Abstracts and Annotations on Anthropology and Public Policy

Anderson, James E. 2000. *Public Policymaking*. Houghton Mifflin.

> Describes the process of policymaking, including stages from defining problems, to formulating policy, to adopting policy, to budgeting , to implementation, to assessing impact, evaluating, and changing policy.

Angrosino, Michael V. and Linda M. Whiteford. 1987. "Service, Delivery, Advocacy, and the Policy Cycle" in *Applied Anthropology in America*. Eddy and Partridge, eds. Columbia University Press.

> In this essay, Michael Angrosino and Linda Whiteford examine policy formation and implementation as a social process. This process entails systematic interaction among policy makers, bureaucratic structures that carry out policy, and client populations to whom the policies are addressed. The classic model of policy analysis is the top-down model: policy decisions are passed from executive or manager to line agency personnel who transmit them to clients. In contrast, Angrosino and Whiteford propose a cyclical model which conforms more closely to their analysis of two case studies.

Curtis, Ric. Adventures in Engaged Anthropology or Why 'Getting it Right' isn't Enough. Available on the SFAA website: www.sfaa.net/committees/policy/policy.html

> Building on Kirk Dombroski's comments on anthropology being divided between an epistemological emphasis (getting it right) and pragmatics/ engagement Curtis uses his own work with illicit drugs to demonstrate the possibility of engaging oneself on multiple levels and "gaining a seat at the table."

Davis, Shelton, and Robert O. Matthews. 1999. "Public Interest Anthropology: Beyond the Bureaucratic Ethos." *Classics of Practicing Anthropology,* edited by Patricia J. Higgins and Anthony Paredes. Oklahoma City: Society for Applied Anthropology.

> Shelton Davis and Robert Matthews address an issue that has long troubled many anthropologists: For whose benefit is anthropology being applied? Like M. F. Trend (this volume), Davis and Matthews are concerned that the contribution of applied anthropology is too often limited to providing data for decisions made by persons in more powerful positions. Their proposed solution, however, is not for anthropologists to rise to positions of power within research organizations working on government (or corporate) contracts – or even to rise to positions of power within governments or corporations. Rather, they propose that anthropologists focus their research on the structures of power and powerlessness, address significant social problems, represent the interests of those most affected by the problems, and put the results of their work in the hands of citizens and citizen groups. They offer brief descriptions of three projects undertaken by the

Anthropology Resource Center as examples of the type of applied anthropology they advocate.

Eisenberg, Merrill. 1994. "Translating Research into Policy: What More Does it Take?" *Practicing Anthropology* 16(4):35-38.

Based on her work as a consultant in program planning and evaluation, Merrill Eisenberg argues that to have an impact on programs and policies anthropologists must not only do well-grounded, scientifically solid research and present the results in ways comprehensible to policy makers and the public. They must also be thoroughly acquainted with the political context and policy culture surrounding each project, and they must act on that knowledge. To highlight some relevant contextual features and the actions anthropologists can take, she compares two projects – one a well-executed study of sexually transmitted diseases, commissioned by the Connecticut Department of Health, which had no impact on policy or programs; the other study of disability services commissioned by the Department of Human Services which resulted in changes in policy, programs, and administrative organization. Eisenberg stresses that is every bit as necessary and as legitimate for anthropologists to use their skills and knowledge to change behavior of policy makers as it is for them to attempt to change the behavior of the intended beneficiaries of policies and programs.

Gow, David D. 1993. "Doubly Damned: Dealing with Power and Praxis in Development Anthropology." *Human Organization* 52(4).

Development anthropologists are doubly damned – criticized by both academics and development professionals on romantic, moral, and intellectual grounds, and basically regarded as second-class citizens within the "development community." As a result, they have studiously avoided defining the principal objectives of development. Likewise, they have shied away from developing theories that direct action to the underlying causes of "underdevelopment." And given their traditional focus on the local context, development anthropologists have often been hard pressed to deal effectively with external factors, particularly power, whether political, institutional, or economic. An analysis of three rural development projects shows how anthropologists dealt with power. A key element was their effectiveness in the policy arena, based partly on their "anthropological authority," but also on their relative development anthropology to shed its stigma of damnation, it is necessary for it to increase its concentration on critique and analysis, leading to better policy formulation, and the opportunity to implement policy as theory in practice.

Hackenberg, Robert. 1999. Advancing Applied Anthropology. *Human Organization,* 58(1): 105-107.

The aim of this paper is to suggest a perspective on the formulation of applied projects that exploits options for coping competitively within an ever more complex and less hospitable working environment. It serves as a game plan for increasing applied anthropology's effectiveness, especially as regards policy.

Heighton, Robert H. and Christy Heighton. 1987. "Applying the Anthropological Perspective to Social Policy" in *Applied Anthropology in America*. Eddy and Partridge, eds. Columbia University Press.

