5-1993

A Study in Training for Applied Anthropologists Working in Business and Industry

Cherie Ann Black
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Recommended Citation

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Cherie Ann Black entitled "A Study in Training for Applied Anthropologists Working in Business and Industry." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Anthropology.

Benita J. Howell, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Faye Harrison, Michael H. Logan

Accepted for the Council:
Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Cherie Ann Black entitled "A study in Training for Applied Anthropologists Working in Business and Industry." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fullfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Anthropology.

Benita J. Howell

Dr Benita J. Howell, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance

Faye V. Harrison

Michael H. Logan

Accepted for the Council

CW Minkel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate
School

A STUDY IN TRAINING FOR APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGISTS WORKING IN
BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Cherie Ann Black
May 1993

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree theat the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in her absence, by the head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mother Gloria Bunger Black and to my father James Ransom Black. They have supported me financially, emotionally, and spiritually through the course of this project. It was my father who taught me the value of an education and instilled in me the drive to get it. It was my mother that taught me the values and standards that I will always live by, and to never settle for second best in any facet of my life. She has been an extraordinary example to me. Together they have given me the strength and the courage to finish what I started by believing in me when I could not believe in myself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This research attempted to shed some light on one of the currently central issues in applied anthropology, that of training for applied anthropology students specializing in business anthropology. The data for this project came from a sample of anthropologists currently practicing in the domain of business and industry. This "panel of experts" was chosen because of their uniquely emic point of view. Much of the information concerning this subject has come from the academic community, there is very little from the practitioners themselves. The data was gathered from the respondents with two questionnaires; An initial survey was sent out to a large group in order to identify an appropriate sample of anthropologists practicing in business and industry. Then a second in depth survey was sent to the group of individuals selected for the panel based on their careers that were almost exclusively based in business and industry. The respondents were questioned on issues such as: personal training and job experiences, skills and where they were acquired, accreditation and personal certification, and a standard curriculum for applied anthropology graduate programs.

The respondents were in favor of a graduate student being a generalist first then allowed to take collateral training in a specific area of interest, in this case business courses. It was very important to many of the individuals in the sample that all of this be sanctioned and supervised by the anthropology department. Personal certification was seen in a very negative light by almost all of the individuals in the sample, but accreditation was acceptable if it applied only to a generalized standard curriculum, not

special areas of practice. The respondents also saw a need for more practitioner

involvement in the training of graduate students and development of curriculum for these

students. The data gathered from this panel of experts were used to develop

recommendations for training programs presented in the thesis conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

During the last century, the discipline of anthropology has slowly been expanding into areas outside academics (Van Willigen 1979; Eddy and Partridge 1978). This expansion can be attributed to a number of things: interest of the individual in new opportunities, new areas where multi-cultural expertise is needed, lack of satisfaction with what the academic job market has to offer or financial concerns to name a few. In the last two decades changing attitudes and economic conditions have facilitated this movement of anthropologists away from academics to the point that their work is now a recognized sub-field within the profession. The members of this new sub-field, now called applied anthropologists or practicing anthropologists, are individuals who work in government or private sector organizations, both very diverse and broad areas of practice.

There has been much discussion within the discipline about this "new" field of anthropology and its validity. There are several issues to consider here, one being the survival of the discipline as a whole. Anthropology must find a link to the outside world, a means of communicating what we do. This is necessary because it is the outside world that supports us with grants, tuition, and other monetary means. An important part of this link are the practitioners, they advance to the outside world what anthropology has to offer and people can see it at work. Also the practitioner provides data to the academic community, data they might not otherwise be able to get. Lastly, it is the applied researchers who test many of the theories that the academic community propose. In a circular fashion, the academic community and the applied community benefit each other.

1

It is to these ends that anthropology departments would benefit from training students specifically in the applied domains.

This thesis deals with one specific domain of application, an area of specialization known as business anthropology. The insight of a practicing business anthropologist is even more vital for planning purposes than the views of those practicing in a well established domain of application because this domain is new, its curriculum is still taking shape; moreover, among anthropology faculty there is a lack of experience in this area of practice.

Because the topical domains of applied anthropology are so diverse, training for this sub-discipline can be problematic. Most of the graduate training programs in operation try to provide diverse training to their students, but there is a lot of debate over who should provide this training, where in the academic structure it should come from, and exactly what types of skills should be included to effectively prepare graduate students to be career oriented practitioners.

One of the central issues within this debate is that of departmental training versus cross disciplinary training. The proponents of departmental training feel that teaching specialized applied skills to students within the department will narrow the gap that students feel between traditional anthropology and applied work. Also, based on the experience of the faculty, they believe that these skills will be taught from a uniquely anthropological perspective through courses within anthropology departments. The proponents of cross-disciplinary training feel that a student of applied anthropology should be able to work effectively and competently with other professionals to be

2

effective. One way of acquiring this skill is to work closely with faculty in other departments and gain the benefit and insight of their perspectives and experience. Advocates of cross-disciplinary training also feel that putting anthropology students in contact with other disciplines in their own environments will give applied anthropology more recognition as a viable and useful discipline.

Another aspect of this debate over applied anthropology training is the issue of generalized versus specialized skills and the "tracking" of applied graduate students into topical sub-disciplines. Some academicians feel that an applied anthropologist must be a generalist, able to function in many different types of situations. In this case, besides anthropology, the training program would have to provide very general knowledge in many areas. There are others who feel that the applied anthropology student should choose a specific domain of application and be trained for expertise in that one field. Still others think that the applied anthropology student should be a generalist first, then pinpoint a speciality. Each of these orientations would require a different curriculum for a graduate program.

Still another issue in the debate over training for applied anthropologists is identifying skills that would most benefit students who want to practice outside academics, and developing a standard curriculum or body of accredited courses for these skills. An accreditation program would provide employers with knowledge of what basic skills an applied anthropologist masters in graduate school, but it would also take away some of the uniqueness of specialized programs.

Much of the literature addressing training for applied anthropologists comes from academics. Though the authors usually have some experience as practitioners, most of their careers have been spent in the university setting. Therefore, in most cases, they lack an emic perspective on the world of practice outside the academy. This lack of emic perspective is especially acute for business and industry anthropologists because of its recent resurgence and because of attitudes against involvement with business people.

The most logical way to get an emic point of view, in this case, is to go directly to the practitioner. Practitioners will in most cases have had the experience of going through a graduate program as well as the experience of working outside the university setting. They are in a position to look back at their careers and see the skills and/or knowledge needed to be effective but that they were not able to get in a graduate program, as well as the positive things that were gained in graduate school that were of use to them as a practitioners.

The best way to get to the practitioners was through a survey. An initial survey, sent to a large group of anthropologists, was analyzed so that the group could be narrowed down to a panel of experts. Then the panel of experts were sent a second more in depth questionnaire in order to get the necessary information. These data were then analyzed to produce recommendations for training programs being developed in this area of study.

Some of the recommendations from the panel of business anthropologists were, briefly:

• A general core curriculum that is required for everyone, possibly accreditated

- Built in time for training in the business school and other departments

- Related internships and fieldwork experiences

- More practitioner involvement in the training process and curriculum development.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a wealth of literature that exists on the subject of applied anthropology and the skills and training necessary to work in the field (Chambers 1985; Van Willigen 1986). However, once the focus is narrowed to a sub-field such as business anthropology, the body of literature becomes much smaller and more manageable. This chapter will deal with literature related to training for applied anthropologists, why we as a discipline should invest in this training, and material concerning business anthropology and related issues.

Applied anthropologists on the leading edge of the discipline became involved in business and industry as early as the 1930s. The earliest and most famous of these alliances between business and anthropology were the Hawthorne studies. These were experiments carried out on a group of workers by an industrial psychologist and an anthropologist. What they discovered was that factors other than physical surroundings affected the productivity of workers. These studies have been challenged and criticized by later anthropologists, but they are the traceable beginnings of applied anthropology in business and industry (Baba 1986:4,5). This study provided data for the academic community that was not available before, and it contributed to theory building. During the following decades of the 1940s and 1950s the relationship of anthropology to business and industry grew in the areas of research and practice. The focus of American business at the time was looking towards increasing productivity and harnessing U.S. markets, therefore much of the research that was done was focused internally (Baba 1986:5-7).

In spite of this positive beginning, the 1960s and 1970s brought a serious change in the attitude of anthropology towards business and government. There was a general feeling of prejudice based on an ethical stance which associated commercial success with a lack of concern for the human side of a situation (Chambers 1985:1-35).

By the late 1970s enrollment in anthropology programs was going steadily down, and though there has been a gradual comeback since 1985 the discipline is still lagging behind the numbers it had in the 1960s and early 1970s (Givens 1991:32). If one looks at the situation pragmatically, it becomes obvious that applied researchers are the ones who can "sell" anthropology to the general public and to the decision makers with the financial resources to support anthropology. This is important especially in times of recession because smaller departments can be easy prey in budget cutting situations.

Another issue that promotes the discipline's investment in applied training is the reciprocal relationship between theory and practice. There is a professionalization occurring in the discipline of anthropology that is fueled by the application of theory to practice. This is something that has already happened in other social sciences. In cultural anthropology, application has contributed to many areas of study including business anthropology. Anthropologists who are in the field of practice depend on sound theory, and practice challenges theory. Academics need the practitioners to test the usefulness of theory and how it can solve problems (Fiske 1992:11,12).

The body of literature addressing training for these applied researchers seems to be fairly consistent in its conclusions about the issue, though there are different frameworks to use in discussing the subject. One anthropologist who has written

extensively on the issue of training applied anthropologists is John van Willigen. He sees applied anthropology through the concept of domain of application(Van Willigen 1986:4-9). The domain of application is the skills, knowledge and techniques relevant to a particular work setting, role, or topical domain. Within the domain of application are two components: the methodology of application and the context of application. The methodology of application is very similar to methodology employed in more traditional anthropology, but it is expanded to include action and sometimes policy making. It is the context of application that changes so dramatically with each topical domain, role, and work setting. Applied anthropologists must evaluate their situation, and become aware of other social science literature addressing the field they are working in, as well as learning something about the technical basis of the given field. This enables the anthropologist to talk and work intelligently with other professionals in the workplace.

