number of roles to increase. Some practitioners can be enlisted as (van Willigen, 2002):

Policy Researcher

The role of practicing anthropologists is also to give information to policy makers and it is in this role they become policy researchers. The given information is vital in the making of policy decisions. The findings of ethnographic research with the use of different core research techniques can create knowledge which assists in better policy formulations. This is a common role of the practitioner and can be taken up as a stage of research, from the creation of a research design to collecting of data and its analysis. The research function is common to many applied positions, and therefore, all potential practicing anthropologists need to have preparation as policy researchers.

Evaluator

As opposed to policy researcher, the role of an evaluator is specialised. The evaluator's task is to utilise his/ her research expertise to decide whether a project, strategy, or policy is operating and functioning successfully or not. Sometimes an evaluation is also known as programme monitoring. Thus a practicing anthropologist as an evaluator is assigned to impartially ascertain the success or failure of a project or plan.

Impact Assessor

The role assigned to an impact assessor is also specific and is part of the policy research role. S/he has to envisage the results of any scheme, project, policy or programme. A practicing anthropologist in the position of an impact assessor endeavours to ascertain the consequences of any strategic project designed by the government for the public. This data related to the outcomes is aimed at guiding the strategy or plan of a programme/project. The impact assessor hence offers different substitute strategies so that a programme or a project can work better. For example the construction of larger systems (like airports, highways, dams, etc.) creates havoc in the entire population surviving in these planned areas. It is here that the impact assessor plays an important role of providing a structure which is beneficial and supportive of the inhabitants long with the success of the proposed constructions. This in fact briefly also defines what social impact assessment is all about. Anthropologists are trained to understand communities always from their perspectives, and thus as practitioners they can enact a pivotal role here.

Needs Assessor

Another specific policy research role of the practicing anthropologist is the role of the need assessor. In this, the need assessor collects information on public programme needs expected in the designing of programmes related to social, economic, educational and health concerns. The practicing anthropologist as a need assessor fundamentally evaluates and participates in the administration of designing and reasoning of any programme or project.

Planner

The role of a planner is not very usual. However if a practicing anthropologist does get an opportunity to work as a planner, s/he contributes to the framing and modeling of projects, policies and programmes to be taken up in the future. This also includes among other things collection of information and research investigation which assists the decision makers.

Research Analyst

This role is a common one and decision makers like policy makers, planners, programme supervisors, etc. use practicing anthropologists for this. Here the research analysts have to infer the outcomes of research and help in creating new decisions.

Advocate

Practicing anthropologists as advocates perform complex role which involves acting in support of community groups and individuals. It almost always involves direct political action consistent with the community's self-defined goals. Advocacy may be part of the other roles. This is not a common role.

Trainer

A practicing anthropologist as a trainer develops training materials for different client groups and content areas. Often this involves preparation of technicians for cross-cultural experiences. This is a role with a long history in practicing anthropology.

Culture Broker

Practicing anthropologists as culture brokers serve as links between programmes and ethnic (and local) communities. The role appears especially useful in reference to health care delivery and the provision of social services. Many other roles have culture broker functions attached to them. Brokerage is always a two-way communication role.

Public Participation Specialist

This role is a recent one and has come as a reaction to the requirement of public involvement and contribution in the process of planning. It sounds similar to that of the concept of culture brokerage however here the participation of the specialist with the public is on a case to case basis instead of being uninterrupted, as is the case with the former. As a public participation specialist the practicing anthropologist organises public education using the media and public meetings. The amount of anthropological involvement in this role is increasing.

Administrator/Manager

Practicing anthropologists may also take up or be asked to take up administrative duties in programmes and projects for which they provide investigative and research support. This kind of participation does not arise at the beginning. It is only when their role of researcher and analyser is appreciated, are they offered the jobs of an overseer. Though such positions were not so popular among anthropologists in the past, these last few decades have seen an increase in anthropologists being approached for such posts. The anthropologists do play influential roles here and it is their responsibility in such arenas to work for the betterment of communities and people.

Therapist

Anthropological knowledge and know-how is used as a therapeutic means by practicing anthropologists to converse and connect with people troubled by myriad issues. When anthropologists act as therapists, they are referred to as "clinical anthropologists".