> Based on their experiences as employees of the Southern Regional Education Board, Robert and Christy Heighton consider specific contributions that anthropologists can make to deliberate social planning processes and their evaluation. They see the major contributions of anthropology in the discipline's breadth of view, theories of change, study of systemic relationships within the context of an organic whole, means of contributing for value judgments, and use of inductive reasoning. They note that the models and theoretical models of anthropology are only mirrors of reality which must be tested in applied situations. The Heightons share the convictions of Kimball and other contributors to this volume that, if anthropologists are to contribute effectively to nonacademic roles and institutional settings, applied work and contributions will have to become as valued as academic ones. It is only as this occurs that anthropologists will be able to make significant contributions to social policy.

Heyman, Josiah McC., Evelyn Caballero, and Alaka Wali, eds. 2006. Special section on Public Policy and World Anthropologies. *Practicing Anthropology* 28(4): 2-16.

> An overview and three case studies of public policy and anthropology outside the traditional anthropological "core" nations (U.S., U.K., France). The introductory essay ("Public Policy and World Anthropologies" by Heyman, Caballero, and Wali) notes the importance of understanding specific social-cultural settings to practicing anthropology and public policy and delineates a variety of arenas and ways that anthropologists can engage in public policy. "Mexico: National Anthropology and the Construction of the Nation" by Gabriela Vargas-Cetina examines an important case of a national anthropology that has long been engaged in public policy. "Ancient Civilizations and Plural Societies in the Andean Amazon: Anthropologists and Indians Fight for Inclusion" by Richard Chase Smith examines the historical legacy of racist/culturally biased views of indigenous peoples and how they shape policy struggles in Peru. "Advocating Policy: Initiatives in Mining and Development" is a rich case study of long term community-based policy engagement concerning the regulation of traditional indigenous miners in the Philippines.

Hicks, George L. and Mark J. Handler. 1987. "Ethnicity, Public Policy and Anthropologists" in *Applied Anthropology in America*. Eddy and Partridge, eds. Columbia University Press.

> The orientation of Americans toward the present and the future often results in each generation confronting contemporary social problems as if they were appearing for the first time. What is true of Americans generally is also true of American anthropologists in particular. This ahistoricism means that we are often unaware of the lessons of the past and assume that there are no past guideposts for present actions. George L. Hicks and Mark J. Handler present an historical review of the relationship between anthropologists and public policies with respect to ethnicity. Using the case studies of native Americans, immigrants, and black Americans as examples, they demonstrate the failure and success of anthropologists in influencing the major policies which have affected these groups. Present issues and concerns about ethnicity are then discussed within the context of historical developments of ideas in the discipline of anthropology and the meaning of ethnicity in American life. From Hicks and Handler, we learn a great deal abut the complexities entailed in studying our own society and the problems of separating our roles as researchers form our roles as well-intentioned citizens.

Kimball, Solon. 1987. "Anthropology as a Policy Science: in *Applied Anthropology in America*. Eddy and Partridge, eds. Columbia University Press.

> The development of anthropology as a policy science will not be easy. It will require a greatly expanded research emphasis on contemporary complex societies and a vigorous development of applied anthropology so that data may be provided to achieve programmatic goals and to test theories of change. Research methodologies which produce only ethnographic description must yield analysis of communities, organizations, and processes within them. Solon T. Kimball develops the above themes and describes the difference between policy recommendations based on empirical analysis and those based solely on one's own moral judgments. Pronouncements about policy issues do not necessarily constitute policy analysis. Unless such pronouncements are based on scientific methods of investigation, the policy statements of anthropologists are similar to those of any other citizen with an opinion.

Nader, Laura. 2001. Thinking Public Interest Anthropology 1890s-1990s, In *The Applied Anthropology Reader*. 18-23. McDonald, ed. Allyn & Bacon.

> In this essay Nader reviews some of what anthropology has done in the public interest. She summarizes her perspective on the subject as articulated in earlier publications and gives suggestions for making anthropology a more fundamental part of public life.

Okongwu, Anne Francis and Joan P. Mencher. 2000. The Anthropology of Public Policy: Shifting Terrains. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:107-124.

> As we enter the twenty-first century, the terrain on which social policy is made is changing rapidly. This has resulted in anthropologists, in combination other social scientists, giving serious attention to the impact of this new phase of globalization on changes in social and environmental policies. This review focuses on the ways in which anthropology as a field has contributed, and continues to contribute, to social policy research, practice, and advocacy in the current international context. Given the limited space allotted, we have selected the following six areas of public policy for analysis and description: (*a*) links between globalization processes and policy on the national and local levels; (*b*) social welfare policy, including employment and family welfare survival strategies; (*c*) the impact of structural adjustment and economic restructuring on migration and labor force incorporation; (*d*) policies in the north and south related to global agriculture, social inequality, and manipulations of some multinational corporations; (*e*) policies affecting sustainable agriculture, and (*f*) the role of anthropologists in examining the impact of political and economic hegemony on the environment.