The concept of domain of application breaks applied anthropology down into three possible aspects of application: topical domains, roles that the applied anthropologist might be called on to play, and work settings. Van Willigen puts parameters on the three aspects of application, creating a type of grid with each level related but separate. The topical domain is defined as the content area or specialty of an applied anthropologist. Technical reports and other items collected by the Applied Anthropology Documentation Project at the University of Kentucky have been classified into 27 different topical domains or content areas. The most common topical domain in that collection is rural development. Others include agriculture, demography, housing, education, health, water resources and other social services (Van Willigen 1986:6).

8

The roles that applied anthropologists play are the second aspect of application. The typical applied anthropology job consists of many roles, roles that may or may not be evident from the job title. The roles the applied anthropologist will assume in a particular job depend partially on what topical domain the employing organization deals with and the work setting the anthropologist is placed in. Some fairly common roles for an applied anthropologist are: evaluator, cultural broker, advocate, and policy researcher. Some less common roles are: expert witness, change agent, and therapist. Van Willigen maintains that the most frequent role for an applied anthropologist is that of researcher (Van Willigen 1986:6-10).

The third aspect of application is the work setting. The work setting that an applied anthropologist is in will in part determine the skills needed to perform the job. For instance: an anthropologist working overseas will need second language skills and a working knowledge of the host culture; an anthropologist working in an international business merger might need negotiation skills. The work setting will be unique to every job situation and the anthropologist must adjust accordingly.

The field of business anthropology, if looked at through Van Willigen's framework, is a whole new topical domain within applied anthropology. This new domain of application will require applied anthropologists to have new skills relevant to business. It will require them to assume new roles and work in settings different from any they have seen before.

Van Willigen (1979:411-416) did a review of several articles written on the subject of training applied anthropologists. He found the major problems addressed had to do

9

with the applied anthropologist's inability to deal with things as a "generalist." It seems that some applied anthropologists had problems adapting to situations outside their given specialty. The recommendations were for general social science research skills, quantitative skills, as well as training in skills relating to the given field.

Chambers (1985:225-230) points out some problems in the training programs as they are currently designed. He feels that many graduate programs training applied anthropologists have had trouble keeping pace with the rapid growth of applied anthropology, and they have not been able to attract a faculty with an adequate range of experiences in the applied fields. A by-product of this lack of experienced faculty is that many applied skills must be taught in departments other than anthropology. Chambers feels that major applied skills should be taught by anthropologists with applied skills from the perspective of anthropology (Chambers 1985:227). This would require a lot of refocusing by anthropology faculty. I think that this is really an authority issue. Does the anthropology department release their students to the influence of other departments, or do they take on the burden of teaching all of the applied skills? This is a crucial issue.

Another view of the issues of training for applied anthropology, similar to that of van Willigen and Chambers, is given by Eddy and Partridge. They see many shortcomings in the traditional training of anthropologists, particularly those wishing to go into applied work. One of the major problems discussed is the lack of interdepartmental cooperation within the university (Eddy and Partridge 1979:3-45). They see the preparation of an applied anthropologist as the responsibility of many departments, requiring transdisciplinary training. Besides this interdisciplinary approach,

10

Eddy and Partridge also discuss some changes that should take place in the anthropology department itself. They present three recommendations: (1) theoretical and methodological training in the analysis of complex societies and institutions and of the process of adaptation and change; (2) transdisciplinary problem orientation; and (3) the innovation of systematic field training in collaboration with other professionals and departments within the university. Eddy and Partridge maintain that an applied anthropology program must be practical in its orientation, providing the student with much more than a theoretical grounding.

At the 1992 meeting of the SFAA/NAPA training standards committee, some of these issues of applied training were discussed. There was a strong commitment to the idea of standards within the graduate level curriculum. The members felt that there was a change occurring in the discipline, from a disciplinary approach to a professional orientation, and that accredidation would be a part of this change in the long term. They felt that accredidation was not appropriate at present. Many of the practitioners felt that they had to overcome the professional mistakes of others and that training standards would improve the quality of practice. When discussing specific skills the committee identified writing, the ability to present ideas, and interviewing techniques as important. They also advanced the idea of the supplementation of anthropology training with coursework in areas of specialization (Van Willigen 1992). These are all issues addressed in my survey of practicing business anthropologists.

Most of the applied anthropology training literature is very general in nature, meaning that it could apply to an applied anthropologist in any field. Training literature

11

for a specific area of applied anthropology is much more difficult to find, but some articles do address training for business anthropology. Briody (1988:76-88) reports findings of a study of a non-random sample of eight anthropologists engaged in non-academic employment. Briody conducted one to two hour telephone interviews with each. She inquired about educational training, early career development, employment history, how they got involved in business, and skills and interests that the anthropologist felt were important for a non-academic career. She found that none of the eight had formal courses in applied anthropology, but they all had skills outside of the field of anthropology. Some of these useful elements cited by the anthropologists were: statistical and computer skills, the ability to blend qualitative and quantitative analysis into appropriate conceptual categories, the ability to speak a second language, and oral and written communication skills. Many of these skills were gained outside the anthropology department. Though these types of skills were cited as being important to their job, the subjects agreed that they had to be an anthropologist first, then a business person (Briody 1988:76-88). Published examples of business anthropology and the literature about training for applied anthropology (specifically business anthropology) raise many questions which this research will address.

A tremendous amount of information about these new skills, roles and work settings that practitioners will face can be gained from the body of business literature that addresses the field of business anthropology and related issues. This body of literature is a conglomerate of articles written from many different points of view, not just anthropology. The authors include business people (George 1983), organizational culture

12

specialists (Meek 1989), and journalists (Zemke 1989) as well as anthropologists (Baba 1986). Many of the articles in the business literature address the issue of a large number of anthropologists working outside academe and they discuss, in a general manner, the role expectations and work settings that a business anthropologist might face. Three major roles that emerge from this literature are: advertising and consumer researcher (Fannin 1988), cross cultural training consultant (Briody 1989), and management consultant (Gemmel 1986).

An applied anthropologist in the role of advertising and consumer researcher can bring concepts to the job that other social scientists do not traditionally use. One of the most highly visible applied anthropologists in this field is Steve Barnett. Barnett maintains that anthropologists do not trust surveys and structured interviews that are analyzed on the basis of frequency of response and demographics (Fannin 1988:21-23). His methods include simple observation, participant observation, informal conversation and a mix of quantitative as well as qualitative information. Many of the skills that Barnett is using are traditionally associated with anthropology. However, many of them are also business and technical skills. Clearly the role of advertising and consumer researcher requires good communication skills, a knowledge of general business practices and marketing, and good research and analysis skills. The work setting for this type of job could range from an office to a private home, or possibly a research facility built for that purpose.

The subject of cross-cultural training has become a very big issue for business in recent years. Business has always been willing to spend money on things that will get a

13

better performance out of executives working outside their own culture, but they have been reluctant to spend money on preparing the family members that accompany them (Trager 1988). Many businesses are now realizing that an executive will perform better when the family at home is happy and well adjusted in their new environment.

The applied anthropologist involved in the cross-cultural training of executives going overseas must be able to provide information on the immediate problems after arrival, information on ways to deal with culture shock and solutions to it, and information on the specific host culture. The first of these requirements could be satisfied by any social scientist, but the other two, and the two most important, are specialties of anthropology.

Elizabeth Briody, a research anthropologist at General Motors has recently completed a project, along with M. Baba of Wayne State University, addressing cross-cultural training. Structured interviews concerning adaptive behavior were conducted with returning GM International Service Personnel (ISP), their spouses or older children, and program administrators (Briody, Baba 1991:3). Briody and Baba found some very surprising results. Going in they thought that expatriation was the biggest problem for these ISP's, but what they found was that repatriation was a much bigger problem. After several months of research it was discovered that employees who went overseas but stayed within the same GM division had few repatriation problems. However, employees who went to a separate overseas car division had severe problems, some to the point that they actually left GM (Baba, Briody 1991:325-328). This is an

14

interesting illustration of a cross-cultural study in which the problem turned out to be domestic.

The role of consulting for management is a very diverse one for the applied anthropologist. There are three major functions for the consultant that are evident in the business literature, even though some of the articles do not directly mention the use of anthropology. They address issues such as cultural differences, American management practices and the problems these things can create. These articles discuss social science in very general terms when they suggest solutions to these problems.

The business literature highlights contributions made by anthropologists working in management in the arena of international negotiations. Not having knowledge about the country and culture of the people being negotiated with can be deadly. Barnum (1989) addresses some of the cultural differences between negotiators which can create problems. For example: Americans tend to see things in black and white, one issue at a time. Their Japanese counterparts wish to discuss the "big picture", and they see this as much more important than small disagreements. In situations like this the anthropologist can prepare the negotiator for whom and what he/she is about to face, and the negotiator is much less likely to come home empty handed.

Another function is that of general management consultant. Management practices vary greatly from country to country, and if these differences are not addressed nor understood, the company in question can suffer greatly. Whitehill (1989) discusses American executives as they are seen through foreign eyes. There is also a similar discussion focusing on American vs. Japanese management styles in DeFrank's work

15

(1988). There are some significant differences between American and Japanese executives that come out in these articles. American executives tend to be aggressive, task-oriented, they make decisions in a top down fashion, they are short-term oriented, and they see their job as coming up with innovative ideas to push the company's profits up. Japanese executives tend to get everyone's approval before making a major decision, they see their job as maintaining the existing harmony within the company, they are long term oriented, and their motivation is the good of the organization, not self promotion.

The types of problems discussed above present obvious opportunities for an applied business anthropologist. Any time two companies based in different countries come together to conduct business of some type, cultural problems and misunderstandings can arise. Whether it be a joint venture, a buyout, an executive exchange program, or a domestic company with offices abroad, a cultural training program is needed. An applied anthropologist working as a consultant can assume any number of roles in helping people understand and overcome differences in cultures and business practices that make transnational business difficult.

The business literature suggests the great number of needed skills for the applied business anthropologist, but there are differences of opinion on how to train aspiring business anthropologists. Finding out what the business anthropologist really needs in terms of training, skills, and contexts of applications is part of what I hope to accomplish with this research.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Graduate training programs specifically geared to applied anthropology are relatively new within the discipline. As discussed in the introduction, there is a lot of disagreement about what basic skills should be taught and about whether or not these skills can or should be taught within the anthropology department.