2.6 ANTHROPOLOGISTS AT WORK: HAZARDS

When anthropologists move out of hard core academics and move to professions outside it, to practically use their knowledge, they face many unexpected hurdles. And the problems may not be the same for everyone. In some cases, discrepancies arise when needing to collaborate and work with people from other disciplines and fields. In other cases research perspectives can clash. If in one situation quantitative methods get an upper hand, in others it may be the qualitative method. At times ethical and moral confrontations are to be dealt with, for example giving out particular knowledge to clients. Again in other situations, practicing anthropologists may need to repeatedly market their proficiency of the role of a consultant or contractor to the organisations' employers who are not acquainted with anthropology or its methods. Practicing anthropologists may also find themselves in jobs which involve a good amount of risk and threat. Anthropologists studying and researching issues like use of drugs or gangs or racial conflicts or inconsistencies in the military, etc. have to make use of all their skill sets and knowledge to tread such paths carefully and still bring out positive ideas and solutions to the best of their abilities.

Client organisations may use practitioners to produce an impact on third parties. Clients may also use the anthropologist as a means of solidifying, protecting, or enhancing the position/image of the client. The anthropologist should use his/her position of centrality to increase control and access to information.

2.7 SUMMARY

The various methodologies of practicing anthropologists are nothing but the story of the growth of public recognition of practicing anthropology and its use from ancient times to the present, from colonial powers establishing trade and conquering indigenous populations to practitioners working to preserve at-risk cultures and empower communities for self-determined positive change. Over the past 25 years a new synthesis has emerged. This new synthesis revolves

around a newly emerging relationship between anthropologists and the persons and communities they study. Most recently a trend for short-term, contract work makes us brood over the question that do practicing anthropologists practice anthropology?

The methodology of practice should improve the client's or community's understanding of anthropology. Before developing the methods one should not be absorbed into "whether or not it's an anthropological problem." As practicing anthropologists we cannot afford compulsively maintained boundaries. Attempts to rigidly define what is or is not anthropology are unproductive. The focus of concern of a practicing anthropologist is not the discipline, but reality that we see through what we have learned as anthropologists.

The information, policy and action which are the heart of practicing methodology should ultimately focus on the total situation. If the needs perceived by the client are different from and perhaps contradictory to the needs discovered in the community at large, the practitioners through suitable methods should identify a significantly large range of needs within the total community served by the agency. This will bring holism in the true sense. The client may be presented with a copy of the Society for Applied Anthropology or the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology's ethics statement to make them understand the professional ethics of the anthropologist.

One of the benefits of using these methods will be an improved understanding of the nature of anthropology as a practicing discipline.

References

Chambers, Erve. 1989 *Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide*. Prospect Heights, Illinois.: Waveland Press.

Downum, C. E. and Laurie J. Price. 1999. "Applied Archaeology". *Human Organization* 58(3):226–239.

Kedia, Satish, and Linda A. Bennett. 2005. "Applied Anthropology." In *Anthropology*, from Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS). Developed under the auspices of UNESCO, published online at http://www.eolss.net. Oxford, UK: EOLSS Publishers.

Schensul, Stephen L. 1973. "Action Research: The Applied Anthropologist in a Community Mental Health Program". In *Anthropology Beyond the University*. A. Redfield, ed. Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings No. 7. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Schensul, Jean J. and Stephen L. Schensul. 1992. "Collaborative Research: Methods of Inquiry for Social Change". In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. Margaret D. LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy, and Judith Preissle, eds. San Diego, California: Academic Press.

van Willigen, John. 2002. *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction* (3rd Ed). New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Suggested Reading

van Willigen, John. 2002. *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction* (3rd Ed). New York: Bergin and Garvey

Sample Questions

1) Is there a difference between a practicing and an applied anthropologist? Is the distinction real or is it just an extension of how they work?

2) What are the methodologies applied in practicing anthropology. Discuss elaborately.

3) Who is a practicing anthropologist? Identify and describe some of the roles practiced by a practicing anthropologist.

4) What are the hazards faced by a practicing anthropologist?

UNIT 3 CHALLENGES AND DILEMMAS OF ETHICS IN PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

Contents

Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

➢ understand the meaning of ethics;

➢ learn why ethics is required in anthropological research;

➢ know how ethics developed variedly due to different mishaps of anthropologists in the history of anthropological research;

➢ understand the issues of confidentiality, consent, utility and transmission of knowledge

➢ learn about more detailed ethical practices; and

➢ learn about the guidelines provided by the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA).

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapters we have learnt about the development of practicing (or applied) anthropology. Now that we are equipped with enough knowledge to make ourselves comfortable with the subject, we are ready to learn about the vital concern an anthropologist should keep in mind when s/he applies or practices her/his skills. Among many concerns, an important concern is the issue of ethics. This unit thus will deal with what ethics is, how it came to be used, what its role in application and practice is, what its need is and how its use influences the final creation of an anthropologist.

