Florida Journal of Anthropology, Vol.8, No.2, Pt.2; 1983

INDUCTION INTO THE APPLIED ACADEMIC REALM OF BUSINESS

BY: JOHN SHERRY

MEMORANDUM

To: Applicants for faculty position

From: Chairman, Search Committee

This report is intended to bring you up to date on our hiring progress. As more than 400 individuals have applied to date, I trust that you will excuse the necessarily impersonal form of this memo . . . Selecting from so many candidates for a single position has been both difficult and painful, especially when many have been from people who have strong credentials . . .

The frequency at which I have received form letters of this sort has imbued me with the spirit of "rethinking" or "reinventing" which has survived the critrical scalding it has suffered from our discipline over the years. Just such a "Dear John" letter prompted a recent discussion between my wife and myself. As we rested at the base of the cool, verdant sinkhole of a local state geological preserve, watching our two young sons tumbling their way down the incline, my wife casually observed, "You know ... Anthropology is like the Devil's Millhopper." Knowing her to be something of a romantic, I savored the simile for a moment, seeking an apposite interpretation. After brief reflection, I queried, "How's that?", and found myself somewhat unprepared for her rejoinder. "The whole damn thing's caving in," she replied.

Despite her unforgivable punning, she eloquently reminded me of the need to use our anthropological imagination to counter what must seem to some to be disciplinary erosion. As a graduate student in the post-rethinking- and reinventing-era, I discovered the fallacy of the devolutionary premise in anthropology, even as the Manpower Committee of the AAA commented that the 'buffalo was disappearing'. That discovery might have remained purely conjectural or academic had it not been reinforced by an extended period of fieldwork in organizational culture. Before launching a discussion of the substantive issues pertaining to an emerging subdiscipline, I intend to recount briefly my own induction into and odyssey through the applied academic realm of business.

From field research in Caribbean fishing villages through Irish pubs to urban American treatment clinics, nothing has integrated my conception of professional anthropology as much as my experience as a blue collar worker. Having hailed from that subculture, and pursued an

education partially in an attempt to transcend (if not escape) it, I found it ironic that my roles of graduate student, husband and father were ultimately mediated by my role of workman. From the vantage point of a Visiting Professor of Marketing, I occasionally reflect [in contra-nostalgia] on the period when my days began at 3:00 AM and ended at 10:00 PM. During this time I would load trucks and tend conveyor belts for five hours before racing off to teach and be instructed. After school it was off to the warehouse to truck, tend and ship produce for five hours. Upon clocking out, I'd engage my family in somnolent conversation, crack the books, then stumble off to bed. It was Full Nest I, and I gradually rounded the turn at burn-out and proceeded toward melt-down. Some semblance of a sane perspective was maintained by hewing to our tradition that an anthropologist goes out and stays out, and by invoking a fictive kinship bond with Camus' Sisyphus.

Like Malinowski confined to the Trobriands, I sought to cope with the blue collar blues through intensive participant observation. While working I attempted to analyze dimensions of organizational culture: rationality, stress, alieniation, joking relationships, flow, social control and other phenomena occupied my thoughts while on the clock. Concurrent reading in applied anthropology stemmed not from coursework but from a desire to convert the shop to the field. When funding exigiencies prompted a shift in the focus of my dissertation from Irish aesthetics to industrial alcoholism, this impromptu field immersion stood me in good stead.

Completion of doctoral research was a watershed for me in so far as it marked a transition from studying corporations using anthropological methods and insights to working as an employee within corporations using anthropological methods and insights as professional tools. During the several years I worked as a substance abuse therapist, I envisioned myself as a practicing anthropologist. I found, as the literature is beginning to suggest, that the anthropologist has much to offer the corporation in terms of planning, implementation, management, evaluation and strategic vision. Of signal import to my own professional development was a rereading of Jules Henry's (1963) "passionate ethnography" of contemporary American culture, in which he observes that no country in the world is more suitable for anthropological study as a whole than the United States. Coupled with Laura Nader's (1969) timely, reasoned and virtually unheeded admonition that anthropologists ought to "study up" (in contrast to Nancy Scheper-Hughes observation (1982) that we have an emotional and professional investment in the careers of social marginals), I cast about for a position that would permit me to practice anthropology in a nontraditional arena.

Hoping to achieve a competitive advantage as a researcher within the academy, but expecting - given our currently discouraging employment forecast - to remain a practicing anthropogist indefinitely, I was pleasantly surprised and mildly alarmed by the invitation to join the faculty of the Marketing Department at the University of Florida. Despite the acknowledged excellence of the Center for Consumer Research, I imagined the castigation I would suffer at the hands of colleagues who believed I was about to embark upon a career of selling infant formula to Third World mothers. Walt Dickie (1982) has done an excellent job of describing the world-view restructuring that the anthropologist must do just to envision American consumer behavior as a field of inquiry, let alone as a potential profession. I'll re-examine this disciplinary ethnocentrism momentarily. Having been a stranger in a strange land now for an academic year, this apprehension has passed. The utility of an anthropological perspective on business, from the standpoint of teaching and research is finally becoming clear to anthropologists. (I am becoming convinced that some of the best ethnographic accounts of contemporary American culture are being produced by market researchers; unfortunately for us many of these studies are proprietary in nature.). Clearly, we don't need to study business solely by default. Considered as a component of a fifth level of sociocultural integration, activity within the business network is more than just intrinsically interesting to anthropologists. Both intellectual and moral integrity demand that we investigate this domain.