The Society for Applied Anthropology's <u>Guide to Training Programs in the Applications of Anthropology</u> (Hyland andKirkpatric 1989) lists 29 graduate programs that offer applied anthropology as a specialty. There are many institutions that may teach a course or two in applied anthropology, but these 29 offer graduate degrees in the field. Most of the training programs try to prepare their graduates for non-academic careers in a very general sense. They want students to be prepared for development anthropology, work in a government agency, work in a non-profit organization, or work in a for profit organization. This type of general training is a good starting point for an applied anthropologist as suggested by van Willigen, but there must be some training for specific domains of application. To solve this specialization problem, some programs suggest, even require that a few credit hours be taken outside the department of anthropology. These cognate courses are contingent on what domain of application the student wishes to pursue.

Some of the programs offer different types of internship opportunities, which can further solve the specialization problem by giving the student hands on experience in his/her chosen area. In some cases the programs are able to offer specialties within the

17

department of anthropology based on the experience of the faculty members, meaning there is a special concentration in an area that faculty members have expertise in. In such cases, the courses are taught in the anthropology department itself. The only element universal to all of the programs is the quantitative skills requirement: every department requires some sort of statistics course, whether it was taught inside the anthropology department or in a math/statistics department.

When looking at programs that address business anthropology, the field is reduced considerably. There is only one of the 29 programs that offers business anthropology as a specific and separate domain of application (Wayne State University). There are three others that list as part of their curriculum transdisciplinary training or practical training in areas that suggest business/management training.

As is obvious from this brief examination of applied anthropology training programs, there is a wide variety of ideas on how to best train an applied anthropologist, but very little concentration in the business area.

This issue of appropriate skills and training for applied anthropologists has been in the forefront of professional discussion in recent months because of the debate over accreditation in applied anthropology, the most recent discussion being in the Summer 91' issue of Practicing Anthropology The pro accreditation camp (Trotter, Tashima, & Crain 1991), carefully separating themselves from personal certification supporters, see three main advantages to accreditation. First, they see it as an asset to the students. It would be an objective way for a prospective student to judge whether or not a program can provide training relevant to that student's career goals. Secondly, accreditation could give

18

potential non-academic employers of applied anthropologists a guideline to go by when evaluating applicants. It may also help familiarize the employer with the skills an applied anthropologist has. Thirdly, the pro accreditation camp argues that accreditation will give anthropology departments more leverage when competing for scarce resources within the university environment.

All of these advantages are valid ones, but the group against accreditation takes issue with who or what body will establish the curriculum and standards upon which to base the accreditation. Grey, Hackenburg and Stull (1991) feel that there is a lot of variation in how different departments teach applied anthropology depending on what specialties they offer, and a standard approach would be detrimental to these departments. There is also the feeling that accreditation would cause even more specialization and "tracking" of students into these specializations because of the emphasis on acquisition of resources and faculty within each department. The group against accreditation states that an accredited program would not have an edge in competing for university resources. In fact, they maintain that accreditation would lead to even more competition than presently exists for resources and good students. Lastly, the group against accreditation believes that the present review program is satisfactory in maintaining standards because the programs are judged relative to their own potential, faculty members, and work settings.

The main problem with the idea of accreditation for anthropology programs, as the group against accreditation points out, is the standard curriculum that would have to be agreed upon and adhered to. At present there does not exist an agreed-upon standard for the training of applied anthropologists. This group also stated that the present

19

reviewing system was satisfactory because it judges each program according to its own stated emphasis and goals.

Most of these departmental reviews are carried out by other anthropologists and members of collateral departments. This review process makes the review itself extremely subjective: the composition of the review panel will affect in a significant way the outcome of the review. Also, it seems that in the accreditation process there would eventually have to be standards for specialties within applied anthropology as well as a basic curriculum, and that opens up a whole "pandora's box" of debates on top of the already existing ones.

Before an accreditation of applied anthropology programs can be implemented or the review process changed and improved, there must be some agreed upon standards of training. These standards or necessary skills are at the center of the various debates concerning training applied anthropologists. It seems that when debating training and skills issues for applied anthropologists, the academicians discussing the issue take in a sense an etic point of view. There is not a lot of research that has been done by actually talking to the practitioners and asking them what types of skills have been useful to them in their various careers. This however, is what I am going to attempt during the course of this thesis. This research will require a purposive sample of practitioners with the experience and knowledge to address the issues brought up by the literature. Hopefully the results of this research will be useful to graduate programs as well as the debate over accreditation. Once we as anthropologists start asking the practitioners what is important,

it may be possible to come up with some basic standards of applied anthropology education and training.

There are some general research questions that I hope this thesis will answer:

1. What types of skills does an applied business anthropologist consider essential to being successful in a non-academic career?

2. How and where did the practitioner acquire these essential skills? If not in a graduate training program, then where?

3. What would the practitioner change in the graduate programs to make them a better preparation for a graduate looking for a career in business? Would accreditation or personal certification of applied anthropology programs be a positive or negative development?

In answering these three questions I hope to answer the most basic question that this thesis asks: Are the graduate training programs adequately preparing practitioners of applied anthropology and more specifically business anthropology for the non-academic careers that they are pursuing?

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The first step towards answering some of the questions raised by the literature

review was to locate appropriate subjects: a panel of experts in the field of business

anthropology. The subjects, as previously discussed, must be anthropologists who have

spent the better part of their careers working in or for private industry, in

business/corporate related activities. Due to the novelty of business anthropology as a

field, these practitioners working in business make up a very small group within applied

anthropology. However, through several different sources, I was able to come up with an

initial group with whom to begin the research process.

To identify this initial group of informants, I began by looking through the

bulletin put out by the National Association for Practicing Anthropologists that lists all of

its members. Since my sample was to be purposive, in that I was looking for practitioners

working in a very specific sub field of applied anthropology, I felt that the best way to

begin would be with an organization whose members identify professionally with applied

anthropology. I went right to NAPA because NAPA is an organization for practitioners

who are members of the larger more encompassing American Anthropological

Association (AAA). The Society for Applied Anthropology is an independent

organization of academics and practitioners of applied anthropology, but it does not

publish a directory comparable to NAPA's. The NAPA bulletin lists its members by job

categories which are large encompassing sub fields of applied anthropology. I focused on

the category that NAPA labels private industry. The private industry category includes

anthropologists in any field as long as they work for a private company, or have some expertise in the field. This could be anyone from a medical anthropologist to an anthropologist working for a private consulting firm that bids mainly government contracts. I read carefully through this list and from the vague descriptions provided, I narrowed my list down to a group of people that I thought might be appropriate subjects.

I also wanted to get, in this initial group, those people who may be engaged in the same activities as a business anthropologist, but identify with some other profession. The next step in the research to identify these informants was a letter writing campaign to university departments and local practitioner groups in hopes of finding these "business anthropologists" who were for some reason not identifying themselves professionally with the National Association for Practicing Anthropologists or other similar organizations. The letter writing proved to be very unsuccessful. Only two of the local practitioner groups out of 12 contacted responded at all (both provided no information) and the university departments were willing to give very general information about their graduates as an aggregate, but not specific names. The few that did provide information, provided information that I already had. Having done all of this, I used the list that came mainly from NAPA and sent out a survey to get general data about what practitioners in business are doing, and to identify the respondents from whom I wanted to get more detailed information.

Before doing any kind of research with human subjects at, with, or for the University of Tennessee, the research project in question must be approved by the Human Subjects Office located on campus. After filling out all of the required forms this thesis

was approved, providing that the cover letter and informed consent form met university standards. The mailing sent out to each person on the list included a cover letter stating who I am, what type of information I wanted, a brief statement about respondent selection and a request for the names of other business anthropologists who may have been overlooked. There was also an informed consent form that had to be signed by the participant and returned with the completed questionnaire. This consent form included a description of the research project, an assurance of the anonyminity of the participants, and a statement about the benefits of a project such as this one.

The questionnaire itself was designed to get very general information from the informants, and to enable me to eliminate those that would not be useful to my research. The questions inquired about job title within the organization and the skills related to anthropology that are used in that job, educational background and specific courses that have been especially useful, and professional identity with the discipline of anthropology (though I realize that this question was somewhat biased due to the nature of where my sample came from). I also asked if the participant would be willing to talk with me in the context of a phone interview, and I requested a phone number and a convenient time to call.

There was a total of 83 questionnaire packages sent out in the first mailing. I set a period of four weeks in which I would accept completed surveys, and in that time I had roughly a 52% return rate (43 of the questionnaires and consent forms were returned completed). I had a set of criteria to apply to the surveys upon their return, that would either keep or eliminate them from my project. The first and most important criterion

24

was that the participant work for a private for profit organization, but several of the respondents worked for private companies that did nothing but government contracts. There were others who worked for private industry and identified themselves as anthropologists in an academic sense, but their jobs were not inclusive of any type of anthropological skills. These subjects were really not appropriate to this thesis. The participant that I was looking for should work in a private business situation and in a position that requires at least some anthropological skills. The second criterion was that the participant link their professional identity to anthropology in some way, even if their academic background and initial skills were not strongly oriented towards anthropology. Lastly, I was looking for respondents who had careers focused mainly on being a practitioner, not a combination of practice and academics.

When analyzing the data there seemed to be so many "exceptions to the rule," due to the reasons stated above, that my set of criteria did not effectively eliminate or keep the subjects that I thought relevant to this thesis. The only way to effectively keep or eliminate the surveys was to analyze each one separately on its individual content with some very basic criteria in tact. These criteria were that the subject hold a position within or for a private company and that the position be related to anthropology in some significant capacity.

Upon analysis of the initial survey, I found that 25 of the completed and returned surveys were appropriate for use in this thesis. The reasons that respondents were eliminated from the group varied greatly. As previously discussed, some worked for companies that bid only government contracts while some held jobs totally unrelated to

25

anthropology. For instance, one respondent was a full time secretary for a large company and another was an attorney in private practice. To these respondents, anthropology was little more that an interest or hobby picked up at some point in their academic careers. Still other respondents were simply unwilling or unable to participate in any further interviewing, whether by phone or by mail.

The initial research plan was to do telephone interviews with the appropriate respondents selected from the original sample. However, the number of individuals kept in the sample (at 25) was much greater than I had anticipated. Because of this relatively large number of individuals, the in depth telephone interviews were not feasible. Instead, it was decided that a second questionnaire would be more practical in getting the more detailed information required.