3.2   WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ETHICS?

Ethics may mean moral conduct, codes, beliefs, values, integrity, conscience, principles, etc. It is a system of moral principles that regulates the appropriate demeanour of an individual or a group. Now that we know what ethics mean, you must be thinking how this comes into the turf of anthropology.

We know from our readings of our earlier texts that anthropology is basically a field science. And this designation is what has led us to act as applied or practicing anthropologists in different organisations. Our main purpose for being in the field to investigate and research brings us in contact with many dealings. The place where we investigate, the people we study, their lives, relationships, equations, etc., are their own which we enter and somehow try to offer to the world with academic, intellectual or professional intentions. As practicing anthropologists we may even go to find solutions for the people whom we study and try to bring about change. Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that we get in touch with people and populations and "use" what defines them for the immediate purpose of serving our intentions. The impact of such activities may be high. It is in such situations that ethics plays a big role. For example, we should keep certain questions in mind, like: How the findings of a population can be used without disclosing the identity of the informants? How do we know that the results of our findings will not eventually be a burden on the people studied? Or how much as an investigator, can we become involved with the population at a personal level?

In view of these questions, we may like to believe that ethics denotes a complete criterion of conduct. However it is important for applied and practicing anthropologists to understand the notion of ethics subjectively. This is because it is not easy to identify ethical norms precisely and it is also difficult to employ them steadily as the areas in which practitioners' research may each have different and problematic ethical needs. Then again ethical concerns are also to be viewed in terms of the respondents, the funding agencies or co-workers, all put together so as to not hurt the sentiments of the involved parties. As there are different outlooks, most of the time there is tension among these associations. Hence ethics is not always as simple as it may sound in the beginning.

It is not as if ethical tenets are specific to practicing anthropologists. Concerns such as reverence for individuals or groups, kindness, and impartiality are all basic to any research, whether he is an anthropologist or otherwise. Any layout or execution of a study is determined by manifestation of the tenets which is influenced by the limitations prescribed by a particular research framework. As a result anthropologists might face more hurdles than other researchers, specifically anthropologists who are employed in research connected to policy formulation where ethnographic and qualitative methods are used. This is no less than a challenge for practicing anthropologists as they have to retain both "scientific and moral integrity in a research reality of competing social values and ambiguous social facts." (Marshall, 1992: 4).

3.3 ETHICAL CONCERNS IN ANTHROPOLOGY'S HISTORY

With the growth of new ideas and notions anthropology has flourished immensely. Fields of investigation are increasing with great rapidity. Along with it the growth of applied actions has given birth to fresh challenges and confrontations. In turn this builds new concerns related to ethics.

To delve into history, we find that deliberations on ethical code always occurred with it becoming a major issue of concern during the Vietnam War. The anxiety was aggravated by research projects which were highly ill devised and were conducted without any moral ethos. These were "embarrassing disclosures that anthropologists had cooperated in government counter insurgency research in Latin America in the early 1960s and in Southeast Asia in the late 1960s." (Fluehr-Lobban, 1991: 62).

In fact much before the Vietnam War or the debacles of the 1960s, in 1919, questions were raised by Franz Boas in a letter to *The Nation* where he openly alleged four anthropologists working as spies under the façade of their job as researchers. In Boas' own words, he stated that, "a person, who uses science as a cover for political spying, who demeans himself to pose before a foreign government as an investigator and asks for assistance in his alleged researches in order to carry on, under this cloak, his political machinations, prostitutes science in an unpardonable way and forfeits the right to be classed as a scientist." (Boas 1919, in Weaver 1973:51)

This incident cited by Boas is still a matter of debate among many anthropologists and the gravity of the act still finds mention in published papers, pledges taken at public meetings, and the ethics codes brought out by the *American Anthropological Association* and *The Society for Applied Anthropology.* The main concern, among many others which is always discussed in ethical deliberations, is the possible injury or damage that the actions of an anthropologist may do to a group of people or to an individual. An anthropologist, practicing or academic, has to be sensitive to this concern. As s/he gets intimately connected to the community s/he works with, it becomes inevitable that the relationships between the investigator and the studied community or person becomes complex. In such a situation the results of the research as to be carefully put forward or else there may be critical unforeseen consequences. This can be explained in a clearer manner with the following example.