In the remainder of this presentation I intend to sketch briefly, the history of anthropological interest in the realm of business. I will discuss some areas of research appropriate to anthropological inquiry, and suggest some practical applications for merging anthropology and business. I will conclude with some suggestions for improving both the quality of entry level preparation for and academic research into the domain of business.

HISTORICAL SKETCH AND EMERGING DIRECTIONS

In his acerbic assessment of the state of the anthropological enterprise, Cohen (1977:392-95) notes that

> Hunting, gathering, cultivation, herding, distribution, reciprocity, and so forth, are the business activities of tribal and peasant groups, though we are careful not to use the term. If anthropologists studied industrial business organization and activities with the rigor with which they approached horticultural or pastoral

> businesses, our insights into our own societies would be greater. Unfortunately, however, it seems to be in too many people's interests to have us perpetuate the myth that kinship, religion, visiting, marriage, socialization, and the like in industrial societies are on one side of the fence, while "business" is on the other. Some of the best ethnographic data on the cultures (not the culture) of the United States are in the daily Wall Street Journal and the financial pages of the New York Times. That is where the relationship between anthropology and business should begin . . . Anthropology begins at home, and we have lost the art of anthropologizing.

It is time to accept the challenge implicit in Cohen's critique. For our present purposes, we will consider business as a complex of activities surrounding the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of commodities. This complex includes the cultural environment concurrent, antecedent and consequent to these processes.

The impetus for exploring business as a social phenomenon grows out of the intersection of several subdisciplines or research foci. Clearly, applied and economic anthropology can be used as an interpretive frame. Organizational behavior, especially the dynamics of formal organizations, is relevant to such an investigation. Finally, what has been termed "industrial ethnology", or the "anthropology of work" has advanced our understanding of business.

Anthropologists pioneered the development of the field of human problems in industry, beginning with the Western Electric research program of the late 1920s. The interpretation of data collected during the field study of the Hawthorne plant has shaped most theories of organizational behavior since that time; recent reinterpretation of the same data (Franke and Kaul 1978; in a popular account, see Rice 1982) promises to be similarly influential. W. Lloyd Warner, a consultant to this project, pursued his interest in the informal organization of the workplace in a larger scale community study of Yankee City, in collaboration with such colleagues as Arensberg, Chapple, Davis, Gardner and Kimball. These pioneers in turn independently advanced the study of shop floor behavior from an ethnographic perspective. However, after the initial surge of activity subsided in the late 1940s, anthropologists appear to have abandoned industrial ethnography as a subdiscipline, leaving the development of the field of organizational behavior to the other disciplines (Whyte 1978). Individual anthropologists retained an interest in the business world, but as practitioners rather than as academics. For example,

Burleigh Gardner founded Social Research, Inc., a consulting firm specializing in attitudinal and motivational research.

Holzberg and Giovannini (1981:326-327) have observed that the industrial firm is the "optimal context for the study of the dynamics of social interaction and group structure." The authors cite the case study as a significant conceptual and methodological tool insofar as its contextual nature "closely approximates the holistic integrative dimensions of anthropological inquiry." Recent case studies have explored cognition and industrial work, as well as macro-level processes in industry. Interorganizational behavior, and levels of socio-cultural integration have also been investigated. Recently I completed a study of the sociopolitical dynamics of conflict generation and management within a multinational corporation, which was influential in improving the quality of organizational programming in that particular company (Sherry 1983). While industrial anthropology has maintained a commitment to practical utility since its inception, recent literature contains little direct concern with applied industrial research (Holzberg and Giovannini 1981:329-332; 346-349). As Gamst (1980:85), has noted, the "social power" of industrial ethnology lies in its description of social reality beyond "ideal patterns," and in its presentation of emic points of view, rather than in its contribution to theory. Our disciplinary myopia with regard to theory construction and action orientation in the study of business organizations is urgently in need of correction. It may well be through such a forum as the Anthropology of Work Review that such study will be catalyzed.

In contrasting the notions of anthropology as a vocation and a profession, Robert Hinshaw (1980) has provided us with some potentially corrective measures. His observations on the history of our involvement in government and national institutions are applicable to the business domain as well. As the demand for teachers and the opportunities for fieldwork in traditional research settings decline, our disciplinary worldview requires restructuring. Our conception of anthropology as an academic vocation must broaden to encompass the possibility of anthropology as a profession. This restructuring must begin with a purging of some ethnocentric notions. As Hinshaw notes (1980:500),

> anthropology has never reconciled the central values of cultural relativity and holistic science with the partisanship potentially required in accepting anyone other than students as clients.

That we pursue our craft with "studied alienation" in the service of "everyman" frequently blinds us to the fact that we are not value free, and that we do serve an advocacy

function. Hinshaw notes that the careers of future anthropologists may lie less within the academic discipline than in "networks linking anthropologists with other social scientists and nonacademic consumers of social knowledge." The transition to this type of career, however, is threatened by a "grave image problem": beyond our strictly data-gathering skills, nonacademic consumers of social research remain skeptical of the utility of anthropology (Hinshaw 1980:500). We stand in need of cultural brokers to demonstrate the symbiotic potential of anthropology and business.

Whyte (1978) has cited the need to reintroduce anthropological method and orientation to the study of organizational behavior, in the face of a paucity of solid contributions by social science since the late 1940s. The need to focus on systems of interpersonal, intergroup and interorganizational relations (especially on horizontal linkages) is seen as imperative. Whyte envisions studies which not only relate organizational structure and function with those of the community, but also integrate economic and technological data with social data. Of particular relevance to the study of organizational culture is Whyte's (1978:138) advocacy of "diagnostic research." An organizational systems framework obviates the necessity of long-term field immersion to produce action implications. Implementing such implications through appropriate brokers, however, may require substantial time.