In designing the second questionnaire, I tried to pose questions that would gain the most useful information in looking at training issues. Initially there were questions concerning job experiences, academic careers, skills, opinions about standard curricula and accreditation, and the use of anthropological training. Before sending out all 25 surveys, there were 3 sent out as a test along with a request that the respondent critique the survey instrument itself. Based on the responses of these three individuals, there were some minor changes made in the questionnaire. The entire survey was shortened and a section concerning reactions of peers and the anthropological community in general to the individuals private sector job was added. The revisions complete, the new questionnaire was sent to 25 individuals including one of the three test cases. The other two test cases were people in academic jobs who do consulting on the side. Within six weeks of

26

mailing the second survey thirteen had been returned completed, roughly a 52% return rate. However, one of the thirteen was not usable because it was not completed properly.

Given the exploratory nature of this research and the extremely small, focused sample size, most of the analysis was qualitative along with some basic descriptive statistics. In coding the data qualitatively, the technique of taking summary statements reflective of a number of individuals in the sample was used as a means of identifying patterns within the sample. In coding for the statistical results, the data were entered into spread sheets that were specifically designed to extract numerical information based on the final questionnaire.

The purpose of this portion of the project is to acquire and analyze in depth data on the training and skills, work histories, and academic involvement of a small, purposive group of anthropologists practicing in the domain of business anthropology. Therefore, the analysis of this portion of the research will be of a qualitative nature, using case histories, specific quotes to convey ideas and patterns, and visual representations of patterns in the data. It is hoped that this along with the survey analysis will reveal patterns of information that will address my research questions and in turn, be of some use to those academic programs training applied anthropologists and more specifically anthropologists who wish to pursue a career in business or industry.

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS

As discussed in the methodology section, the final questionnaire was sent to a sample consisting of 25 individuals. Of those 25 questionnaires, 12 were completed and returned.

PERSONAL HISTORIES

Personal histories give some indication of the body of skills, knowledge, and attitudes that private sector anthropologists have as well as where and how the skills, knowledge, and attitudes were acquired. This kind of information is valuable when addressing training issues such as a standard curriculum or accreditation.

The academic backgrounds of the 12 individuals in the sample are diverse and unique. When designing the survey questions about personal histories, I had some definite expectations about what the academic background of this sample would look like. My assumption was that the individuals would show anthropology degrees at the undergraduate, master's, and possibly Ph.D levels, with other needed skills being gained from on-the-job training or in some other fashion. I assumed this because at the time most of the individuals in the sample finished graduate school, specialized applied anthropology programs were few and far between. However, presented in the data was something quite different. As seen in table V-1, every person in the sample had anthropology training, but 8 individuals in the sample had at least some type of academic training in something other than anthropology. Of these 8, 2 persons held MBA's, 2 had other types of advanced business training, while the other 4 held their non-anthropology

28

TABLE V-1	ACADEMIC BACKGROUNDS
INDIVIDUALS	DEGREES/SEQUENCE
1	BA Anthropology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology
2	BA Anthropology, MA Anthropology, MBA Management
3	AB Anthropology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology, Certificate from graduate school of business, Professional development courses
4	AB Anthropology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology
5	BA Anthropology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Communications
6	BA Psychology/Economics, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Applied Anthropology
7	BA Psychology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology
8	BA Anthropology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology with minor done in the college of Business
9	BA English, MA English, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology, Certificate in human resource management
10	BA Anthropology/Math, MA Applied Anthropology, MBA Marketing and Management
11	AB Anthropology, MA Linguistics, Ph.D. Anthropology
12	BA Anthropology, MA Anthropology, Ph.D. Anthropology

degrees in other social sciences or communications. There were 10 Ph.D's in the sample, all but one in anthropology. However, the two individuals without Ph.D's had in its place an advanced business degree along with an MA in some area of anthropology. The sex ratio in this sample was 9 female/3 male.

As a supplement to academic training, many anthropologists have jobs while in graduate school that are related to their career goals. Questions were asked addressing this issue because the training and experience can be every bit as valuable as academics, and because these jobs can be a factor in career choices. In fact, many applied programs now offer internships and other field experiences via the local community. The individuals in the sample were asked if they held teaching assistantships, research assistantships, internships in the community, or jobs unrelated to their career. They were also asked to comment on their experiences in this area (see table V-2). Of the 12 individuals in the sample, 8 held jobs outside the University that had no bearing on their careers; they were simply a means of support. Five of these also had a TA or RA at one point in their academic career. Only 4 of the people in the sample held long term internships in the community that gave them field/work experience. The comments received from the people who held the internships were very positive statements like: "This was the most enlightening experience of my academic career," and "The internship experience taught me the realities of the business world." However the comments from the other 8 individuals were not nearly as enthusiastic; they seemed to view the job or assistantship as necessary for financial support but not really a desirable use of their time.

TABLE V-2	JOBS HELD WHILE IN GRADUATE SCHOOL
TYPE OF JOB	% OF SAMPLE
jobs unrelated to career	66.6%
long term internships	33.3%

The trend within the sample was for individuals with more diversified backgrounds to hold more business oriented positions. The people with a heavy background in anthropology were working for private industry, but as a researcher or consultant on various projects. The individuals who had a heavily diversified background with business training and/or business oriented internships held jobs as managers and some were involved in marketing projects. There were two exceptions to this trend, but these two individuals had a great deal of experience.

These data seem to suggest that an anthropologist with a diversified background will be successful in acquiring a private sector job. At this point the question arises; How intentional were these career paths? Did these individuals seek out their non-anthropological degrees and non-anthropological internship experiences with the intent of marketing themselves in the private sector, was it just a matter of academic interest, or were their diversified backgrounds due to an early intention of going into another field that later allowed them to be successful and take advantage of opportunities in a job market where academic positions in anthropology are scarce? All but one of the 10 Ph.D's in the sample is in anthropology, so in these cases the non-anthropology training came at the BA or MA level. However the individuals with the MBAs and other business training got this training after their anthropology degrees. In every case the business training, if it exists, is the most recent training.

As discussed in the methodology chapter, three test cases were sent out with a request that the survey instrument itself be critiqued. Of the three individuals, one was re-surveyed with the final questionnaire. After seeing these three test cases, the

suggestions given, and the academic information contained in them, I decided to design some questions to get at the issue of when and why the individual went into the private sector. The survey also asked about respondents' present relationship with the academic community and reactions of colleagues to their choice of a non academic career. There was only one individual in the sample who actually intended from the onset of academic training to be an applied anthropologist working in the private sector. This individual finished school in 1988, a time when applied anthropology programs were available and attitudes in the discipline about non-academic work were becoming much more flexible than they had been in the past. The other 11 people in the sample, all of whom intended to be anthropologists, ended up in the private sector because of various circumstances that they had not foreseen while preparing for a career. Most, in fact, had been looking forward to academic careers. As seen in table V-3, there were 5 individuals in the sample who went to work in the private sector simply because there were no academic positions available at the time that they were looking for a job. There were comments made such as: "It was the only job I could find," "There were very few academic jobs, and the pay seemed low," and "I needed to find employment, it was really a matter of elimination." After making comments such as those above, these same individuals stated that after being forced into the private sector, they found that they enjoyed it very much and chose to stay even when academic positions became available to them. There were three individuals in the sample who spent the very early part of their careers in academic positions, but later became so dissatisfied that when private sector opportunities became available they took them, and have been there ever since. There were statements made

TABLE V-3　　　　　REASONS FOR GOING INTO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

REASONS	# IN SAMPLE
simply no academic jobs available at the time person was looking for employment	5
became dissatisfied with academics	3
chose private sector for financial reasons	3
intended from the start of academic career to go into private sector	1

such as "One trigger was myfrustration with teaching" and "I was burned out from the hassles of college administration." The remaining three individuals in the sample went into the private sector for financial reasons. They all stated in different ways that the private sector is much more financially rewarding than academics and that it allows them to lead more flexible lifestyles. There did not seem to be a relationship between the reasons for going into the private sector and the types of jobs held, other than the fact that individuals who had gone into the private sector from the beginning instead of teaching had higher level jobs reflective of their years in the industry.

It seems apparent from this section of the data that the diverse backgrounds of the individuals in the sample were not intentional preparation for the private sector save one, but the backgrounds did enable them to successfully look into alternatives to academics. In talking with anthropologists working in the private sector, I found that their academic experiences were not the only factors in their success outside the university. Most of them had very dynamic, forceful personalities, necessary they said to overcome the adverse reactions that they got from the academic community and some public sector anthropologists because of their business orientations. This is why questions about interactions with other anthropologists and peer reactions were asked (see table V-4). Of the 12 individuals questioned, 8 stated that they still had some kind of interaction with the academic community, though all 8 indicated that this interaction was mainly through professional organizations. Three individuals stated that they had absolutely no interaction outside of their fellow private sector anthropologists. Only the one individual who was teaching part time still has close contact with academics.

35

TABLE V-4   INTERACTIONS WITH ACADEMIC ANTHROPOLOGISTS

TYPE OF INTERACTION	# IN SAMPLE
organizational/social	8
no interaction at all	3
close working ties/part time teaching	1

The fact that only one person in the sample has a working tie to academics, while the other 11 have organizational/social or no ties at all shows a rift in the discipline of anthropology expressed in some fashion by everyone in the sample. This rift becomes even clearer when looking at the reactions of peers to the careers of the individuals in the sample. Only 3 individuals stated that everyone they had come in contact with had reacted positively to their business oriented applications, but these three individuals were also the three who had no interaction with the academic community at all. At the other extreme, as seen in table V-5, only 3 individuals stated that everyone they had come in contact with had reacted negatively. The other 6 people in the sample stated that they had gotten mixed reactions. It seems that from other practicing anthropologists they got very positive reactions, while the academically based anthropologists reacted in a negative way. This became especially apparent to the individuals in the sample when attending professional meetings where there are both academics and practitioners. Some of the qualitative comments made in this section of the questionnaire were much more emotional than in the other sections:

"They don't see it as research, so do not see it is as valid as the academic setting regardless of its need or usefulness in the business environment."

"My professors at the university where I got my Ph.D do not consider what I do anthropology."

"Academic anthropologists generally are interested, but have no grasp of what I do and cannot relate what they do to what I do.",

"I got the impression that I had somehow sold out the discipline."

37

TABLE V-5	PEER REACTIONS
TYPE OF REACTION	# IN SAMPLE
mixed reactions (typically positive reactions from other practitioners/negative reactions from academics.)	6
all positive reactions	3
all negative reactions	3

One person responded to this question with a single word: "Patronizing." It was apparent that the individuals with the strongest and most recent ties to academics had the most negative and emotional reactions to this section of questions. The individuals with the most positive reactions were the ones with little or no contact with the academic community and they were more likely to hold a managerial or marketing position as opposed to pure research.