Cora Du Bois, an anthropologist and advocate of the culture and personality school of thought, had done research in Indonesia in a place called Alor. This work was published as the *People of Alor*. Alor was conquered by the Japanese at the time of World War II. Once the war was over, Du Bois learnt from sources that due to an action of a few Alorese, resulting from their acquaintance with Du Bois, led to the untoward execution of them (publicly beheaded) by the Japanese during the war. The story goes that unwittingly these Alorese had mentioned that the Americans should achieve success in the War as they thought the Americans were "good" people. The Alorese prior to knowing Du Bois had no knowledge about America or its inhabitants. Du Bois writes with trepidation that "there is no end to the intricate chain of responsibility and guilt that the pursuit of even

the most arcane social research involves." (Du Bois 1944 in Weaver 1973: 32). This incident may sound unreal in terms of simple conducting of research having such a horrific consequence. Nevertheless its reality highlights the fact that scientific efforts have the ability to produce astonishing damage.

In this part of the lesson, we try to look into more such incidences from the history of anthropology in connection with research ethics. Unethical conduct by anthropologists in the past has been aplenty but the most infamous and debated cases happened during the Vietnam War time. Here we will discuss the notorious Project Camelot introduced in Latin America and some monetarily aided research work conducted in Northern Thailand during the Vietnam War.

Before the Vietnam issues occurred, the research project which faced much ridicule was Project Camelot. It was started in 1964 under the management of the Special Operations Research Office (SORO) of the U.S. Army. This initiative was created to fund research in order to bring a stop to proliferation of communism in South America. This was to be done by the use of social research methods to contradict insurgency research. The scheme at a larger level was to include in its gamut of study, Asia, Africa and Europe besides Latin America. In this dubious venture, anthropologists too were taken in, to conduct research. However as luck would have it, the dealings of this undertaking was made known to the Latin American press slyly even before the project gained any momentum. The project and its model faced powerful local response and the project was aborted.

However the inclusion of anthropologists in it, left scars within the discipline's ideologies. Anthropologists after this debacle of questioned virtues, tried to reaffirm their academic position of scholars refuting vices like wars. There were protestations by the locals and the academics as the project was considered to have a fundamentalist bias and research was said to have powerful political insinuations. In the presence of overtly subjugated classes in these areas, many people did not find the use of social sciences to sustain social tranquility as approving. To explain simply, the involvement of social scientist to conduct research which obviously meant encroaching on the undertakings of other countries was not acceptable (van Willigen, 2002).

But sadly in the late 1960s, a post for an anthropologist to conduct intelligence work in South Vietnam was advertised in the journal (*American Anthropologist*) of the American Anthropological Association (AAA). The proposal was highly criticised by the anthropology fraternity with strict warning to the AAA not to entertain such promotions in the future. In the 1970s there were instances again of anthropologists assisting government on war related research in the Southeast of Asia, particularly in Thailand. In these circumstances, an important study took place which tried to look into the tricky issue of ethics. It was done by Ralph L. Beals and was called *Politics of Social Research* (1969). This work and deliberations between the major members of the AAA brought out a Committee on Ethics which drafted the first AAA professional code of ethics in 1971 (Fluehr-Lobban, 1991, Willigen, 2002).

Another project which had acute repercussions in the anthropological community was the "Thailand Project". Without understanding the cultural makeup of the inhabitants of Thailand's hill tribes and their relationship with the elite lowlanders, some anthropologists went ahead with their studies funded by government

supported agencies to offer their services to create social changes. To give a brief, the highland tribes lived in semi-isolation with their only means of contact with the rest of Thailand and the world being their production and selling of opium. Due to their trade, the Thailand government was coerced by international nations to stop the increasing opium transactions. Moreover, these tribes were looked down upon by the plain people of Thailand who deprecated them and their lifestyles. Needless to say the tribes hardly had any political or economic influence and were not in good terms with the government (Belshaw 1976). This region came in the spotlight, when the Vietnam War got bigger. In the 1960s social investigators from the western world proliferated in number in the name of research. The investigators, including anthropologists, did not take into consideration the existing facts into account and only concentrated on the good amount of money that was pouring in for such investigations. They completely ignored the valley's culture (Jones 1971). The Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) was one such funding agency of the American government from the Department of Defense, which provided monetary support to this scheme. Their main interest was to conduct research directed towards counterinsurgency intentions.

This entire process of conducting research was done without any regard towards the country's cultural set up and ethical responsibilities. This led to the ridicule of these researchers in 1970 by the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, who termed this as "counterinsurgency research."(ibid) This example of ethical violation worked as a lesson for anthropologists, subsequently generating awareness in ethical concerns. In a way it was through the discords experienced during the Vietnam episode, indirectly felicitated the understanding of our moral obligations. The process of discussing and finally accepting to respect ethical considerations was a painful and difficult one. However the attempt by the AAA to make changes in 1971 which were finally out in 1981, with renewed codes of conduct for anthropological investigators was commendable, though it too had its flaws.