The Tavistock Institute of London embraces most fully the epistemology of applied anthropological research in business settings. The Institute has developed an open sociotechnical systems perspective of organizational behavior. It employs an interdisciplinary approach which merges sociological and psychological perspectives. While acknowledging the influence of technology on behavior, the Institute eschews technological determinism by stressing the mutual interdependence of psychosocial, technical and economic factors. Models of transaction between organization and environment have been developed by Institute researchers. Finally, the Tavistock group has an "action" orientation that obliges the researcher to collaborate with subjects in defining objectives and in using data to design planned interventions (Lupton 1976:193). The action research, consultancy projects and group relations training conducted by Tavistock (Lawrence 1979:3) can be readily transferred to or imported into the applied-academic domain of business by the applied anthropologist.

Watson (1980:35) has noted five theoretical strands in the sociology of work and industry. Managerial-psychologistic theory stems from two contrasting "schools of thought": the scientific management tradition of Taylor,

and the neo-human relations tradition of Mayo. Systems theory is seen to arise from the structural functionalism of Durkheim. An interactionist perspective has been developed by the Chicago School. Social action is traced to Weber's concern for the dynamics of bureaucracies. Finally, dialectic or conflict analysis has been developed by Marxian theorists. Lupton (1976:190-193) has further categorized the field by subdiscipline. Clearly, clinal zones exist between these strands, and syntheses of theories have been advanced to explain both organizational structure and process. As anthropologists with a holistic, integrative bent, we have much to contribute to the inquiry.

AREAS OF SUGGESTED RESEARCH

By now the case has been made that we posses the vision, the requisite methodology, and the mandate to fashion an anthropological perspective of business. Toward this end, I suggest we pursue research in several substantive areas. We need to study management, through the vehicle of organizational culture. We need to study marketing, through the vehicle of consumer behavior. Finally we need cross-cultural (or cross-formal) comparison of both management and marketing activities. Our incipient interest in multinational/ transnational business (Idris-Soven, Idris-Soven and Vaughn 1978), in terms of intramural dynamics and social impact, attests to these needs.

Organizational Culture

In their seminal essay on the anthropology of formal organizations, Britan and Cohen (1980) advise us to focus on specific research issues: the nature of analytic units; formal and informal rules; input/output functions; everyday activities; informal networks; environmental relations. This comprehensive, holistic approach to the study of business activities, both domestic and international, has been faithfully pursued by a relative handful of researchers, most of whom are interested in "industrial anthropology". These anthropologists have explored such topics as industrialism, industrial as a societal type, and the industrialization process. The case study is a preferred mode of analysis among these researchers (Holzberg and Giovannini 1981). The other faction of anthropologists which addresses issues of concern to corporate organizational culture is oriented toward the study of power and ideology (Nader, Lomnitz and Bailey 1983). The managerial implications of each of these channels of research are apparent.

Watson (1980:192-194) describes organizational structure as an emergent pattern of relationships and behaviors of actors. Official control aspects of structure are related dialectically to unofficial activities. Although these dimensions are conceptually distinct, they interact to produce an overall structure. This model effectively describes the outcome of the behaviors of actors with a variety of goals. Thus, an organization's structure has formal and informal components. It is in the interaction between these components that such power strategies (Rushing 1964) as transaction (Kapferer 1976) and negotiation (Maines 1977) assume importance. Whitten and Whitten (1972) have examined a variety of these social strategies in their review of adaptational theory.

It has been widely recognized that formal rationality (regulation of behavior by rules) and substantive rationality (rational goals of behavior) may frequently be incongruent. Formal rationality can become substantive irrationality (Burawoy 1979:253). As Meissner (1976:218) notes, "official" work rules vary widely in their degree of explicitness, and even rigidly designed industrial operations demand some voluntary discretion of workers. Industrial sociologists have tended to focus on informal activity affecting desirable production rates (rather than organizational goals or social consequences), given the relative ease of interpretation of production process properties as a system.

Arensberg (1978:54-56) observes that informal organization in an industrial setting is protective and responsive. Informal organization can support or undermine formal hierarchy, depending upon immediate satisfactions and extended participation of individuals. Insight into the dynamics of large scale business organizations has several potential applications beyond increased efficiency. Dealing with the reality of the power and impact of such organizations would be facilitated. "Taming" them to the service of human use and social responsibility would also be facilitated. Finally, effective management would be enhanced (Arensberg 1978:56). These applications are feasible only if formal and informal organization are jointly considered.

In deference to my traditional training and affinity for interpreting expressive culture, the existence of a small, growing cadre of researchers interested in organizational symbolism must be applauded. A network of American scholars coordinated by Tom Dandridge (SUNY-Albany) and a European Working Group on Organizational Symbolism coordinated by Carl Asplund (University of Lund-Sweden) are currently generating a literature on the expressive culture of business corporations. Recently at UCLA, the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology and the

Behavior and Organizational Science Group of the Graduate School of Management jointly sponsored a conference entitled "Myth, Symbols and Folklore: Expanding the Analysis of Organizations." Both academically-oriented (Pondy, et al 1983) and popular accounts (Deal and Kennedy 1982) of secular ritual within corporations demonstrate the wisdom of viewing business in anthropological perspective. The symbolic dimension of consumer behavior (Hirschman and Holbrook 1981) is also an appropriate focus of inquiry. This transplantation of traditional anthropological research interests and methodologies to novel field settings, which is producing unanticipated insights into organizational behavior, is being conducted largely by non-anthropologists.

