

980521.026

in anthropology as it is in any science. Theory relating to human social behavior, if it is to be scientific, has ultimately to be theory tested in action.

A final note on the contributors to this bulletin. The programs below are not the "merely academic" conceptions of designers who themselves have had no applied experience. Instead, a perusal of past issues of *Human Organization* will show that the majority have long been engaged in research and writing on applied issues. Several have served or now serve as officers of the Society for Applied Anthropology. In fact, both the president of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Nance Gonzalez, and the president of the American Anthropological Association, Edward H. Spicer, are represented. We are especially fortunate in being able to lead off with a discussion of basic issues in training applied anthropologists written by Edward Spicer and his colleague, T. E. Downing. The particular significance of this opening article arises from the nature of Spicer's contributions to anthropology over the years. They illustrate well how artificial is the distinction so commonly made in the social sciences between the "pure" and the "applied."

Eleanor Leacock, City College, CUNY
Nance I. Gonzalez, Boston University
Gilbert Kushner, University of South Florida

TRAINING FOR NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT: MAJOR ISSUES

Edward H. Spicer and Theodore E. Downing

Contemporary American anthropology has changed radically since the mid-1960s. Then the cornucopia of NSF and NIH fed our most esoteric tastes in research; now we scramble for table scraps of government grants and contracts. Then we worried about finding enough teachers to cover our classrooms; now we worry about maintaining low faculty-student ratios. Then some graduate students were hired *before* penning the introductory paragraph of their dissertations; now graduates cannot get job offers without PhD in hand. And then tenure was a relatively common condition, but now it seems a sporadic blessing.

These Golden Sixties of anthropology have had a lasting impact on anthropologists themselves, and probably on their theories. Like stuffed nobles finishing a regal banquet who hear news of famine, some feel reports about current conditions are ephemeral or exaggerated. We disagree and contend that *le grande bouffe* is over. Now, anthropologists must search for working responses to the changing conditions in which they find themselves.

Anthropological associations and departments are undertaking or contemplating remedial actions in response to these changing conditions. The American Anthropological Association established three committees which have reported to the AAA Executive Board on the future of academic manpower. Interpreting the statistics of these committees appears to be a problem. Some consider the figures as nothing more than indicators of an employment problem of limited dimensions. Others raise the question whether the clear and obvious shift in the job market is symptomatic of a deeper condition having wide implications for the discipline. Although nothing is completely clear, it is apparent that our decisions about graduate training will differ depending on whether we look at the changing job market as an isolated problem or as an indicator of the changing role of anthropology within a society.

Decisions are already being made based on both interpretations. Anthropological departments have restricted graduate student enrollments, hoping this will decrease the future supply of PhDs and MAs. Other departments have decided to do nothing, awaiting further information, or a more obvious push, before they act. And yet others, many of which are represented in this symposium, have chosen another response: the design of programs to prepare anthropologists for non-academic employment. Which of these several responses will prove a good adaptation to the milieu of long term changes in which American anthropology finds itself?

At the University of Arizona we are in the midst of discussing this question. It seems likely that, like others in this symposium, we will opt for some combination of academic and non-academic training. However, a report of our plan would be premature. In place of a program report, we would like to discuss several important issues which continue to arise in our deliberations concerning what an appropriate departmental action should be.

In the long run, a discussion of these questions is probably more important to another faculty than our plan is. We say this because the half-dozen programs described in this symposium reveal that, like a society, each department acts within its unique history and social environment. These programs are tailored to fit their faculty's interpretation of the problems facing anthropology, the flexibility of their administrators or regents, local community opportunities, student interest, financial resources, and the theoretical and political backgrounds of their faculty. Although such tailoring increases a program's probability of success, it reduces the likelihood that any of these programs will fit the needs of another department. If so, then the "Arizona Plan" or the "Kentucky Plan" or the "Brock Plan" represent specific adaptations, not general recipes.

Each plan represents such a set of decisions, related to issues and questions that have been left implicit between the lines. Yet the answers to these questions not only affect the future of academic employment in anthropology, but also the theoretical trends of the discipline. It is time that they be publicly debated and discussed.

WHY DO ANYTHING?