3.4 DISPUTES IN ETHICAL USAGES

When we deal with ethics and ethical concerns, there are some areas which clearly stand out and cannot be ignored. It is these concerns that we will discuss in the following paragraphs.

3.4.1 The Dispute of Confidentiality

In anthropological research the investigator may in many societies have to live and work among people and societies, whom they are not familiar with. Even if there is familiarity of some sort between the researcher and the researched, there may be norms which the researcher would have to abide by. One cannot forget the fact that it is the investigator who is the "taker" and thus placed in a supposedly subordinate position. It is of utmost importance that great care must be taken as to how one must behave among a society studied and represent them later in their writings in a way that their lives are not compromised with in any way. Rapport building and creating a relationship of utmost trust is the base of a healthy relationship between both so as to be beneficial to the researcher and not harmful to the researched. The trust created in the minds of the respondents, allows them to divulge a lot about their own society, however it is the researcher's

responsibility to protect their identities and retain confidentiality if sought for. Rapport and friendship built may lead to the revealing of information which might be helpful to the researcher but may turn to be damaging for the respondent and her/his community. It is the task of the researcher to comprehend such information and either not use it or if it is of vital need for one's investigation, use them in such a way by not giving away the identity of the information giver. Mostly the informants give away information that might be damaging to them, without realising it due to their feeling of hospitality towards the researcher or also because they might be in awe of the "power" that the anthropologist might hold. They also reveal things unwittingly due to the need to flaunt their knowledge or because they seek recognition.

It should be borne in mind that though we try to provide the respondents enough privacy and secrecy, yet the use of important and at the same time harmful information, may not be completely possible. In most cases, the assurance of anonymity promised becomes difficult. Mostly the legal rights to any information collected by a researcher belong to the funding agency funding a project. Thus even when the researcher might want not to use any information or reveal a community's or person's name, s/he might not be in a position to do so. Thus it is to be noted that such situations must be tread cautiously. Though research findings are of immense help in myriad ways, they should not be utilised at the cost of the respondents' lives.

Researchers should try their best to respect and protect the confidentiality of our respondents. However difficult, they may try to take care in their own small ways whenever and wherever possible. If not invited, one must not infringe upon the subjects' personal space. Wherever possible, they should do away with the collection of sensitive information. If collected, proper ways of keeping them should be devised during and after fieldwork. Sometimes if names are to be used, pseudonyms can be used during the time of writing or documenting data. The researchers should always be truthful to the respondents and should let them be aware of all pros or cons, like the revealing of identities of families or groups or administrative officials unintentionally. They should from the beginning let the respondents be aware of any legal obligations and proceed accordingly. Lastly it is always best to learn from the earlier experiences and mishaps of other researchers and the methods they used to cope with the issues of confidentiality.

3.4.2 The Dispute of Consent

The issue of confidentiality is in sync with the issue of consent. This is a major concern in the arguments of ethics. Before resorting to anonymity of respondents when needed, the bigger task at hand for the anthropological researcher is to seek permission to probe into their lives and culture. It is highly important that the researcher while taking consent also makes the prospective respondents aware of the fact that they will be getting involved in. The respondents should be aware of the necessity of the research work, the knowledge of the research funders, their objectives, the ultimate use of the findings and the effect that only these might have on them. Only when they are aware of these and give their consent to the researcher to proceed, can the investigation be called ethically sound.

The respondent should always be told that her/his participation is voluntary. This is termed informed consent. In informed consent, lies the basis of ethical enquiry. This term and use of it has been borrowed from research in medical

arenas, as it mostly uses human subjects to investigate. Cases of human abuse during experiments have also been heard from the medical world. All these connected with the administration's concern about the ethical aspects of hugely funded research projects, have made the concept of informed consent imperative. To explain informed consent clearly, a definition given by the Board of Regents of the State of New York in 1966 is presented (van Willigen, 2001). It was made for medical professionals but is now applicable for other researchers, including practicing anthropologists. The definition says, "No consent is valid unless it is made by a person with legal and mental capacity to make it, and is based on a disclosure of all material facts. The federal government defines some populations as vulnerable and not able to give informed consent. These include the under-aged, mentally handicapped, institutionalized or incarcerated, persons under risk because of the illegal status or activities, people who can't read, and people who are ill or physically handicapped. Any facts which might influence the giving and withholding of consent are material. A patient has the right to know he is being asked to volunteer and to refuse to participate in an experiment for any reason, intelligent or otherwise, well-informed or prejudiced. A physician has no right to withhold from a prospective volunteer any fact which he knows may influence the decision. It is the volunteer's decision to make, and the physician may not take it away from him by the manner in which he asks the question or explains or fails to explain the circumstances" (Langer 1966:664).