Consumer Behavior

While the primacy of work in establishing a conception of self, shaping social relationships, and in framing a notion of psychological health is uncontested, anthropologists have virtually overlooked the multifaceted significance of consumption in our society. Yet, the role of "consumer" may well be more influential than that of "worker" on the worldview and ethos of our contemporary culture.

In the early 1960s Charles Winick (1961) itemized the contributions of anthropology to the theory and practice of marketing. He reasoned that our specific knowledge of particular cultural traditions, our awareness of cultural themes and our sensitivity to taboos afforded us an insight into the behavior of consumers typically denied to those disciplines less oriented to holism and empathic response. Some seventeen years later, Sidney Levy (1978) again discussed the merits of constructing an anthropology of market transactions in contemporary society. At issue was our holistic perspective, attention to historic process, functional and symbolic analysis, and our concern for the "deep structure" of human behavior. Each of these dimensions has implications for understanding consumer behavior. Ironically, neither Winick nor Levy is a trained anthropologist. Their familiarity with our work in traditional, non-Western societies coupled with their knowledge of the contemporary American marketing domain makes their call for interdisciplinary study most persuasive. Our neglect of consumer behavior during that seventeen year interval between exhortations becomes more embarrassing when the volume of ethnographic research on contemporary American culture conducted by market researchers is compared with that of anthropologists. Just as ironically, some of the most serious cross-cultural blunders have been committed by marketers (Ricks 1983).

Fortunately our contribution to consumer behavior promises to be greater than the mere addition of

methodological refinements to the market researcher's tool box. (And lest we forget the variety of tools our discipline commands, the implications of William Rathje's development of garbology for consumer research are profound.) There is an increasing interest on the part of academic anthropologists in the dynamics of the modern marketplace. Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood (1979) have observed that

> If there is to be any useful insight from anthropology for the theory of consumption, the eager anthropologist has to plunge into the trap-bestrewed forest, the most recondile area of demand theory, and try to see if any of the problems which interest economists there is likely to yield to a new approach.

In exploring the world of goods, these authors note that commodities make the categories of culture stable and visible; they are a nonverbal medium for the human creative faculty. Goods create intelligibility, and, apropos of Levi-Strauss, are "good to think with." The impact of objects on patterns of thought and emotion is little understood (Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 1981). Anthropologists are perhaps uniquely suited to investigate this impact in the contemporary world. Douglas' novel examination of the social structural features of consumption patterns is a case in point. Dannhaeuser (1983) has demonstrated the need for a "marketing anthropology" in his study of distribution channels in the Philippines. Scholars such as Harris (1981) and Bodley (1976) increasingly draw our attention to the ethnical consequences of consumption. Clearly there is no dearth of subjects toward which the anthropological imagination might be turned.

In my capacity as a member of the Center for Consumer Research, I am compelled to outline the current deficits in our understanding of consumer behavior from the marketer's perspective. Sheth (1982) has directed the attention of consumer researchers to disciplinary shortcomings in the areas of focus, process and purpose. In terms of focus, we lack systematic understanding of group phenomena, and have neglected macro-and non-problem solving interpretations of consumer behavior. In a complementary observation. Zielinski and Robertson (1982) have suggested that researchers adopt a sociological perspective in interpreting consumer behavior as an alternative to the dominant psychological orientation which has shaped the field. Consumer research process is deficient in self-generated, normative constructs. Finally, consumer behavior research has lacked metatheoretical purpose, the result being that a wealth of empirical data remains to be synthesized into a theoretical frame.

With a relatively simple shift in focus, anthropologists might use their traditional methods to correct these deficits. Interdisciplinary cooperation in turn might produce hybrid scholars qualified to shape an anthropology of consumer research. Sheth (1982) provides us with a veritable shopping list of topics in need of exploration: cross-cultural buying behavior; hedonic and deviant consumption; fads and fashion; mores and taboos; lifestyle and life cycle; consumer welfare; marketing policy; advertising; symbolic communication. These are but a few of the areas to which we might make immediate (or in some cases additional), lasting contributions.

Cross-Cultural Considerations

Turning our attention to the cross-cultural dimensions of the business enterprise, we are on somewhat more familiar terrain. Our orientation toward the "underdog" has been useful in understanding such processes as modernization and development "from below". Participant observation among acculturating peoples has so sensitized us to issues of ethics and social responsibility that we have virtually assimilated an advocacy role into our job descriptions. To the extent that the spread of industrial capitalism may be held responsible for the "marginalization and immiseration of the world's poor" (Hoben 1982:356), we have been critical of corporate enterprises that fuel the processes of disinfranchisement at home and abroad. When governments have been destabilized (as in Chile), when the health of consumers has been jeopardized (as in the marketing of infant formula and various pharmaceuticals in the Third World), when products become a threat to healthy socialization (as in the marketing of such video games as Custer's Revenge), when culture change itself becomes dysfunctional (as in Harris' (1981) account of the aborted "American dream"), anthropologists have taken corporations to task. This tradition of critically appraising and assessing culpability, of gauging the social impact of business activities, has culminated in Taussig's (1980) eloquent discussion of the shaping by commodity fetishism of epistemology and praxis. A number of anthropological associations concerned with the destructive consequences of an advancing capitalist world system - the International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs, Cultural Survival, the Anthropology Resource Center, and Survival International - are currently engaged in helping indigenous peoples to survive and adapt to corporate business practices abetting modernization (Nash 1981).