Priester, Ken. 2003. Social Ecology and Public Policy. Available on the SFAA website. www.sfaa.net/committees/policy/policy.html

> This paper describes the social ecology approach to planning, programs, and public policy, with its core concepts and key phases. It should be helpful to people interested in alternatives to models of policy change centered around lobbying. Examples from work with the BLM and Forest Service demonstrate how to make policy formulation participatory.

Puntenney, P. J. 1995. Informing Environmental Policy Making. *Futures* 27(6):675-680.

> As we move into the 21st century, anthropology has enjoyed the diffusion of its knowledge into public discourse and into the discussions of other professions. Within academe, the American Anthropological Association recently adjusted the traditional four field approach (linguistic, biological/physical, cultural and archaeology) to include *practice* as a fifth field. Almost everyone in the international community at some level is struggling to make sense of how to balance economic priorities with environmental concerns. While science can attempt to evaluate the functions and risks confronting human and environmental systems, solutions to the major issues ultimately will require public choice and public responsibility. This reality raises important questions regarding what do we need to protect, how, at what cost, and who else should be involved in making these essentially value-based decisions. Here anthropology, through its broad approach, holistic perspective and field-based methods, can contribute in substantial ways.

Rose, Nikolas and Peter Miller. 1992. "Political Power Beyond The State: Problematics of Government." *British Journal of Sociology* 43(2):173-205.

> This paper sets out an approach to the analysis of political power in terms of problematics of government. It argues against an over-valuation of the 'problem of the State' in political debate and social theory. A number of conceptual tools are suggested for the analysis of the many and varied alliances between political and other authorities that seek to govern economic activity, social life and individual conduct. Modern political rationalities and governmental technologies are shown to be intrinsically linked to developments in knowledge and the powers of the expertise. The characteristics of liberal problematics of government are investigated, and it is argued that they are dependent upon technologies for 'governing at a distance', seeking to create locales, entities and persons able to operate a regulated autonomy. The analysis is exemplified through an investigation of welfarism as a mode of 'social' government. The paper concludes with a brief consideration of neo-liberalism which demonstrates that the analytical language structured by the philosophical opposition of state and civil society is unable to comprehend contemporary transformations in modes of exercise of political power.

Shore, Cris and Susan Wright. 1997. *Anthropology of Policy: Critical perspectives on governance and power.* New York: Routledge.

This book argues that policy has become an increasingly central organizing principle in contemporary societies, shaping the way we live, act and think. This book shows how anthropological approaches to policy can provide insights into a range of contemporary issues, from equal opportunities to health care, from AIDS to housing policies. Despite the importance of policy as a key institution of modern society, it remains curiously under-theorized and lacking in critical analysis.
In questioning and explaining policy's language and its links with power, the contributors challenge the accepted notion of policy as rational and progressively linear and pave the way for further research.

Weaver, Thomas. 1985. Anthropology as a Policy Science: Part I, A Critique. *Human Organization*, 44(2): 97-105.

> This article gives an overview of the successful policy sciences, a review of Anthropologists' work in public policy, and an assessment of the success and failure of anthropology as policy science.

Weaver, Thomas. 1985. Anthropology as a Policy Science: Part II. *Human Organization*, 44(3): 197-205.

> In part two Weaver calls for a refocusing of anthropology to improve its efficacy. He provides the context in which the development of anthropology as a policy science is taking place and gives recommendations for the training of applieds,

elements include cross-disciplinary topical expertise, communication and other professional skills.

Wedel, Janine R., Cris Shore, Gregory Feldman, and Stacy Lathrop. 2005. "Toward an Anthropology of Public Policy," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 600 (July):30-51.

As the rational choice model of "policy" proliferates in "policy studies," the social sciences, modern governments, organizations, and everyday life, a number of anthropologists are beginning to develop a body of work in the anthropology of public policy that critiques the assumptions of "policy" as a legal-rational way of getting things done. While de-masking the framing of public policy questions, an anthropological approach attempts to uncover the constellations of actors, activities, and influences that shape policy decisions, their implementation, and their results. In a rapidly changing world, anthropologists' empirical and ethnographic methods can show how policies actively create new categories of individuals to be governed. They also suggest that the long-established frameworks of "state" and "private," "local" or "national" and "global," "macro" and "micro," "top down" and "bottom up," and "centralized" and "decentralized" not only fail to capture current dynamics in the world but actually obfuscate the understanding of many policy processes.

Van Willigen, John. 1993. Anthropology as a Policy Science, in *Applied Anthropology*. Bergin & Garvey.

Anthropologists provide a wide variety of research services in response to various needs associated with the process of policy formation, implementation, and evaluation. This chapter describes the policy process and summarizes the major types of applied research done in relation to it.