The definition above may seem simple and easy to practice, however it is not so. The job of the researcher to create the situation for informed consent would also include explaining to the prospective respondents about the consequences their information may create later. However, at the stage of explaining this to the respondents, the researcher is himself or herself not sure, if these would be the real consequences which s/he predicts. In fact in anthropological research such are the cases where future implications of the research work cannot be forecasted.

It is noticed in research of anthropological nature, there is change in the way research is conducted due to new or different or unexpected data found in the process of investigation. Thus at the beginning when consent was taken from the respondents for a particular kind of knowledge, the problem of new permission from the same people with the rise of a new condition, occurs. Consent allowed for a particular kind of enquiry may not work for another kind. There are authors like Jorgensen who says that "consent should be requested for the research ends that are anticipated" (1971: 328). But it is not necessary that this would make things easier. The only thing that may help the researcher in all this is to believe and remember that the aim of informed consent is to conduct research enquiry without trickery and distortion.

3.4.3   The Dispute of Utility

Once the informants start giving data about themselves and their community, they might do so leisurely and abundantly. They would do so if they are assured of confidentiality. However the information gathered from the respondents may be used to dominate them. Once the research information gets into the hands of the sponsors it cannot be predicted they will always be put to use so as to benefit the communities studied. The knowledge may be used as a power to exploit them. Thus practicing anthropologists should create terms or ways by which the respondents would not have to suffer the "potential" harm later.

But it is difficult to bring this to reality. First the fact needs to be accepted that most of the times it is the researcher who accumulates profits from the findings while the same does not have any significance to the respondents. Many societies studied are not aware of what to do with the required data of the researcher or the topic of relevance to the researcher has no meaning to the community. In most cases the researcher herself/himself does not provide the society with enough detail about their own work which they should do. It helps if the researcher before beginning investigation can take meticulously into regard the prosperity of the people studied in the research design stage itself. A solution may be a deal between the researcher and the community for the research matter and objectives of the research design. This may lead to some changes in the process of research and also parts which the society is not comfortable with may be removed in the design stage itself. The project can be restructured to be designed in such a way that the information provided by the respondents would be helpful to the respondents' society. The way the final output would also come out should be accessible to the respondents' community. Or the researcher's entire project should be designed in such a way that everything should be created for the advantage or utilisation of the community studied. This way the moral obligations towards a community remain. In fields where research is done for application or practice, this process of building utility is not difficult as the main interest of the researcher should be a betterment of the community. However one must be careful to note that the clients who hire anthropologists to work for a community might not be related to it, and thus might not be completely aware of the intricacies of the community's life. In such a situation the ethical scenario should be taken care of more carefully. The researchers should think about the effects or consequences their work might have on the communities, as they would represent the clients who usually are the government, social service institutions, development organisations, etc. All in all the benefit of the community should always be at the back of the mind of the researcher.

3.4.4 The Dispute of Knowledge and its Transmission

Transmission of knowledge means how findings are disseminated, that is usually through publication in the form of books, articles or reports. This is one of the important ethical issues that is connected to the practicing anthropologist. Practicing anthropologists are always confronted with how to distribute the knowledge they gather. It is their duty to circulate their findings so that it may be added to the already available knowledge for better productivity. It is but obvious that research only comes to an end when its results are learnt by all. Mostly practicing anthropologists need to publicise their work not just to provide help to the communities they work with, but also so that their work gets known both in the academic and non-academic worlds. In doing so, the anthropologist must be careful as what to reveal and what not to. Their publications may also help them work better and convincingly in the applied field. The published work will give ideas to the other prospective practicing anthropologists in their area of work. However even when all this may sound easy, the issue of how much can be published, and how much needs to be kept from the public, is still a concern. One cannot ignore the fact that the practicing anthropologist's knowledge is more often than not, owned by their clients. In all this, researchers are believers of the ethical use of the distribution of data. The anonymity of the subjects is maintained if need be during such distribution of knowledge and is not to be compromised with in any circumstances.