Despite our access to native perspectives, however, there is nothing intrinsically anthropological about advocacy. While morally imperative, the concern for ethical issues has been epiphenomenal to the study of other patterns of behavior. Ironically, our concern for the "underdog" has

hampered our field transition from village to corporation, insofar as our "studying up" has been focussed largely on the lowest rungs of the organizational ladder. We have several excellent ethnographies of blue collar culture, shop floor interaction and class antagonism, but relatively few accounts of white collar or professional organization in anthropological perspective. The recent trend of examining foreign systems of production and managerial strategies in the interest of revitalizing American business practices may catalyze anthropological inquiry into corporate culture "from the top down."

In her critical evaluation of the world capitalist system paradigm, June Nash (1980), emphasizes the need to retain the anthropological respect for internal variation and resistance to ethnocentric judgments" in our microfieldwork explorations of the relation between so-called core and peripheral regions. The process of capitalist accumulation and expansion, which is transforming contemporary patterns of production and consumption, which in turn is reshaping patterns of social organization, has recently engaged the attention of anthropologists interested in the "new international division of labor". The impact of this internationalization of national economies on the Americas was explored recently at the Thirty-second Annual Conference of the Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Florida. While anthropologists have studied the impact of transnational corporations in terms of the resultant sociocultural (dis-) integration developing from the international transfer of labor, management and technology, we have only broached the study of multinational corporations themselves (Nash 1980:413). Wolfe's (1977) controversial discussion of the developing supranational system makes this point clearly, and Riner's (1981) subsequent call for the investigation of interlocking directorates is similarly persuasive. Safa (1983) suggests that we explore several dimensions of the multinational enterprise: recruitment policies; plant location; wages and working conditions; the role of the state; technology; migration. It is through our holistic approach and evolutionary perspective that Nash feels we will make our most significant contribution. She observes (Nash 1980:414) that an evolving international division of labor

> is bringing about an integration of manufacturing processes that is beginning to erase the boundaries of "core", "periphery", and "semiperiphery" as transnational firms move production sites to whatever areas contain reserves of cheap, available labor and where they will expect the least resistance from government or labor unions. The integration of the productive system is occurring simultaneously with a breakdown in social organization. The resulting crisis . . . is exploding before us in our field research,

often inhibiting the entry and participant observations essential to good fieldwork.

The changes resulting from this international organization of production - within corporations and societies - are ripe for anthropological analyses. Having studied multinational firms from "above" as well as "below", Nash (1979:174) is particularly well-suited to defining the avenues our anthropological inquiry can and must take: 1) the structure and organization of the multinational corporation; 2) the impact of the multinational corporation on the local society and economy; 3) the process of conflict and accommodation in which the goals of the multinational corporation and the interests of the recipient group are redefined. The status of anthropology as a multinational social science equips it to restore a humane perspective to the multinational enterprise (Dow 1977).

APPLICATIONS: THE ANTHROPOLOGIST AS ENTREPRENEUR

Each of our subdisciplines has, by chance or necessity (but rarely by design), generated a number of nonacademic practitioners. We have contract archaeologists, development officers, forensic anthropologists, linguists, therapists and clinicians of one persuasion or another, administrators, planners, and multidimensional consultants. Gerald Britan's (1978) work in program evaluation is illustrative of the potential anthropologists have to capitalize on the resurgence of interest in qualitative evaluation methods (Patton 1980). But, as Hinshaw (1980) notes, unlike psychiatrists or social workers, we have yet to field a professional corps of practitioners. Occasionally, networks of practitioners are linked in regional professional associations, while the journal Practicing Anthropology currently serves as a forum on the national level. However, the notion of applying anthropology as a profession is "gaining currency".

When Burleigh Gardner and W. Lloyd Warner founded the consulting agency Social Research, Inc. in Chicago in 1946 (Gardner 1978a), they believed that business could be interpreted as any other cultural system, with corporations constituting the contextual arenas in which specific behaviors occur. Gardner (1978b) trained with an "unusual group" at Harvard: Warner in anthropology, Elton Mayo and Lawrence Henderson in the Harvard Business School. His teachers emphasized both theory and practice. The methodology employed at Social Research is expressly anthropological. Qualitative understanding of behavior and attitude preceeds and integrates quantification of data. It is Gardner's conviction that market researchers are ethnologists, and that such ethnology can be used to solve problems for clients. Social Research, Inc. is currently a thriving concern.

Planmetrics, Inc., a consulting firm based in New York, offers a service called "Cultural Analysis" to clients seeking to improve communications, strategic planning, social impact assessment, political risk analyses and futures research. Under the direction of anthropologist Steve Barnett, cultural analysts attempt to offset the limitations of traditional demographic and psychographic studies with intensive interviewing, observation and quantitative modelling. Culturally appropriate process- and content-oriented focus group research, coupled with intensive interviewing, provide the basis for survey research directed to particular cultural segments. Planmetrics publishes the results of its ongoing cultural analysis into issues of interest to planners, including predictions of emergent trends, in a report entitled Directions. Cultural Analysis has been usefully applied in the areas of energy, consumer products, heavy industry and health care.

The utility of practicing anthropology has become apparent to numerous business organizations. Whether it is market research (as practiced in Chicago by Walt Dickie of Creative Research, Inc.), hi-tech (as practiced in Virginia by Kirk Gray of Advanced Technology, Inc.), or investment (as practiced in New Jersey by Darcy Stapp, of 1990 Plus), anthropological entrepreneurs have been able to radiate adaptively to niches in commerce. Perhaps most auspiciously, executive education concerns such as the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute School of Management and Strategic Studies in La Jolla, California (directed by Dr. Richard Farson) are beginning to recruit anthropologists to their curricula.