Is there any good reason to remodel our training programs or, more seriously, our own academic behavior? Can't we continue to train and teach as we always have? What is all the excitement about?

Since its beginnings, American anthropology has been a product of its social, economic and demographic surroundings, including employment conditions, funding sources, faculty-teacher ratios, and governmental policies toward various social programs. Most importantly, it has been a response to developing needs, interests, and demands of the society in which it exists and the cultures of other societies that it studies. Since World War II, its almost exclusive focus on training teachers and researchers has been a direct response to an affluent society in the process of expanding its universities at an unprecedented rate and, along with that, expanding its anthropology departments and creating new ones with an even greater acceleration. Responding to this affluence and demand, we have turned inward, rapidly producing more and more PhDs to staff the new departments and the tremendously expanding old ones. Only a few have pondered the why of what was happening.

In retrospect, we lost sight of a trend which became insistently strong during the 1930s and continued vigorously through World War II. This was a demand for, and an increasing capacity of, anthropologists in the practical application of their discipline. We need only refer to the 1930s and the Hawthorne Studies, where the effective beginnings of the application of Radcliffe-Brown's concepts of social structure and social sentiments took place. These endeavors became landmarks, pioneering paths that have subsequently been followed and

developed by sociologists, industrial "psychologists" and others. We might also recall the activities of anthropologists who applied their knowledge to a variety of problems during the war—from the Committee on Changing Food Habits, which Margaret Mead helped guide, to war-focused studies of Japan by Ruth Benedict, Clyde Kluckhohn and others. From the perspective of the Golden Sixties, it was argued that these were abnormal times, causing anthropologists to stray into topic areas where they shouldn't meddle, and where they lacked guidelines for understanding anthropology's functional relations with a normal human society. To be sure, World War II was not precisely like any preceding war, but in the long view, it appears as one of those recurrent peaks in the continuous crisis of international relations. In that sense it was not unique, but chronic. The labor-management conditions of the 1930s into which anthropology was drawn were likewise a phase in the growth of industrial society, an instance of developing process.

The point is that labeling either the pre-war, war, or post-war conditions as abnormal explains nothing and does not help us understand or adapt to our current conditions. There is nothing on which to base a choice if we look only at these three phases, out of context of the longer term human development. If we are to make a judgment about anthropology's role in society, we must look further into the past and future.

We find, even in a cursory view, that nearly all leading anthropologists for a hundred years have sought to conceive anthropology as something more than a purely academic undertaking. From Tylor's view of anthropology as a "former's science," through Morgan, Brinton, Boas, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, Kluckhohn and on, to Redfield's "Talk with a Stranger," many anthropologists has repeatedly attempted to demonstrate a relationship between their discipline and society which involves more than the teaching in classrooms of accumulating knowledge. Anthropology, they have maintained, ought to function more directly in the arena of those processes of change which produced anthropology itself.

The declining opportunities for academic employment constitute only an aspect of our current situation. Taking a broad view, we can see that highly specialized teachers, such as we have been turning out by the score, are in less demand; there has been an increasing interest in anthropology from a variety of other areas and this has given rise to a demand for less specialized anthropologists. Moreover, since World War II, there has been a persistent, growing demand for anthropologists who are interested in problems of health planning, rural and urban development, cross-cultural administration and community development.

Thus, it appears that we may view training for non-academic jobs as something that we have merely forgotten about in our absorption in meeting the demand for professors. The extent of this development of anthropological practice before 1950 is documented in the one-fourth of the volume devoted to applications of anthropology in *Anthropology Today*. Clearly we have always done something in response to the conditions of the society in which we have existed. In this perspective, the decision to maintain our training track toward the PhD by cutting the number to be trained seemed a narrow-gauge and non-adaptive response, inconsistent with our tradition of concern for the contribution of anthropology to society as a whole.

Sentiments in favor of "doing nothing" are fortified by the insensitivity of the traditional prestige schools to the issue. If those from whom our theoretical innovations flow do not act, isn't this a good indication of the lack of seriousness of the problem? Or, are our theories of social change equally true of our own discipline, and may we interpret the inactivity and avoidance of risk taking among our nobles as unreflective complacency? Is Sahlins and Service's Law of Evolutionary Potential—"that the more specialized and adapted a form in a given evolutionary stage, the smaller is its potential for passing to the next stage"—applicable to the current situation where innovations appear to come from the academic hinterland rather than the traditional titanic departments?