3.5 PRACTICE OF ETHICS BY PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Let us now discuss how ethics is to be really practiced. Two vital aspects that practicing anthropologists need to look into are 1. accountability and responsibility and 2. quality (Gardner and Lewis, 1996). It is really necessary that the practicing anthropologist knows whom to be accountable. It should never be the clients but the informants whose lives s/he intrudes by extracting valuable information. Quality of work is equally vital as during the time period the anthropologist spends with the informants, it should be assured that the material collected should be of worth. Behaviour is also an important factor. Overbearing and bossy attitude will not go down well with informants and might slow the process of rapport building in the beginning. It is imperative that the practitioner listens intently to the views shared by the respondents and show ample respect to the inhabitants, especially to women, lower classes, lower castes, aged people, etc. When people offer their time to share their thoughts and knowledge, it is equally important that the researcher should return the favour by helping them in day to day work or wherever possibility of helping them occurs. Promises made in return of information should always be kept. The complete sincerity of the practicing anthropologist is depicted by the good deeds, conduct and manners s/he exhibits. The respect should be mutual between the researcher and the researched.

Hence if ethical dictates are followed and recognised then the sought after results would also follow. The position and status of the practicing anthropologist will also get acknowledged as an implementer, investigator and promoter of applied practices which enhances betterment and development of societies studied.

3.6 ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES AS CITED BY A PROFESSIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL BODY

In this section we provide the learners with the statements on ethical practices for application as listed by the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA). The statements were written so as to act as guidelines for the practicing and applied anthropologists.

Background

The preparation of the ethics statement involved a unique partnership between the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA) and the Southern California Applied Anthropology Network (SCAAN). Jean Gilbert, a SCAAN member and Chair of the NAPA Ethics Committee, worked with a local committee composed of several of her fellow SCAAN members (Claudia Fishman, Neil Tashima and Barbara Pillsbury) to create the first draft, which appeared in the December 1987 Anthropology Newsletter, pp 7 -8. Membership comments were solicited at that time. The Guidelines were also sent to all of the local practitioner organizations (LPOs) for comment, and in addition were the topic of discussion in a regular SCAAN monthly meeting. The final version of the NAPA Ethical Guidelines for Practitioners was published in the November 1988 Anthropology Newsletter, pp 8-9. Gilbert thanked the membership of SCAAN and the following individuals who reviewed and commented on the draft: Fred Hess, Elvin Hatch, Barbara Frankel and Gene Anderson. The final version incorporated many of their comments.

NAPA Ethical Guidelines for Practitioners

These guidelines have been developed by the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology as a guide to the professional and ethical responsibilities that practicing anthropologists should uphold. A practicing anthropologist is a professionally trained anthropologist who is employed or retained to apply his or her specialized knowledge problem solving related to human welfare and human activities. The designation "practicing anthropologist" includes full-time practitioners who work for clients such as social service organizations, government agencies and business and industrial firms. This term also includes part-time practitioners, usually academically based anthropologists, who accept occasional assignments with such clients. The substantive work of practicing anthropologists may include applied research, program design and implementation, client advocacy and advisory roles and activities related to the communication of anthropological perspectives. These guidelines are provided with the recognition that practicing anthropologists are involved in many types of policy-related research, frequently affecting individuals and groups with diverse and sometimes conflicting interests. No code or set of guidelines can anticipate unique circumstances or direct practitioner actions in specific situations. The individual practitioner must be willing to make carefully considered ethical choices and be prepared to make clear the assumptions, facts and issues on which those choices are based.

These guidelines therefore address general contexts, priorities and relationships which should be considered in ethical decision making in anthropological practice.

1) Our primary responsibility is to respect and consider the welfare and human rights of all categories of people affected by decisions, programs or research in which we take part. However, we recognize that many research and practice settings involve conflicts between benefits accruing to different parties affected by our research. It is our ethical responsibility, to the extent feasible, to bring to bear on decision making, our own or that of others, information concerning the actual or potential impacts of such activities on all whom they might affect. It is also our responsibility to assure, to the extent possible, that the views of groups so affected are made clear and given full and serious consideration by decision makers and planners, in order to preserve options and choices for affected groups.

2) To our resource persons or research subjects we owe full and timely disclosure of the objectives, methods and sponsorship of our activities. We should recognize the rights of resource persons, whether individuals or groups, to receive recognition for their contributions or to remain anonymous if they so desire or to decline participation altogether. These persons should be informed of our commitment to the principle of confidentiality throughout the design of research or other activities involving resource persons and should thoroughly investigate and understand all of the limitations on our claims of confidentiality and disclosure.