The time has come to make the transition from vocational to professional anthropology (whether practiced in a corporation or a college of Business Administration) less of a serendipitous leap and more the culmination of a strategic vision. We need to engage in some impression management - repositioning, if you will - to retool our traditional methodologies, and to revamp our current patterns of apprenticeship, if, as academics or practitioners, we hope to take care of business.

TOWARD IMPROVED UNDERSTANDING OF AND PREPARATION FOR BUSINESS

In tracing the evolution of academic anthropology from inception through efflorescence, Eddy and Partridge (1978) affirm the centrality of the role which applied anthropology is to play in the next stage of development. Echoing concerns raised by Dell Hymes (1969) a decade earlier, and repeated in a debate in the pages of the current American Anthropologist (Kershaw 1983; Kent 1983) these authors call for the ideological and institutional restructuring of the

anthropology we now teach. Three essential revisions are proposed for providing future practitioners with an intellectually viable, marketable heritage: (1) theoretical and methodological training in the analysis of complex societies and institutions and of the processes of adaptation and change; (2) transdisciplinary problem orientation; (3) the innovation of systematic field training in collaboration with other scientists and professionals (Eddy and Partridge 1978:421). Scholars at the colleges and universities throughout Florida - under the direction of Bernard at UF, Gainesville, Wolfe at USF, Tampa, Weidman at UM, Miami, and, apropos of our present purposes, Serrie at Eckerd, St. Petersburg (see Serrie 1983) - have been especially effective in shaping curricula to the service of contemporary realities.

To provide those of our graduate and undergraduate students who intend to seek employment outside the academy, or who desire to undertake fieldwork in corporate organizational settings, with credentials appropriate to their aspirations, I suggest that the following strategy be implemented:

1) The four traditional "core" areas of training must be expanded to include a fifth: applied anthropology. This addition would operationalize the core curriculum, provide a much-needed measure of synergy, and promote the requisite sense of social responsibility for praxis.

2) Coursework on contemporary industrial/postindustrial society must be developed and legitimized. Departments might begin by drawing on intramural resources. For instance, most of us have local "surrogate" research regimens in place at the moment, which keep our skills in shape during periods of downtime between "bona fide" field expeditions. At the very least, we are each participant observers in a variety of interesting, underexamined cultural activities, as Horace Miner (1956) and his imitators have demonstrated. A slight alteration of our perspective (rather than a paradigm shift, or even a social drama) would be sufficient to spur curriculum development - and all this without even tapping the expertise our colleagues who have specialized in contemporary societies. Extramural resources can be developed through the vehicles of cross-listing courses and enlightened advising. It is certainly reasonable to assume that a well-rounded education would include exposure to topics in business administration. Finally, the potential of interdisciplinary training, long one of the

Planmetrics, Inc., a consulting firm based in New York, offers a service called "Cultural Analysis" to clients seeking to improve communications, strategic planning, social impact assessment, political risk analyses and futures research. Under the direction of anthropologist Steve Barnett, cultural analysts attempt to offset the limitations of traditional demographic and psychographic studies with intensive interviewing, observation and quantitative modelling. Culturally appropriate process- and content-oriented focus group research, coupled with intensive interviewing, provide the basis for survey research directed to particular cultural segments. Planmetrics publishes the results of its ongoing cultural analysis into issues of interest to planners, including predictions of emergent trends, in a report entitled Directions. Cultural Analysis has been usefully applied in the areas of energy, consumer products, heavy industry and health care.

The utility of practicing anthropology has become apparent to numerous business organizations. Whether it is market research (as practiced in Chicago by Walt Dickie of Creative Research, Inc.), hi-tech (as practiced in Virginia by Kirk Gray of Advanced Technology, Inc.), or investment (as practiced in New Jersey by Darcy Stapp, of 1990 Plus), anthropological entrepreneurs have been able to radiate adaptively to niches in commerce. Perhaps most auspiciously, executive education concerns such as the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute School of Management and Strategic Studies in La Jolla, California (directed by Dr. Richard Farson) are beginning to recruit anthropologists to their curricula.

The time has come to make the transition from vocational to professional anthropology (whether practiced in a corporation or a college of Business Administration) less of a serendipitous leap and more the culmination of a strategic vision. We need to engage in some impression management - repositioning, if you will - to retool our traditional methodologies, and to revamp our current patterns of apprenticeship, if, as academics or practitioners, we hope to take care of business.

TOWARD IMPROVED UNDERSTANDING OF AND PREPARATION FOR BUSINESS

In tracing the evolution of academic anthropology from inception through efflorescence, Eddy and Partridge (1978) affirm the centrality of the role which applied anthropology is to play in the next stage of development. Echoing concerns raised by Dell Hymes (1969) a decade earlier, and repeated in a debate in the pages of the current American Anthropologist (Kershaw 1983; Kent 1983) these authors call for the ideological and institutional restructuring of the

anthropology we now teach. Three essential revisions are proposed for providing future practitioners with an intellectually viable, marketable heritage: (1) theoretical and methodological training in the analysis of complex societies and institutions and of the processes of adaptation and change; (2) transdisciplinary problem orientation; (3) the innovation of systematic field training in collaboration with other scientists and professionals (Eddy and Partridge 1978:421). Scholars at the colleges and universities throughout Florida - under the direction of Bernard at UF, Gainesville, Wolfe at USF, Tampa, Weidman at UM, Miami, and, apropos of our present purposes, Serrie at Eckerd, St. Petersburg (see Serrie 1983) - have been especially effective in shaping curricula to the service of contemporary realities.