The immediate past period of plenty from which anthropology is painfully emerging and the inactivity of the prestige schools are forces inhibiting decisions within some departments. Of course, there are others, but the first problem facing any faculty considering its corporate responsibility to the discipline will be to decide whether these forces are strong enough to justify a "do-nothing" decision. Is it better to watch this social change from the grandstand or to be a participant observer? In our deliberations on this problem, it should be assumed that cultural sub-systems, including our own, have their own internal dynamics apart from any "directed" actions. Thus, the consequences of inaction should also be discussed alongside the consequences of different plans.

IS ANTHROPOLOGY BECOMING A PROFESSION?

The creation of degree programs designed to train students for non-academic employment might be interpreted as a movement toward professionalization. There are other things happening that support this interpretation: an increased concern for "codes of ethics," an upsurge of anthropologists calling themselves "social scientists" in non-anthropological circles, the filling of non-academic positions by anthropologists, and the promotion of the concept of "profession" as opposed to "learned society" by the American Anthropological Association. It is worthwhile to take a closer look at what may be involved if such a shift is taking place.

A learned society consists of scholars intent on specialized interests, supporting publication for communication with one another, and sanctioning standards for teaching young men and women to be scholars like themselves. A learned society is, in short, a group of professors concerned with perpetuating themselves and insuring the growth of knowledge in their field. A profession, on the other hand, is an alliance of professors with practitioners of knowledge in a given discipline. Like a learned society, professionals set standards for training in and practicing of their discipline. In addition, they interpret their profession to the general public as well as communicate and standardize practice among themselves. One might mistake a learned society for a professional association if it were not for the one characteristic of the latter: its concern about the relations of its members with the general society in which and for whom it practices. This is the key interest which makes a professional association "professional."

Hence the question: Is anthropology becoming a profession? The answer to this question is closely bound up with the answer to the previous question: Why do anything? If it has been decided to sit tight or balance the number of

students enrolled for PhDs with the demand for finished PhDs, then it has also been decided that anthropology should limit itself to maintaining an already secure place in the academic world. On the other hand, if the broader view is taken that anthropology's sphere of action extends beyond academia, then defining alternative strategies for developing professional status becomes paramount. Three models exist.

First, there is the prestigious model of the MDs or lawyers, who have some of the high status which our society lavishes on holders of advanced degrees. The acquisition of their degrees initiates careers which are totally different from those of the professors who trained them. After the new JD passes the bar exams (in other words, submits to society's testing of his or her capacity for using the knowledge acquired to solve practical human problems), then he or she hangs out a shingle and leads a non-academic life. What this person does is the result of society's demand for a well recognized set of skills. Centuries of differentiation in Western society have made it clear that the systems of codified laws built up by all states require interpreters, that the laws which legislatures keep producing require technicians to prepare them, that the laws which business works under have to be understood in order to avoid or submit to their requirements. Young JDs get out and immediately work on these problems, utilizing the store of knowledge which they have acquired in their study of innumerable cases or, that is to say, applications of law to specific instances. Medical graduates follow a similar path.

Is this the route that is possible or desirable—colleges of applied anthropology which teach primarily knowledge derived or derivable from cases of the application of anthropology to practical problems? Are we aiming at something like a college of medicine or a school of law?

Economists have worked themselves into a different professional mold. Departments of economics are basically places where students are familiarized with the tools of economic theory, analysis and forecasting. So far very few institutes of economics train people for jobs as practicing economists. The result is that the term "economist" is ambiguous. Without further information we do not know whether an economist teaches economics in a university, consults with the President of the United States, or forecasts profits for a corporation. They are all called economists, and this reflects a different condition with regard to professionalization of our knowledge of economics, as compared with our knowledge of law or human diseases. Compared to medicine and law, economics is in an early stage of professionalization, and the recognition of the usefulness of economic knowledge is relatively recent.

A third model, business and public administration, retains even fewer graduates to propagate their flock than medicine, law or economics. The degrees offered by business schools are considered prerequisite credentials for continued on-the-job training, and most business graduates shed their academic name-tag, "business school" major, after graduation. Professional standards are determined by the employer, not the profession of business administration.