In the literature review chapter for this thesis, the reasons for prejudice against business and industry were discussed. The literature seemed to suggest that the discipline of anthropology was slowly coming out of the doubt and suspicion it had of the establishment, a doubt and suspicion born in the early sixties. However, the previous section of data suggests that academic anthropologists remain suspicious of business and anthropologists who work for corporations.

The academic faction and the private sector faction of anthropology, generally, do not seem to be working together in a positive way. This is a major issue when addressing training for applied anthropologists. Academic departments need the experience of non-academic anthropologists when trying to prepare students for a job market with a shrinking number of academic jobs, as well as new and upcoming graduate students whose intention is to practice in the private sector.

JOB EXPERIENCES

Contained in the questionnaire was a section asking each person for two job experiences that they considered important to their career. They were asked about tasks, settings, roles, skills, and how they got the said employment. Optimally, there should

have been 24 job experiences in the sample. However, 6 of the job experiences given were of a teaching or public sector nature, most of which were very early job experiences. Therefore there are 18 business and industry job experiences in the sample.

In trying to code these job experiences, it became apparent that they could not be put in just one category such as manager or researcher. Most of the 18 jobs in the sample required the anthropologist to fill many roles. Therefore, the roles were evaluated based on how many times they were cited, some job experiences being coded more than once because of the diversity of the job requirements. The most common role for the business anthropologist in this sample was consultant (See table V-6). There were 12 work experiences that required the anthropologist to fill the role of consultant, usually on a variety of projects. The second most common role was that of manager; in 8 of the jobs individuals saw this as an important role that they had to fill. Six of the job experiences cited research/research & development as a vital role required of them. Marketing knowledge was also mentioned in two of the consulting experiences as a significant part of the job. As would seem obvious, the more business in a person's background, whether it be academic or job experience, the more likely that person was to have a job in the managerial or marketing field. Also these individuals were the furthest removed from academics and had the least amount of animosity towards the academic community.

The qualitative descriptions provided in this section of the survey were very job and company specific but with a little modification, some of that information can be presented: 1) "I am the senior management consultant and cultural specialist" 2) "I

TABLE V-6	TYPES OF ROLES CITED IN JOB EXPERIENCES
ROLE	# IN SAMPLE
consultant	12
manager	8
research & development	6
marketing	3

design and develop research projects, consult in data analysis and evaluation of services." and 3) "I am manager of R&D, new program development, and strategic planning."

When asked about the skills required to fill the roles involved with these job experiences and for their careers in general, the study participants cited many skills currently available in anthropology programs but also many that are not. The most common skills (see table V-7), mentioned respectively in 8 and 7 of the experiences, were the ability to write and good research methods; both skills that can be gained in any good anthropology department. However, general business skills, skills that are very important to the anthropologist's chosen domain of application, were also mentioned as very important in 11 job experiences. These general business skills, according to the sample, included administrative and management skills, marketing skills, generalized computer skills, and communications and public speaking in a business environment. There were also some general skills mentioned that can be gained in any number of academic departments. The most important and frequently mentioned of these was statistical skills; no matter what area of anthropology or business these job experiences entailed, statistics was always of the utmost importance. Other general skills cited were technical skills particular to a job, abstract thinking, and the ability to conceptualize situations. The comments given in this section of the questionnaire were mainly just listings of the needed skills; there was very little qualitative information. The consensus among the sample pointed toward the importance of a broad number of courses with special attention given to business skills, the specialty of this domain of application.

TABLE V-7	SKILLS NECESSARY TO FILL ROLES
SKILL	# IN SAMPLE
general business skills (this was presented by the sample in very general terms.)	11
good writing skills	8
good research skills	7

When studying a new field of applied anthropology from the point of view of job experiences, it is important to know something about how the employment was obtained. This information will shed some light on how accepted the field is and what the job market is like. The participants were asked in the case of each experience that they reported, what factors aided them in getting said employment. They were asked about networking vs. experience/skills and education, or simply filling out an application (see table V-8). In most of the 18 job experiences in the sample more than one factor was cited as important, in a few of the cases all of the factors were mentioned and this is the basis on which they were coded. The overwhelmingly common factor present was networking. In 14 of the jobs networking was the primary means of getting employment. There were statements given such as:

"I got this job by being in the right place at the right time and knowing the right people."

"I did this work as a result of a contact I made during my thesis research."

The second most common factor present, many times in conjunction with networking, was previous experience. Coming in a distant third was the factor of education, with one job gained by answering an ad and filling out an application. This information supports what was seen in the literature: that this is such a new field that people have to be able to market themselves in the business culture and create their own positions within an organization. Also, it is understandable that education is not yet as critical as networking or experience because no clear-cut accredited educational background has been designed for this type of applied anthropology.

44

TABLE V-8	MEANS OF GETTING EMPLOYMENT
MEANS	# IN SAMPLE
networking	14
previous experience	8
educational background	3
answered an ad	1

There was no relationship between how an individual got employment and the type or level of job held. This is such a new domain in the discipline of anthropology that people are having to invent their own positions and sell their skills to a prospective employer. There are no applicant calls for business anthropologists; therefore networking is the primary means of gaining employment.

SKILLS HISTORY

When trying to do a project that addresses training issues it is important to look at the whole body of skills present in the sample as well as the academic backgrounds. Within the survey there was a section asking the participants what skills they considered most important to their careers and, after having given their academic histories, how and where they gained these particular skills. See table V-9.

The first question in this section asked about skills gained specifically in the anthropology department. The respondents focused on two areas, the most common with 7 citations, being a generalized anthropological point of view. The study participants felt that things like "a holistic point of view" and "the notion that there are specialized technical cultures with rules and languages of their own within our larger culture" were extremely important in their career success. The second most valuable skill/experience gained in the anthropology department, according the sample, was the opportunity to do field work of any kind, cited by half of the sample. This seemed to be a very enlightening experience for those who had the chance to do it. Every member of the sample expressed in some manner how important these generalized ideas were to their basic point of view and to their success.

46

TABLE V-9	SKILLS HISTORY
SKILL	# IN SAMPLE

SKILLS GAINED IN ANTHROPOLOGY TRAINING

anthropological point of view	7
field work	6

SKILLS GAINED IN NON-ANTHROPOLOGY TRAINING

technical writing	6
knowledge of general business practice	4
statistical skills	4
computer skills	3

SKILLS GAINED IN ON THE JOB TRAINING

management skills	5
coding & statistical analysis	4
public presentation	3

The second part of this section asked about skills gained in non-anthropological academic experiences. As one would expect in the case of this sample, much of the non-anthropological coursework was in business or related fields. The most common skill, mentioned by 6 individuals in the sample, was technical writing. They learned to write in a way appropriate to the business culture, a more concise and straightforward style of writing than found in anthropology departments. General business knowledge and a knowledge of statistics tied for second place with 1/3 of the sample mentioning each. It seems that very few individuals in the sample were able to get statistical skills in the anthropology department, but many programs require courses be taken in the statistics department. Computer skills were third, mentioned by 3 people in the sample. Some respondents also mentioned management skills and organization & planning skills in this section of the questionnaire.

The last part of this section of the survey asked the participants about on-the-job training. Management skills were by far the most important skills gained on the job, with 5 of the participants citing them. Coding and statistical analysis skills were cited by 4 individuals as necessary skills that they learned on the job. However, many of the coding and statistical skills mentioned were not general but job specific. Finally 3 people mentioned public presentation. Many of the individuals in the sample had positions that required them to present the results of projects to the management involved.

It is clear from these data that the skills gained in an anthropology department give these practitioners valuable perspectives on their work, and possibly these unique perspectives are part of what makes them attractive to prospective employers. However

the non-anthropology skills, particularly the business related ones, are critical to functioning in the different positions that they each hold. They are also critical to the individuals being able to market themselves outside academics, a job strategy seen as necessary in the work experiences they described.

COMPONENTS OF JOB SUCCESS

In conjunction with the section of questions about necessary skills, the participants were asked to place five possible components of job success on a scale of importance in their work as anthropologists (1 being essential and 5 being not important at all), using a Likert scale to rate each component independently of the other four. The five components were on-the-job experience, anthropological methods/skills, anthropological concepts/theory, non-anthropological training, and knowledge of specific culture/language. For each item the mean rank was calculated from the sum of individual responses (see table V-10).

Respondents rated on-the-job experience and the methods and skills of anthropology as the most important in their work, with means of 1.75 and 1.83 respectively. When commenting on their job experience, many respondents noted that knowledge of their company's corporate culture was essential as well as job specific technical knowledge and management experience. Certainly this experiential, on-the- job knowledge would be important for any professional person, but as one individual expressed: "It allows me to use my anthropological training in a useful way." The methods and skills that were cited by a majority of the sample were interviewing, project design, and qualitative methods. All of these skills are essential to developing a project

49

TABLE V-10	RANKED CONCEPTS
CONCEPT	MEAN RANK
on the job experience	1.75
anthropological methods/skills	1.83
anthropological concepts/theory	2.16
non-anthropological training	2.33
knowledge of specific culture/language	3.29

SCALE FOR TABLE

1 - essential

2 - very important

3 - somewhat important

4 - useful, but not necessary

5 - not important at all

and seeing it through to completion. One individual stated "I can design innovative approaches to data gathering," another stated "I have a unique approach to project design."

The mean rank for anthropological concepts and theory and non-anthropological training were 2.16 and 2.33 respectively. Most of the comments offered concerning anthropological concepts and theory were of a very general nature:

"general ideas of cultural diversity and development," "When looking at a problem, I am able to conceptualize it very rapidly,"

"a holistic approach"

"understanding variation."

This information supports the idea discussed in the skills section that a general, holistic anthropological point of view is what enables the private sector anthropologist to present a unique point of view to an employer. Respondents identified job specific technical skills and general business knowledge as key elements in their non-anthropological training. These responses again support business training and its importance to any professional working in the business/industrial field.

The least important concept was knowledge of a specific culture and language. This is probably a biased statistic because most in the sample work domestically. However, the individuals who did rate this concept as essential or very important interpreted it as the language and culture of business or a specific industry.