To provide those of our graduate and undergraduate students who intend to seek employment outside the academy, or who desire to undertake fieldwork in corporate organizational settings, with credentials appropriate to their aspirations, I suggest that the following strategy be implemented:

1) The four traditional "core" areas of training must be expanded to include a fifth: applied anthropology. This addition would operationalize the core curriculum, provide a much-needed measure of synergy, and promote the requisite sense of social responsibility for praxis.

2) Coursework on contemporary industrial/postindustrial society must be developed and legitimized. Departments might begin by drawing on intramural resources. For instance, most of us have local "surrogate" research regimens in place at the moment, which keep our skills in shape during periods of downtime between "bona fide" field expeditions. At the very least, we are each participant observers in a variety of interesting, underexamined cultural activities, as Horace Miner (1956) and his imitators have demonstrated. A slight alteration of our perspective (rather than a paradigm shift, or even a social drama) would be sufficient to spur curriculum development - and all this without even tapping the expertise our colleagues who have specialized in contemporary societies. Extramural resources can be developed through the vehicles of cross-listing courses and enlightened advising. It is certainly reasonable to assume that a well-rounded education would include exposure to topics in business administration. Finally, the potential of interdisciplinary training, long one of the

hallmarks of our ecumenical "science of leftovers", for reorienting our concerns to contemporary culture is great. Co-development and co-teaching of courses by members of several departments (Serrie 1983), or by academics and community professionals would assure comprehensive coverage of selected topics.

3) Anthropologists must become as fluent in quantitative methodology as they are in the languages of their "chosen people." Such fluency is more than a necessary complement to qualitative techniques in research design, implementation and evaluation. It has become essential to insure interpretability, let alone the hope of collaboration, among the behavioral sciences.

4) Our conception fieldwork must be redefined. Clearly, complex societies and institutions are legitamate fields of inquiry to which some of the skills and insights of anthropology are uniquely suited. Informants, once all too frequently relegated to the status of "silent partner", are much more likely to become by right and by design, collaborators. The utility of interdisciplinary team research is generally recognized. Ethnographers, once privileged outsiders, increasingly assume the role of privileged insiders, as they function in roles as program planners, administrators and evaluators. Consequently, internships may become a preferred vehicle for the fieldwork enterprise as well as for career development. As professional anthropologists, we need to develop and nurture internship programs in the service of continuing education.

5) Finally, the establishment of a national level professional society of practicing anthropologists is indicated. Such a society would transcend the topical or regional distinctions which characterize the proliferating genre directories. The establishment of a journal, perhaps along the lines of Practicing Anthropology, but with less of an academic flavor, would stimulate the growth of professional anthropology. Career development in terms of systematic, informed guidance from the initial appraisal of options through appropriate training to pathing strategies is a particular service that such a society could render members and clients.

CONCLUSION

Dear Mr. Sherry:

> Thank you for your expression of interest in a position in Marketing at the University of _____. Your background schooling and experiences are interesting to me and your research interests, particularly the macro approach to consumer behavior, are very appealing . . . Your presence could be very exciting in a department . . . I personally feel that anthropology has a great deal to offer the field of marketing . . .

In looking forward to the coursework and fieldwork planned for the coming academic year, I have a sense of excitement, almost of urgency. The next family visit to the Devil's Millhopper will be an opportunity for dramatic repartee. As we sit at the base of the cool verdant sinkhole, I can inform my wife that anthropology is not "caving in". Rather, it is becoming reflexive, as it endeavors to maintain its holistic orientation.

References

Arensberg, Conrad
1978 Theoretical Contributions of Industrial and Development Studies. In Applied Anthropology in America, Elizabeth Eddy and William Partridge, eds. pp. 49-78. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bodley, John
1976 Anthropology and Contemporary Human Problems. Menlo Park: Cummings Publishing Company.

Britan, Gerald
1978 The Place of Anthropology in Program Evaluation. Anthropological Quarterly 51:119-128.

1981 Bureaucracy and Innovation. An Ethnography of Policy Change. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.

Britan, Gerald and Ronald Cohen
1980 Toward an Anthropology of Formal Organizations. In Hierarchy and Society, Gerald Britan and Ronald Cohen, eds. pp. 9-30. Philadelphia: ISHI

Buraway, Michael
1979 The Anthropology of Industrial Work. Annual Review of Anthropology 8:231-266.

Cohen, Yehudi
1977 The Anthropological Enterprise. American Anthropologist 79(2):388-396.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly, and Eugene Rochberg-Halton
1981 The Meaning of Things: Domestic Symbols and the Self. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dannhaeuser, Norbert
1983 Contemporary Trade Strategies in the Philippines. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Deal, Terence and Allan Kennedy
1982 Corporate Cultures. The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Dickie, Walter
1982 Profile of an Anthropologist. Anthropology Newsletter 23(9):7.

Douglas, Mary and Baron Isherwood
1979 The World of Goods. New York: Basic Books.

Dow, James
1977 Comment on The Supranational Organization of Production: An Evolutionary Perspective (Alvin Wolfe). Current Anthropology 18(4):620-621.

Eddy, Elizabeth and William Partridge, eds.
1978 Applied Anthropology in America. New York: Columbia University Press.

Franke, R. and J. Kaul
1978 The Hawthorne Experiments: First Statistical Interpretation. American Sociological Review 43:623-643.

Gamst, F.C.
1980 Toward a Method of Industrial Ethnology. Rice University Studies 66(1):15-42.