No department has consciously modelled a program on one, or some combination, of these professional paths. None of the programs in this symposium proposes to convert a department of anthropology into a professional school of anthropology. Anthropologists are not yet committed. However, de-

isions have already been made within these programs to emulate one model or another. A faculty considering a program in non-academic training should consciously realize which model it is following in its program. It should evaluate the society's demand for the services of its graduates and adjust its training programs accordingly.

In current perspective, anthropology might best be considered in an early stage of professionalization, and appears to be moving into a condition similar to that of economics. The society's demands for the service of the anthropologist and the related family of social scientists is nascent but growing, with the most recent example being the concern among policy makers for a "quality of life" index that would permit a non-monetary yardstick to measure government programs. Like economics, anthropology departments in the immediate future will probably be turning out two varieties of anthropologists at the same time, one aimed at academic employment, the other aimed at non-academic employment. The unity of anthropology, as a body of knowledge and theories, will not be strengthened if these two types believe they are practicing two different kinds of science.

CAN THERE BE A SUBDISCIPLINE OF APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY?

Some anthropologists, both applied and otherwise, believe that an emphasis on applied anthropology training promotes the growth of another subdiscipline, parallel to physical anthropology, linguistics, archeology or cultural anthropology. It is time to lay this rumor to rest.

Applied anthropology is neither a body of knowledge, a particular theoretical approach, nor a subdiscipline.

Whoever heard of applied anthropological data? What is applied anthropological theory? What would a theory of applied cultural change look like? Rather than aiming at creating a subdiscipline, applied anthropologists approach knowledge and information concerning human behavior with a question: What is anthropological knowledge and information good for? Applying anthropology means using our findings about human behavior as potentially useful tools for changing, maintaining or understanding specific instances of behavior. It is practiced *within* physical anthropology, *within* cultural ecology, *within* linguistics, and *within* all the rest of anthropology.

To make the point another way, anthropology approaches human behavior from three directions: How does one collect data on human behavior? How does one analyze these data? How can the data be explained? Applied anthropology adds a fourth dimension, another question: What are the data, analyses and interpretations good for beyond enlarged understanding? Can Barnett's theories of innovation be used in changing farming practices in Southern Mexico? How does a distinction between different types of bilinguals help in training children in multilingual schools. And so on. Thus, the decision of a department to train non-academic anthropologists is fundamentally a decision to tailgate our lectures with another application. After we have proposed an explanation, then we consider the potential applications of this knowledge to the society to which we feel responsibilities, if any. Interestingly, this conversion can be stimulated by graduate students as well as by faculty, provided the faculty takes the questions

seriously when their students ask. Although there is much more to applying anthropology than asking what the information, analysis and explanations of the discipline are good for, we feel that when an anthropologist asks this question, he or she has taken the first step toward applying anthropology.

WHO ARE OUR CUSTOMERS?

Adding the problems of applied anthropology to our lectures and programs is one thing; preparing the students for non-academic employment is another. Although anthropologists may bicker over the details, most faculties are familiar with the customers hiring academic anthropologists since they often play the customer role themselves. Basically, we expect a new academic to be able to teach and work well with students—a requirement which we make little effort to prepare students to meet, since we emphasize above all their ability to pass examinations of several kinds and to make substantive and theoretical research contributions. Our training programs now train more for research and writing than teaching, reflecting an internal desire for scholarly prestige. But there is general acceptance of this situation, and so we rock along with maladjusted training and performance programs.

With regard to non-academic employers, we face an as yet unexplored and unfamiliar situation. There is desperate need for a survey of the employers' impressions of and demands for anthropologists; yet action can be based on the fragmentary information we already have.

First, we have some idea of the variety of employment opportunities available to anthropologists desiring non-academic employment. University of Arizona anthropology graduates, most with MAs or Bs, have been finding non-academic employment for several years. They are filling positions in salvage archeology, museum curating, museum administration, environmental impact assessment, community development, economic development, urban housing program evaluation, Model Cities administration and evaluation, Park Service planning and development, cross-cultural health service delivery, Indian health education, radio and TV programming for ethnic groups, industrial administration of several kinds, Bureau of Indian Affairs administration at national and reservation levels, industrial research, and tribal government policy advising. These 17 fields do not exhaust the list and our experience should be supplemented by similar information from other universities and colleges. However, the list results from a survey based on employed anthropologists who are not holding academic positions. It represents a portion of the real world.