The fact that on the job experience was ranked first by the sample as a whole illustrates what a new area business anthropology is. As of yet there is no wide-spread

sanctioned training program, and the people in the industry are learning as they go. An anthropological background and point of view are important and they are what make the people in this sample unique in a business environment. The non-anthropological training was ranked fourth. This illustrates that most of the individuals in the sample have thus far learned their business and "other" skills while on the job. This will certainly change when training programs in applied anthropology are brought up to speed with what is happening in the industry.

ACCREDITATION/CERTIFICATION

Accreditation is an issue that is central to the recent debate within applied anthropology concerning training. The question is can accreditation be beneficial in trying to tailor applied anthropology programs to fast changing work environments. An anthropologist working in business must be able to adjust to new situations quickly.

People in the pro accreditation camp see it as an asset to students in the evaluation of programs, an asset to employers in evaluating applicants, and they believe it will give anthropology departments more clout within the university. The group against accreditation want to know specifically what body would establish the standard curriculum and how the accreditation process would operate. They believe that accreditation would diminish some of the uniqueness associated with anthropology departments. Since this thesis is addressing training issues, questions about accreditation and certification were asked of each participant. (See table V-11.)

On the issue of accreditation all expressed an opinion, 5 reacting positively and 7 reacting negatively. Among the 7 who offered a negative reaction, some did so because

TABLE V-11	ACCREDITATION AND PERSONAL CERTIFICATION
ISSUE	RESPONSE
accreditation	positive 5 negative 7
personal certification	positive 2 negative 10

they felt that the discipline of anthropology was not ready for such a move. Others stated that:

"Most employers do not care what your academic background is, it is unnecessary,"

"I do not see any use for it,"

"It may provide clout for the department within the university, but it does not matter in the real world."

Some of the individuals who responded positively also had reservations, and thought that accreditation was a bit premature. They felt that the discipline of anthropology has a lot of maturing to do in order to catch up with other social sciences whose parameters are more firmly defined. Others that were firmly behind the idea stated that "It would designate the achievement of a set of standards", "If you have them, you set a higher standard and see that they are maintained", and several felt that accreditation would be beneficial to the prospective employers.

The opinions in this section on accreditation are almost evenly divided with five individuals reacting in a positive way and seven giving a negative response. Even though this sample is very small, I believe the results in this one section reflect just how divided the discipline is on the issue of accreditation. It is clear that this is a very emotional issue, and the debate over accreditation is likely to continue for quite a while.

The issue of personal certification, at least in this sample, was much more clear cut than that of accreditation. Of the 12 individuals in the sample, 10 reacted negatively while only 2 offered a positive response. Again there was no one who did not have a very

clear opinion. The comments given with the negative responses tended to be very lengthy and emotional. For instance:

"I view most certifications as silly, made up credentials to form clubs. Most real jobs come from referral and your track record, not through some damn fool hoop jumping contest that leads to a pretty piece of paper for your wall,"

"unnecessary until an anthropologist consultant is as commonplace as a clinical psychologist,"

"no thanks, it is a gatekeeping system."

Some of the other individuals who gave negative responses stated that they thought it impossible to certify every type of practice given the breadth of work that applied anthropologists do. The two individuals who offered positive responses gave very similar statements:

"I have come across a lot of people calling themselves anthropologists; they do not have sufficient training or fieldwork."

"Certification implies a recognition by the profession as being qualified to do the work of practice."

These two comments are only a portion of the whole statements given, but they summarize what each individual was saying. Both believe that personal certification would benefit the private sector anthropologist as well as the potential employer, because both would have to recognize a set of standards set up by the profession.

STANDARD CURRICULUM

The issue of a standard curriculum for applied anthropology is important to the training debate regardless of the outcome of the accreditation issue. Practitioners can provide useful advice in the area of curriculum content and design for applied preparation. The individuals in this sample were asked to give a description of the key elements they would include in an applied anthropology program designed for students wishing to market themselves in the area of business/industry.

This section was presented in a way that the key elements for a curriculum and the issue of collateral training were in separate questions. This was done in hopes of getting anthropology course recommendations under the key elements question and recommendations about collateral courses under the collateral training question. In retrospect I believe this to be a mistake because in most cases the key elements that were presented were part of collateral training; traditional anthropology seemed to be taken as a given. Under the collateral training question I was presented with many opinions and comments on the subject but very few course ideas. One individual wrote in the key elements section: "Above and beyond traditional anthropology I would recommend a large number of business courses, possibly marketing and management." Under the collateral training question, a few individuals even wrote "see above."

As a consequence of the way the material was presented to the sample most of the data focuses on collateral training and opinions about said training. There is very little in the way of recommendations about traditional anthropology courses. The few responses

56

that were given focused on the basics such as theory, data collection and analysis, and courses in the applied area.

The collateral courses recommended in the key elements question were, as expected, very business oriented. There is a visual representation of these data in table V-12. General business courses, statistics, and economics/social sciences were cited by 7 individuals. Many individuals cited all three as essential, others made general comments such as:

"A healthy dose of coursework in business, learning the native's point of view"

"I would think a business course or two, possibly marketing"

"A clear understanding of what you have to offer and how to market this"

Management and administrative courses were singled out by 5 members of the sample. These individuals made comments like: "Good basic training in business concepts, and understanding how to administer something you are responsible for". There were 4 of the individuals in the sample who expressed a need for some built in but unstructured time for the student to gain this collateral training and pursue his/her specific interests. These individuals felt very strongly about the anthropology department sanctioning and even encouraging this exploration into other disciplines. Two other elements, each mentioned by 2 people in the sample, were public speaking and field research in business. Public speaking was simply listed but the field research was commented on: "A one year internship in an applied setting would be helpful" and "Get a job in the industry and learn about it first hand".

TABLE V-12	STANDARD CURRICULUM RECOMMENDATIONS
ELEMENT	**# IN SAMPLE**
general business courses	7
economics/other social sciences	7
statistics courses	7
management/administration	5
time built into a program so that students can explore their own specific areas of applicatiion that they are interested in	4
public speaking/presentation	2
field research/internships in business/industry	2

The data presented in response to the collateral training question are all of a qualitative nature and is best presented by the opinions and comments of the individuals in the sample:

"Yes, but the type depends on the students interests, anthropologists need alternative perspectives in given areas"

"A lot, but these should be approached as other sub-cultures which have their own value systems"

"Everyone I know who is successful outside academics has a Ph.D in anthropology and an additional masters in something else"

"Much of my training came from other colleges rather than anthropology, which says a lot about current thinking in anthropology as a discipline".

One individual simply stated "about 50% of training". It is clear from these data that the entire sample is very much in favor of a large amount of collateral training. Also it seems to be important that it be sanctioned by anthropology as a discipline, otherwise non-academic anthropologists will remain "not quite as valid" as academically based anthropologists.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The panel surveyed for this thesis was small and is by no means a representative sample of all applied anthropologists or all anthropologists working in and/or for business and industry, so the data should be interpreted cautiously. However the field of business anthropology is very young and the perspectives of the individuals in this sample have provided meaningful, cutting edge information about what is happening in this unusual domain of application.

SUMMARY

The educational experiences of the individuals in this sample of business anthropologists were very diverse but anthropology always played a major role, and recent business training was present in most cases. The consensus of the sample seemed to be that the more diverse the academic experience the better, as long as anthropology is the main ingredient. Along with their academic training, some of the individuals in the sample had the opportunity for career related internships. These were seen as extremely important by those who had them, and they were recommended by several of those who did not. In fact, in three cases the internships were stated to be very strong influences on that person's choice of area of application.

In this sample of 12 individuals, only 1 intended from the start of their academic career to become a practitioner in the field of business. The others did so because of the lack of academic jobs available, dissatisfaction with academics, or financial reasons. As is obvious, most of these individuals were forced into or chose to become practicing

60

business anthropologists because of some shortcoming in the academic job market. Given these circumstances, it becomes clear that diverse non-anthropological training is a must for survival. Many of the individuals in the sample stated that it was their diverse academic histories along with the ability to sell themselves that allowed them a foot in the door of business and industry.

Most of these business anthropologists still have some contact with the academic community. Most of this contact is social or through professional meetings. Only one individual in the sample worked regularly with academics teaching part time, and a few said that they had no contact with academics at all. One might assume that there was a good relationship between academic anthropologists and business anthropologists who attend the same professional meetings and interact there. However, when asked about the reactions of their peers to their career choice, over half of the sample reported at least some negative reactions. Most said that they typically got positive reactions from other applied anthropologists and negative reactions from the academic community. Everyone in the sample, even the individual who was still teaching occasionally, stated that they felt there was a rift in the discipline of anthropology between academics and practitioners, and that as a discipline we need to in the words of one respondent, "take a long hard look at where we are going as a discipline." There seems to be a lack of communication and lack of understanding between the applied and academically based groups. This is certainly an issue that must be addressed by all of us, practitioners and academics alike.

The types of jobs that these individuals held fell into four main categories, the categories being based on how they use and apply their anthropological training. The

61

categories were, in descending order: consultant, manager, research & development specialist, and people involved in marketing. The most frequently mentioned critical skill for these jobs was general business knowledge. After this were writing and research skills. Obviously, anthropology was a starting point for these individuals and a basis for what makes them unique, but they considered their business training to be most important to performing their jobs well. This one fact speaks volumes about where applied anthropology training needs to go in the future if it wants to prepare students for a job market with very little to offer in the academic area.

When asked about the issue of accreditation the sample was divided almost evenly down the middle; 7 individuals were against it and 5 were for it. This is a clear reflection of how the accreditation issue stands in anthropology as a discipline, and further evidence of the problems that exist in applied anthropology training. On the issue of personal certification, the sample was much more clearly skewed. Only 2 individuals thought certification would be beneficial in any way at all. Most people felt the it would not work because you could not possibly certify every area within applied anthropology. The only way would be to certify people as generalists and most of the individuals in the sample felt that this would be meaningless in the "real world."

One of the key issues for this thesis is the problem of a standard curriculum in applied anthropology programs, and more specifically a curriculum for students wishing to go into business and industry. When asked about collateral training, every individual in the sample had a very positive reaction and gave recommendations. The consensus seems to be that the graduate student in anthropology needs to be a generalist first then

time to pursue a specific area of interest, whether that interest be business or anything else. Most of the people in the sample felt that collateral training should be a major part of an applied curriculum, and that it must be sanctioned by the anthropology department in order to give applied anthropologists of all types the same validity in the profession as those in academics have. Some specific recommendations from these business anthropologists were for some general business courses, economics, statistics, and management and administration courses.