Gardner, Burleigh
1978a Doing Business with Management. In Applied Anthropology in America, eds. Elizabeth Eddy and William Partridge. pp. 245-260. New York: Columbia University Press.

1978b. Numbers are Not Enough. In Attitude Research Under the Sun, ed. John Eighmey. pp. 1-10. Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Harris, Marvin
1981 America Now. The Anthropology of a Changing Culture. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Henry, Jules
1963 Culture Against Man. New York: Vintage.

Hinshaw, Robert
1980 Anthropology, Administration, and Public Policy. Annual Review of Anthropology 9:497-522.

Hirschman, Elizabeth and Morris Holbrook, eds.
1981 Symbolic Consumer Behavior. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.

Hoben, Allan
1982 Anthropologists and Development. Annual Review of Anthropology 11:349-375.

Holzberg, Carol and Maureen Giovannini
1981 Anthropology and Industry: Reappraisal and New Directions. Annual Review of Anthropology 10:317-360.

Hymes, Dell, ed.
1969 Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vintage

Idris-Soven, Ahamed, Elizabeth Idris-Soven and Mary K. Vaughan, eds.
1978 The World as a Company Town. Multinational Corporations and Social Change. The Hague: Mouton.

Kapferer, Bruce
1976 Transaction and Meaning. Philadelphia: ISHI

Kent, Susan
1983 Academic Courses for Non-academic Anthropologists. American Anthropologist 85(1):120-122.

Kershaw, Greet
1983 A Breath of Fresh Air. American Anthropologist 85(1): 119-120 (See also Reply to Kent. American Anthropologist 85(1):122-124).

Lawrence, Gordon, ed.
1979 Exploring Individual and Organizational Boundaries. A Tavistock Open Systems Approach. New York: John Wiley.

Levy, Sidney
1978 Hunger and Work in a Civilized Tribe. American Behavioral Scientist 21:557-570.

Lupton, Thomas
1976 Shop Floor Behavior. In Handbook of Work, Organization and Society. Robert Dubin, ed. pp 171-203. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Maines, David
1977 Social Organization and Social Structure in Symbolic Interactionist Thought. Annual Review of Sociology 3:235-259.

Meissner, Martin
1976 The Language of Work. In Handbook of Work, Organization and Society. Robert Dubin, ed. pp. 205-279. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Miner, Horace
1956 Body Ritual Among the Nacirema. American Anthropologist 58:503-507.

Nader, Laura
1969 Up the Anthropologist - Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. In Reinventing Anthropology, Dell Hymes, ed. pp. 284-311. New York: Vintage.

Nader, Laura, Larissa Lomnitz and Frederick Bailey, eds.
1983 The Exercise of Power in Complex Organizations. New York: Academic Press.

Nash, June
1979 Anthropology of the Multinational Corporation. In New Directions in Political Economy. An Approach from Anthropology. Madeline Leons and Frances Rothstein, eds. pp. 173-200. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

1981 Ethnographic Aspects of the World Capitalist System. Annual Review of Anthropology 10:393-423.

Patton, Michael
1980 Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications

Pondy, Lou, Peter Frost, Gareth Morgan and Thomas Dandridge, eds.
1983 Organizational Symbolism. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rice, Berkeley
1982 The Hawthorne Defect: Persistance of a Flawed Theory. Psychology Today 16(2):70-74.

Ricks, David
1983 Big Business Blunders. Homewood, Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Riner, Reed
1981 The Supranational Network of Boards of Directors. Current Anthropology 22(2):167-172.

Rushing, William
1964 The Psychiatric Professions. Power, Conflict and Adaptation in a Psychiatric Hospital Staff. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Safa, Helen
1983 Comments on "Labor and Industry in the New International Division of Labor". Manuscript presented at the Thirty-second Annual Conference of the Center for Latin American Studies, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy
1982 Anthropologists and the "Crazies." Medical Anthropology Newsletter 13(3):1-2; 6-11.

Serrie, Hendrick
1983 Anthropology and International Business. Practicing Anthropology 5(2):12; 19.

Sherry, John
1983 The Management of Blue Collar Alcoholism: An Ethnography of an Industrial Containment System. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Sheth, Jagdish
1982 Consumer Behavior: Surpluses and Shortages. In Advances in Consumer Research, Andrew Mitchell, ed., pp. 13-16. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.

Taussig, Michael
1980 The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Watson, Tony
1980 Sociology, Work and Industry. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Whitten, Norman and Dorothea Whitten
1972 Social Strategies and Social Relationships. Annual Review of Anthropology 1:247-270.

Whyte, William
1978 Organizational Behavior Research - Where Do We Go From Here? In Applied Anthropology in America, Elizabeth Eddy and William Partridge, eds. pp. 129-143. New York: Columbia University Press.

Winick, Charles
1961 Anthropology's Contributions to Marketing. Journal of Marketing 25(5): 53-60.

Wolfe, Alvin
1977 The Supranational Organization of Production: An Evolutionary Perspective. Current Anthropology 18(4):615-655.

Zielinski, Joan and Thomas Robertson
1982 Consumer Behavior Theory: Excesses and Limitations. In Advances in Consumer Research. Andrew Mitchell, ed., pp. 8-12. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.

****
*
* SPECIAL ISSUE:
*
* APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE 1980's
*
****

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

SPECIAL ISSUE EDITOR: Leslie Sue Lieberman
SPECIAL ISSUE ASST. EDITOR
and PRODUCTION MANAGER: Domenick Dellino

Vol. 8, No. 2, Pt. 2 1983