A look at the list of jobs at least suggests who our initial customers are. In few, if any of these cases, did the employers seek an "applied anthropologist." As we look at what they have hired anthropologists to do and what anthropologists have been able to perform satisfactorily, we can identify the basis of demand. General characteristics of non-academic employment, as so far observed, appear to include the following:

- (1) Cross-cultural problems, contact situations between peoples of different backgrounds, not necessarily or only ethnic.
- (2) Problems of "development," that is to say, of directed or desired change whether in rural or urban situations.

- (3) Problems in which there is special concern for grass roots or citizen participation among peoples whose education and income levels are very different from that of the employer.
 - (4) The employment of techniques, such as those in salvage archeology, which are taught only in anthropology departments.
 - (5) Problems of an environment, such as university administration, in which the employee has had experience as a result of his or her training period.
- It is important to remember that this is neither an exhaustive nor closed list. Additional opportunities can be developed once a few anthropologists have proven their value in other types of employment.

Above all, we should not become so pessimistic about non-academic employment that we assume the demand for anthropologists can be filled by professors employed as part-time consultants. Such a view looks backward to the sixties and must be called traditionalist. Although the consultant-professor arrangement has been a common role in the past, increased demand for anthropologists willing to work full time with agencies and the decreased supply of academic positions are changing this situation. Agencies and companies are realizing that they get more work for less money by placing a full-time anthropologist on their staff than by hiring a part-time consultant involved in other activities.

Ignoring this trend and reducing the supply of PhDs through reducing graduate student enrollments seems doubly myopic. Such an action not only reduces the potential for anthropology's contribution to society, but also endangers the status of a department within its own institution. That is, declining student enrollments are often legitimate reasons for administrative cuts in department budgets and personnel.

WHAT DO WE OFFER?

This old question has been rephrased in many ways. Do anthropologists have any knowledge that their own or other societies may use to solve practical problems? Should more powerful theories be developed before doing anything outside the narrow frontiers of our own learned society? These and related queries approach the issue of what we have to offer from the wrong direction; they are questions arising from in-house conversations between anthropologists rather than from potential non-academic clients. It seems more reasonable to start with the questions asked by consumers of anthropology, the clients, and proceed from there.

In the perspective of the complex questions about society tackled by academic anthropologists, the questions raised by employers, actual and potential, often seem naive and confused. Their requests are generally of two broad categories. They ask on the one hand: Why do these people behave the way they do; what is going on here? This question sometimes, and increasingly, leads the employer to an anthropologist who is conceived of as knowing about strange peoples. Often, this group about whom the question is asked is of a different ethnic or class origin from the asker who has responsibility—and money—for a "program." The latter has heard of the cross-cultural nature of our work and feels that the reputed ability to collect information on peoples who are culturally or ethnically dissimilar from their own group is the hallmark of anthropology.

Thus, anthropologists are sought as cultural brokers by groups between whom there are cultural barriers. The ability to collect information across such barriers has also become one of anthropology's most sought after traits. We have developed some unique formal and informal techniques for gathering data. In this sense, we are in a position parallel to that of the economist whom many consider a more effective collector than interpreter of data.

As the profession of anthropology develops it will may rest heavily, and in large part, on the training for working cross-culturally. Certainly theory is necessary, but it is not necessary to have an overarching explanation of human behavior to explain the data we collect. We do not claim that such an abstract requirement is requisite for academic employment, nor do economists, doctors or lawyers look for a grand synthesizer in their practice. Why should an integrated theory of social stability and change be considered a prerequisite to applying anthropology?

The second type of question asked by people who employ anthropologists is: What will happen if . . . ? Much more rarely are anthropologists turned to when this question comes up. In fact, they have, until "environmental impact" studies began to be required, been called on less since World War II than they were during that phase of more obvious human crisis. This question underlies policy as well as operational alternatives, and until very recently anthropologists tended to withdraw from the policy-making circles where they had begun to participate just before and during World War II.