As already pointed out, the anthropology training that the people in this sample had is what makes them unique in the business world, and it plays a very important role in their careers. However, that role is very basic and general. In fact, for a few respondents, it was difficult for them to pinpoint exactly how they use their anthropology training. It seems that the anthropological mindset or point of view is what is most important. It is the cornerstone upon which everything else is built.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With the data analyzed and summarized, it is now possible to shed some light on the original research questions presented in the second chapter of this thesis. The first goal of this thesis was to find out what types of skills an applied business anthropologist would consider essential to being successful in a non-academic career. According to the majority of the sample, the first of these skills is a generalized understanding of anthropology. The second component of success, in the case of this sample, is having ample business knowledge and the creativity and skill to sell oneself in a business situation. Ideally, there would also be a certain amount of diversity in the academic background

other than business oriented courses, including some type of fieldwork or internship in the area of the students' interest.

The second goal of this thesis was to find out how and where these successful practitioners got their essential skills. As can be seen from the educational backgrounds of the respondents, the majority have very diverse training.

Only four individuals have no degrees other than anthropology. When asked about concepts important to their work, the sample as an aggregate rated on the job training as most essential. Some expressed the idea that this was because the field was very new and there was no one to teach them how to be a business anthropologist. They knew enough to market themselves and then had to learn by doing. There is no clear cut pattern of how and where skills were acquired, but collateral training, internships, and on the job experience are the major contributors in this sample.

Given this information, the next question is: How would the practitioner in business change graduate programs to better prepare students for a non-academic job, whether they want it or are forced into it by the academic job market. It is clear that the majority of the individuals in the sample support a lot of collateral training, not just in the specific area of interest but in many areas. Also it is important that there is unstructured time built in to degree requirements to permit this personalized collateral training, and that the time spent in other departments is sanctioned and guided by advisors in the anthropology department. Several respondents felt that accreditation of a general applied program of basic courses might be appropriate, but 10 out of 12 thought personal certification was simply unnecessary and not very practical.

64

In the course of getting some answers to the previous three questions it has become obvious that the anthropology training programs the respondents went through are not fulfilling the needs of graduate student anthropologists wishing to go into business and industry. However, there have been some positive changes in programs in the last decade, such as the increase in the number of specifically applied anthropology programs. Some of these programs promote some collateral training and some require internships, but these schools are in the minority. Most applied programs are geared to two or three specialties of application usually contingent on the experience of the faculty. In these cases most of the training, except statistics, is still done within the anthropology department itself. There is currently only one program that has a focus on business at the graduate level, and this is due to the interest and experience of some of the faculty. In this particular program, some of the training is done within the department and some is done in conjunction with the business school. There seems to be in the words of one respondent "A definite resistance to borrowing from other departments for fear that anthropology will no longer be pure".

Several recommendations can be made based on the data presented in this thesis. As previously stated, the respondents felt that an anthropologist working in business should be a generalist first. This would suggest a core curriculum for all graduate students in the field. This core curriculum would include basic courses such as: methodology, theory, policy making, and the fundamentals of applied work. It is these same core courses that the respondents feel could be practically standardized and therefore accredited.

Once the basic training is done by the anthropology department, then possibly there should be some time built in for collateral training in the student's specific area of interest. In the case of business anthropology that training would include economics, management, marketing and other business related courses. Some individuals see this as taking the training of anthropologists out of the hands of the anthropology department. However, in truth it is increasing the responsibility of the anthropology department in that they must supervise this collateral training of their students.

Along with this collateral training, some respondents recommended an internship in the student's area of application. One respondent in the sample participated in an internship with a marketing firm and reported that it was an experience that she considered crucial to her success. This in conjunction with the collateral training should provide the student with a well rounded and well thought out exposure to other professions and their practitioners. It is quite clear that applied anthropology students need to understand and learn to work with other professionals.

Another point made by many of the respondents in the sample concerned practitioner involvement in the training of graduate students. The respondents felt that they should be heavily involved in practicum supervision and that there should be open communication between the practitioners and the faculty members involved in the practicum. Also it was stated that anthropology departments should make more of an effort to get practitioners involved in teaching. This could be done by practitioners teaching part time, guest lecturing, or possibly retired practitioners teaching full time.

The majority of the sample recommended that all of the above be sanctioned and guided by the anthropology department. Most of the professional status in anthropology is accorded to those with tenured academic positions. Applied anthropologists, especially those employed in business and industry, are seen by many in the discipline as not valid anthropologists. There must at some point be an ideological shift in the thinking of anthropology as a discipline if it is going to survive. We need a new generation of anthropologists trained in a new way to eliminate the rift that exists between academic anthropologists and applied anthropologists. However it is this rift that is in a large way responsible for the lack of creativity in training the next generation of anthropologists.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The information in this thesis is most useful because all of the data comes from the point of view of the practitioners, most of whom have multi-disciplinary training in their experience. This practitioner perspective can be used as a partial guide to re-designing training programs. An ideal curriculum for students wishing to work in business and industry might include:

◆ A general core curriculum in the anthropology department. Possibly an accreditated body of courses including method and theory, field research, statistics, general applied courses and other basics.

◆ An opportunity to get some general business skills, possibly through a continuing alliance with the business school on campus. This would include some general exposure to management concepts, marketing, finance, international business and possibly some accounting.

- The availability of diverse collateral training beyond the business school. The nature of this training could be determined by the student's interest but a certain amount should be standard.

- Availability of career/business related fieldwork and internships. Possibly a thesis or dissertation project.

- More practitioner input in the training of graduate students, possibly through practicum supervision, guest lecturing, or consulting with faculty for certain courses.

- Involvement and encouragement of anthropology department in collateral training of students. This could mean built in hours for the business/collateral training, team taught courses or courses that are cross-listed in the business school and the anthropology department.

If some of these training issues can be resolved, I think there are going to be many opportunities for a business anthropologist to find employment and effect some positive change at the same time. There are many international opportunities such as consulting to companies that are globalizing, and market research. There are also domestic opportunities: the ethnicity of American society is changing rapidly and because of this there are going to be opportunities for business anthropologists in consumer behavior, race relations, education, and many othere areas right here in the United States.

It is clear from the data presented in this thesis that traditional and applied anthropology training is extremely important, but non-anthropology training is just as critical. Sooner or later the discipline of anthropology will have to shed its reluctance to accept private sector practitioners as valid anthropologists, and use their experience in

training a new generation of students just as the other social sciences have done. The survival of the discipline may depend on it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Marketing Association
    1987 Marketing Can be Global, But Ads Must Remain Cultural. AMA's World Marketing Conference, Montreal 21:26.

Anderson, David C.
    1985 How to Offend A Mexican Businessman. Across the Board. 22:53-56.

Baba, Marietta L.
    1986 Business and Industrial Anthropology:an Overview. NAPA Bulletin vol. 2.

Barnum, Cynthia; Wolniansky, Natasha
    1989 Why Americans fail at Overseas Negotiations. Management Review 78:55-57.

Bernard, Russel H.
    1988 Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology. Sage Publications, Newbury Park.

Boram, Joan
    1988 AVP of Anthropology? Some Firms Give the Discipline Top-Exec Status. Industry Week. 236:26.

Briody, Elizabeth K.
    1988 Profiles of Practice: Anthropological Careers in business, Government, and Private Sector Associations. In Anthropology for Tomorrow: Creating Practitioner Oriented Applied Anthropology Programs. Robert K. Trotter ed. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association in collaboration with the National Association for Practice of Anthropology.

Bryan, Robert M.; Buck, Peter C.
  1989 The Cultural Pitfalls in Cross-Border Negotiations. <u>Mergers &</u>
     <u>Acquisitions</u> 24:61-63.

Burkhalter, Brian S.
  1985 If Only They Would Listen: The Anthropology of Business and The
     Business of Anthropology. <u>Practicing Anthropology</u> 7:18-20.

Chambers, Erve
  1985 <u>Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide.</u> Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs,
     N. J.

Crane, Julia G.; Angrosino, Michael V.
  1984 <u>Field Projects in Anthropology: A student Handbook.</u> Waveland Press,
     Prospect Heights, Illinois.

Deckinger, E.L.; Brink, James M.; Katzenstein, Herbert; Primavera, Louis H.
  1990 How Can Advertising Teachers Better Prepare Students for Entry-Level
     Advertising Agency Jobs? <u>Jrnl of Advertising Research</u> 29:6.

DeFrank, Richard S.; Matteson, Michael T.; Schweiger, David
  1985 The Impact of Culture on the Management Practices of American and
     Japanese CEOs. <u>Organizational Dynamics</u> 13:62-76.

Edel, Richard
  1988 American Dream Vendors (Advertising-Culture Relationships).
     <u>Advertising Age</u> 59:152-154.

Fannin, Rebecca
  1988 Seeing is Believing. <u>Media Decisions</u> 23:51-54.

Ferraro, G.

    1990 The Cultural Dimension of International Business. New Jersey, Prentice
           Hall.

Fiske, Shirley

    1992 The Five Field Approach in Anthropology. Anthropology Newsletter
           9:11-12.

Frost, Peter J.

    1985 Organizational Culture. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.

Gardner, B.B.

    1988 Anthropologists in Business and Industry. Anthropological Quarterly
           50:171-173.

Gemmel, Art

    1986 Management in a Cross-Cultural Environment: the Best of Both Worlds.
           Management Solutions 31:28-33.

George, William W.

    1983 How Honeywell Takes Advantage of National Cultural Differences.
           Management Review 72:30-31.

Givans, David B.

    1991 Selling Ourselves. Anthropology Newsletter 10:1,32.

Grafton-Small, Robert

    1987 Marketing, or the Anthropology of Consumption. European Jrnl of
           Marketing 21:66-71.

Green,Edward C. ed.
    1986 <u>Practicing Development Anthropology.</u> Westview Press, Boulder.

Grey, Hackenberg, and Stull
    1991 <u>The Case Against Accreditation of Training Programs.</u> Commentary:
        Accreditation in Applied Anthropology <u>Practicing Anthropology</u>
        13:2,20-23.

Gummer, Burton
    1990 Managing Organizational Cultures: Management Science or Management
        Ideology. <u>Administration in Social Work.</u> 14:135-153.