3) To our employers we owe competent, efficient, fully professional skills and techniques, timely performance of our work and communication of our findings and recommendations in understandable, nonjargonistic language. As practicing anthropologists, we are frequently involved with employers or clients in legally contracted arrangements. It is our responsibility to carefully review contracts prior to signing and be willing to execute the terms and conditions stipulated in the contract once it has been signed. At the outset of a relationship or contract with an employer or client, we have an obligation to determine whether or not the work we are requested to

perform is consistent with our commitment to deal fairly with the rights and welfare of persons affected by our work, recognizing that different constituencies may be affected in different ways. At this time, we should also discuss with our employer or client the intended use of the data or materials to be generated by our work and clarify the extent to which information developed during our activities can be made available to the public. Issues surrounding the protection of subject confidentiality and disclosure of information or findings should be thoroughly reviewed with the potential employer or client. We will not undertake activities which compromise our ethical responsibilities. We will carry out our work in such a manner that the employer fully understands our ethical priorities, commitments and responsibilities. When, at any time during the course of work performance, the demands of the employer require or appear to require us to violate the ethical standards of our profession, we have the responsibility to clarify the nature of the conflict between the request and our standards and to propose alternatives that are consistent with our standards. If such a conflict cannot be resolved, we should terminate the relationship.

4) In our relations with students and trainees, we will be candid, fair, nonexploitative, nondiscriminatory and committed to the student's or trainee's welfare. We recognize that such mentoring does involve an exchange in which practitioners share their knowledge and experience in return for the significant effort and contribution of the students/trainees. We should be honest and thorough in our presentation of material and should strive to improve our teaching and training techniques and our methods of evaluating the effectiveness of our instruction. As practicing anthropologists we are frequently called upon to instruct, train or teach individuals, anthropologists and others in nonacademic settings (workshop participants, in-service trainees, continuation or certification program trainees and research teams). To such persons, we owe training that is informed, timely and relevant to their needs. Our instruction should inform both students and trainees of the ethical responsibilities involved in the collection and use of data. To our students and trainees we owe respect for and openness to nonanthropological methods and perspectives. Student and trainee contributions to our work, including publications, should be accurately and completely attributed.

5) To our colleagues, anthropologists and others, we have a responsibility to conduct our work in a manner that facilitates their activities or that does not unjustly compromise their ability to carry out professional work. The cross-disciplinary nature of the work of practicing anthropologists requires us to be informed and respectful of the disciplinary and professional perspectives, methodologies and ethical requirements of nonanthropological colleagues with whom we work. We will accurately report the contribution of our colleagues to our research, practicerelated activities and publications.

6) To the discipline of anthropology we have a responsibility to act in a manner that presents the discipline to the public and to other professional colleagues in a favorable light. We will point out the value of anthropological contributions to the understanding of human problems and humankind. Where appropriate in the context of our work, we will encourage the use of anthropological approaches and recommend the participation of other anthropologists. We will contribute to the growth of our discipline through communicating and publishing scientific and practical information about the work in which we are engaged, including, as appropriate, theory, processes, outcomes and professional techniques and methods.

Source: NAPA (http://practicinganthropology.org/about/ethical-guidelines/)

3.7 SUMMARY

To sum up, this unit discussed a major concern in the practice of anthropological knowledge, i.e. ethics. In today's world ethics and ethical concerns cannot be avoided. And the very fact that anthropology deals with human beings, its need is most vital. The unit begins with the description of what ethics is and what it involves. It then gives a detailed description of the history of anthropology where the use or misuse of ethics in studying communities led to the creation of various anthropological bodies coming up with guidelines for ethical practice. The unit progresses with the various kind of pertinent debates that is involved in the practice of ethics, the major ones being the issues of confidentiality, consent, utility and dissemination of knowledge. The unit further looks into some more ethical concerns that a practicing anthropologist can deploy while conducting research and lastly the unit provides the guidelines stated by NAPA for the learner to have a better knowledge of the ethical scenario and its need in anthropological research.

References

Beals, R. L. 1969. *Politics of Social Research: An Inquiry into the Ethics and Responsibilities of Social Scientists*. Chicago: Aldine.

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

Fluehr-Lobban, C (ed.). 1991. *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Patricia A. Marshall. 1992. "Research Ethics in Applied Anthropology". *IRB: Ethics and Human Research*.Vol. 14, No. 6 (Nov. - Dec., 1992), pp. 1-5.

Weaver, T. 1973. *To See Ourselves: Anthropology and Modern Social Issues*. New York: Scott, Foresman.

van Willigen, John. 2002. *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction (3rd Ed)*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Suggested Reading

Fluehr-Lobban, C (ed.). 1991. *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Jacobs, Sue-Ellen, and Cassell Joan. 1987. *Handbook on Ethical Issues in Anthropology*. New York: Amercian Anthropological Association.

Sample Questions

1) Define ethics. Why is it important to be ethical in our practice?

2) The issues of ethics begin with the investigator. Discuss.

3) Give a critical account of the ethical concerns in the history of anthropology.

4) Discuss the importance of confidentiality and anonymity in anthropological research.