What anthropologists can contribute to public policy is by no means well understood by anthropologists or anyone else. Here we must assume that our comparative knowledge of social structures and of cultural processes fits a well-trained anthropologist in a manner unique among social scientists for critical review of policy alternatives. This potential, however, can never develop without practice, and hence training must include laboratory experience in answering the question posed earlier: What is anthropological knowledge good for? The answering process can not be carried on in academic isolation from reality, but rather must be under laboratory conditions where participants in the practical programs of a region are brought together with practicing social scientists and anthropologists in training. We desperately need practice in determining the relevance of what we know and this must begin in our activities training. The broad, total human perspective is the foundation of what can be the distinctive contribution of well trained anthropologists at the level of formation of public policy and program design.

The other basic and distinctive anthropological foundation, as insisted on above, consists in our traditional training in cross-cultural investigation, understanding, and processes of adaptation. Here is clearly an anthropological emphasis and skill not duplicated in the other social science disciplines. This has become the major basis for what anthropology is looked to to contribute in a larger number of fields. What we have to offer here is increasingly needed as our societies become more complex. We see on all sides the development of segments which grow more and more isolated from one another—bureaucrats from grass roots poor people, ethnic group from ethnic group, occupationally specialized people, even the interfaces of governmental agencies and the non-communicating segments of multiversities. Here the anthropological approach is relevant not

only for policy, both private and public, but also for basic operational activities within our modern societies.

WHAT LEVEL OF TRAINING?

With the exception of the Kentucky Program, all the graduate training for non-academic employment currently emphasizes MA level training. Why? Is there any inherent reason for limiting training to the MA level?

The decision to institute MA level programs appears to be another case of anthropology deciding what its consumers want. To some, it seems reasonable to assume that since MAs have been the easiest persons to find jobs for in non-academic employment, then the MA level is most suited to outside demands. Other factors also favor this decision, including the fact that with declining student enrollments some university administrations are not looking favorably toward "new" higher level degree programs. And yet another reason for limiting training to the MA level is a conservatism toward professionalization, which, as we have already discussed, is an adjunct to such non-academic programs.

Whatever the reason, a rational decision should be made in terms of what is most appropriate to our clients, the consumers, our students, the potentially unemployed, and our discipline. Considering this, we are forced to ask some rather embarrassing questions. Will the training of MAs in applied anthropology have any impact whatsoever on one of the original conditions for setting up these programs—the solution of a PhD employment program? The AAA employment committee should consider this question in the near future. They might also investigate the assertion made by many anthropologists that an MA in anthropology is more hireable in non-academic work than a PhD. If this is true, then could it be that a PhD program emphasizing non-academic employment is doomed to produce an anthropological Edsel? If so, then the basic problem would not be solved, even assuming successful training and placement of the MAs.

We must also consider the long-range consequences of placing MA level people in non-academic jobs. Other fields that have created MA level programs have discovered that employers sometimes return their employees to the campus for advanced degree training. Given the current attitude of graduate departments toward other departments' MAs—that is, another school's MA is seldom accepted as equal to their own—are we to expect this advanced degree work to be accomplished without major entanglements? Is it in the interest of the discipline to have graduate schools work out agreements to honor one another's MA programs as credit toward advanced degrees? Again, this is an issue facing a discipline undergoing the transition from a learned society to a profession.

Then comes the consideration relating to relative status. As it stands now, the PhD is the only degree role with high status. We can hardly assume a static condition if only an MA is emphasized for non-academic employment. If MAs are getting jobs, and at higher pay than some PhDs, will status attitudes change? If we believe that only the less talented students will go into the MA program, we seem to be ignoring other experience eg, of chemists versus chemical engineers. It seems that the academic and practical life have different appeals, but when both exist in a given field, neither draws all the best. We must think in

terms of a changing equilibrium in the status of practical and theoretical degrees and the appeal of each to different sorts of persons.

The level of discussion we are trying to encourage with these questions is that which maintains a focus on the impact of departmental decisions on a whole discipline in that part of its environment which we label non-academic. When we are discussing training programs, unemployment and the like, anthropologists are nothing more nor less than another class of workers. If we do not recognize this aspect of things, we and our students may find it hard to feed hubris to our families.