Heller, Scott
    1988 From Selling Rambo to Supermarket Studies, Anthropologists are Finding
        More Non-Academic Jobs. <u>The chronicle of Higher Education</u> 34.

Hyland, Stanley and Kirkpatrick, Sean, eds.
    1989 <u>Guide to Training Programs in the Application of Anthropology.</u> Society
        for Applied Anthropology.

Louis, J.C.
    1985 It's Anthropological! Research Takes a "Cultural" Bent. <u>Advertising Age</u>
        56:3,31.

Lucas, Rob
    1987 Political-Cultural Analysis of Organizations. <u>Academy of Management
        Review</u> 12:144-156.

Mariampolski, Hy
    1988 Ethnology Makes Comeback as Research Tool. <u>Marketing News</u>
        22:32,44.

Meek, V. Lynn
    1988 Organizational Culture: Origins and Weaknesses. <u>Organizational Studies</u>
        9:453-473.

Naisbitt, John
    1985 <u>Re-inventing the Corporation: transforming your job and your company for
the new information society.</u> New York, Warner Books.

Ott, J. Steven
    1989 <u>The Organizational Culture Perspective.</u> Brooks/Cole, Grove, California.

Partridge, William L.; Eddy, Elizabeth M. ed.
    1978 <u>Applied Anthropology in America.</u> Columbia University Press, New York.

Pennings, Johannes M.; Gresov, Christopher G.
    1986 Technoeconomic and Structural Correlates of Organizational Culture: An
        Integrative framework. <u>Organization Studies</u> 7:317-334.

Reeves-Ellington Richard
    1988 A Managers Use of Anthropology. <u>Practicing Anthropology</u> 10:8-9.

Schein, Edgar H.
    1985 <u>Organizational Culture and Leadership.</u> Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Serrie, Hendrick
      1983 Anthropology and International Business. Practicing Anthropology
          5:12,19.

Siwolop, Sana
      1986 What's an Anthropologist Doing in My Office? Business Week
          June:90F-H.

Spyhey, Tony
      1989 Frames of Meaning as a Concept in Organization. International Studies of
          Management & Organization Fall:16-18.

Trachtenberg, Jeffery A.
      1987 Beyond the Hidden Persuaders. Forbes 139:134-138.

Trotter, Tashima and Crain
      1991 The Case for Accreditation of Training Programs. Commentary:
          Accreditation in Applied Anthropology. Practicing Anthropology
          13:2,20-23.

Van Willigen, John
      1991 Development of Training Standards. Commentary: Accreditation in
          Applied Anthropology. Practicing Anthropology 13:2,20-23.

Van Willigen, John
      1986 Applied Anthropology: An Introduction. Bergin & Garvey, South Hadley,
          Mass.

Van Willigen, John
1991 Anthropology in Use: A Sourcebook on Anthropological Practice.
Westview Press, Boulder.

Van Willigen, John
1992 Training Standards in Applied and Practicing Anthropology. Anthropology
Newsletter 10:34.

Walker, Wallace Earl
1986 Changing Organizational Culture: Strategy, Structure, and Professionalism
in the U.S. General Accounting Office. Knoxville, University of
Tennessee Press.

Whitehill, Arthur, M.
1989 American Executives Through Foreign Eyes. Business Horizons 32:42-48.

Zemke, Ron
1989 Anthropologists in the Corporate Jungle. Training 26:48-60.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INITIAL COVER LETTER

Dear Anthropologist,

I am a graduate student in applied cultural anthropology at the University of Tennessee. Currently, I am doing thesis research on anthropologists working in private industry. I am interested in compiling information concerning educational and career histories, job descriptions, duties, and anthropological skills that are used in private industry.

My initial selection of participants for this were taken from several different sources and pieced together. However, since there is no specific compilation of anthropologists in private industry, I am sure there are people who have been overlooked. I would greatly appreciate any names you could provide of other anthropologists in private industry who could be asked to participate in this research.

Enclosed is a brief questionnaire regarding your position and career as an anthropologist. Your completing and returning this survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope by 7/15/91 would be greatly appreciated

Sincerely,

Cherie A. Black
Graduate student, University of Tennessee
Dept. of Anthropology

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This research is designed to compile information about anthropologists working in private industry, such as career history, educational background, anthropological skills used on the job and how the participant got the position he/she has. The analysis will include quantitative as well as qualitative comparisons.

There is absolutely no personal or professional risk involved in participating in this research. Once received, the surveys and the consent forms will be separated and kept in different places. The results will be made public in a quantitative fashion as part of an aggregate sample. No names will be used in describing individual career histories, and details which would identify individuals will be changed if necessary in presenting case examples.

The benefits of this research are evident. The private sector anthropologist has been a "loner", and largely unrecognized thus far. This research will make more traditional anthropologists and students aware of what the private sector anthropologist is doing as well as making them aware of the benefits of this type of applied anthropology. If you have additional questions about this project, please contact my advisor:

> Dr. Benita J. Howell
> University of Tennessee
> 252 South Stadium Hall
> Knoxville, Tennessee
> 37996

I have read and understand this research project as described above and agree to participate in it.

_____

    research participant

APPENDIX C

INITIAL SURVEY

SURVEY OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS WORKING IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

1) What is your job title?_____
_____

2) What anthropological skills do you use in your duties?
_____
_____
_____
_____

3) What is your educational background?_____
_____

4) Did you get your job primarily because you are an anthropologist or because of other qualifications? _____
_____
_____

5) What anthropology skills were included in the job description If any?
_____
_____
_____

6) How strongly is your professional identity linked to anthropology?

_____very strongly   _____somewhat·

_____strongly   _____ not at all

7) What courses and training experiences were most useful in preparing for your career?
_____
_____
_____
_____

8) What changes would make your graduate program more useful for careers in business anthropology?_____
_____
_____
_____

84

9)Do you maintain contacts with other anthropologists in business? If so, how?

_____

_____

_____

10)Would you be willing to talk with me further about your career and job on the phone? If so:

Number I can reach you at _____

Best days of the week _____

Best times of the day _____

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW UP COVER LETTER

Dear anthropologist,

Enclosed is a follow up questionnaire to the one you completed and sent back to me at the University of Tennessee about five months ago. The survey was for thesis research about anthropologists working in the private sector and their training.

The initial survey that you filled out was designed to get cursory information and identify a sample of anthropologists working in the private sector. As I am sure you know, such information about private sector anthropologists is scarce. Now that all of my background research is done and I have an appropriate sample, I would like to collect some more detailed information about your work experiences, skills, and opinions about a standard curriculum for applied anthropology.

Since my sample is larger than I anticipated, the phone interviews originally discussed will not be feasible. However, I may be contacting some of you for a short follow up interview.

I would very much appreciate you taking the time to complete and return the questionnaire enclosed.

Please include a copy of your resume if possible.

Sincerely,

Cherie A. Black

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW UP SURVEY

BUSINESS ANTHROPOLOGY SURVEY

<u>ACADEMIC BACKGROUND</u>:
degrees, majors/minors, dates awarded

_____

_____

_____

<u>EARLY CAREER DEVELOPMENT</u>:
BRIEFLY DISCUSS:
Jobs held while in graduate school

_____

_____

_____

Graduate internships _____

_____

_____

When and how did you make the choice between academics and practice?

_____

_____

_____

When and how was the decision made to go into business (private industry)?

_____

_____

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

Please chose three (3) jobs, projects, contracts, or work experiences, preferably business related, that you consider significant to your career.

1.Date_____task,setting,roles_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

How did you get this job? Networking, education, experience, specific knowledge base or other?

_____

_____

_____

What were the key anthropological skills for this job?

_____

_____

Other key skills?_____.

_____

_____

2.Date_____task,setting,roles_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

How did you get this job? Networking, education, experience, specific knowledge base or other?

_____

_____

_____

_____

What were the key anthropological skills for this job?

_____

_____

_____

Other key skills _____

_____

3.Date_____task,setting,roles_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

How did you get this job? Networking, education, experience, specific knowledge base or other?

_____

_____

_____

_____

What were the key anthropological skills for this job?

_____

_____

_____

Other key
skills?_____

_____

_____

SKILLS

Of the skills you consider most important in your career, which were acquired in your anthropological training?

_____

_____

In other graduate school experiences?

_____

_____

_____

In on the job training?

_____

_____

_____

PLEASE RANK THE FOLLOWING IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE TO YOUR CAREER, ONE(1) BEING THE MOST IMPORTANT.

RANKING   SPECIFIC ELEMENTS

_____ ANTHROPOLOGICAL
         CONCEPTS/THEORY_____

_____ ANTHROPOLOGICAL
         METHODS/SKILLS_____

_____ KNOWLEDGE OF
         SPECIFIC CULTURE/
         LANGUAGE _____

_____ NON-ANTHROPOLOGY
         TRAINING _____

_____ ON THE JOB
         EXPERIENCE _____

GIVE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF WHAT, IN YOUR OPINION, WOULD BE THE IDEAL CURRICULUM FOR AN APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM DESIGNED FOR STUDENTS WHO WISH TO MARKET THEMSELVES IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

HOW MUCH AND WHAT KIND OF COLLATERAL TRAINING SHOULD BE TAKEN IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS?

ACCREDITATION:
BUSINESS SCHOOLS AND OTHER SIMILAR SPECIALTIES ARE NOW ROUTINELY ACCREDITED; WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF A STANDARD CURRICULUM OR ACCREDITATION FOR APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY?

WOULD ACCREDITATION OF YOUR TRAINING PROGRAM OR PERSONAL CERTIFICATION BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO YOU? WHY OR WHY NOT?

95

VITA

Cherie Ann Black was born in Newport News, Virginia on November 3, 1965. In August of 1966 she was moved to Charleston, South Carolina where she began preschool in August of 1969. She attended elementary school at St. Andrews School and was graduated from First Baptist High School, Charleston, South Carolina in may, 1983. The following September she entered Queens College, Charlotte, North Carolina. In 1985 she entered the College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina and in December 1988 received the degree of Bachelor of Science in Sociology with an emphasis in Anthropology and a minor in Business. In August of 1989 she entered the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and in May of 1993 received the degree of Master of Arts in Anthropology. After spending the summers of 1990, 1991. and 1992 at the College of Charleston, she received the degree of Bachelor of Science in Business Administration in August, 1992.

She is planning to attend Wayne State University in September of 1992 after having won a doctoral fellowship there. She hopes to complete a Ph.D in Applied Anthropology by 1995.