HOW DO WE STRUCTURE PROGRAMS?

Thus far, two distinct alternatives in the training of anthropologists for non-academic employment seem to be emerging. One stresses training in specific skills and areas of knowledge, preparing students for particular jobs. The other emphasizes training in general principles, stressing what we previously suggested was a core for professional anthropological training. When translated into syllabi, these principles can be characterized as a "track" and a "core course" approach respectively.

Using the "track" approach, a faculty organizes the program and facilities around several relatively well-developed specialties, such as medical anthropology, educational anthropology or community development. The emphasis is on specific training which will equip graduates immediately for selected kinds of jobs from among those available. The advantage of this approach is that it trains students for jobs that are already available. However, there are also some dangers. First, it is possible that an emphasis on producing technicians, limited to specific jobs, loses sight of the broader conception of the practical anthropologist, equipped for a number of different kinds of work. Such narrowness will not necessarily happen if the training is set up in terms of a few specifically named tracks; but we should make sure that such a tendency is not built in. Moreover, an additional danger might be built into the choice of alternative tracks. Is the faculty responsibly confident that students with preparation in the particular tracks they are organizing will be wanted by outside employers? To answer this question, the faculty needs to listen to potential employers and read job announcements rather than talk to their academic colleagues. Once again, anthropologists must look at their whole environment.

At the opposite extreme, a faculty may elect to teach courses which attempt to lay the foundations for broad application of anthropology, including work in processes of cultural change, interethnic relations, cultural domains such as "medieval cultures," or social roles and networks. Such a program avoids developing any particular track. Rather, it seeks to provide a generalized foundation according to the interests of students and the facilities of the training center. Of course, those using this approach risk training a student for nothing specific. This could happen if a two year graduate program were planned providing only the general "foundations," merely preparing for, not providing, specific training. This need not necessarily happen if there is a sensible limit on the foundation courses and after the first semester opportunities are found for students to choose and work in fields of their interest—whether in courses in

other departments, in workshops set up by the anthropology and other departments, or elsewhere.

The point is that there would seem to be two phases necessary for training that will put students into jobs. These phases ought to be integrated as much as possible. There will be discussion always with regard to which should come first. One school will hold that the general comes first, the other that the general can be understood most adequately in the light of specific experience. Training programs will be different according to the beliefs of the teachers setting them up regarding the ideal sequence. However, any program which does not emphasize the general principles at any stage of training is inadequate from the point of view of long term development in the application of anthropology as a professional field.

RETROSPECT AND PERSPECTIVE

Several major issues confronting anthropology and anthropologists have emerged from what might appear a mundane symposium on training anthropologists for non-academic employment. We invite other faculties to join the discussion. From our perspective, it appears that if anthropologists are willing to accept the fact that their intellectual accomplishments have been, are, and will continue to be built on the shifting sands of their own class and economic position within American society, and if they are willing to accept the fact that, as members of an occupational group, they should not consider it improper to promote their own social and economic self-interest, then they may face the future as a challenge, not a threat.

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Ari Gallaher, Jr.

In 1968 the Department of Anthropology at the University of Kentucky began offering the PhD. The doctoral program consists of three tracks: culture history, ethnology and social anthropology (applied). The theoretical requirements for all tracks overlap substantially, with the practical requirements for each varying considerably.

A number of premises underlie the applied program. First, and basic, is the premise that in the Kentucky program applied anthropology should be something more, rather than less, than conventional academic anthropology. Second is the expectation that some of the students who opt the applied track will develop an academic interest in the problems and issues of applying social science as a concomitant to their preparation for client-oriented applied roles. Third is the premise that for all tracks there should be maximum contact between the student and faculty; hence the ratio of faculty to students should not rise above three students to one faculty member. This means that at any one point in time there will be thirty-five to forty students enrolled for graduate study, approximately one-half of whom will have declared an applied program intent. Students in the applied program can opt for one or more of three interest areas:

- (1) Health Care—in which case the student will minor in the multidisciplinary concentration in the Department of Behavioral Science, College of Medicine;
- (2) Developmental Change—in which case the student is expected to affiliate with the University's multidisciplinary-oriented Center for Developmental Change; and
- (3) Education—in which case the student is expected to declare a minor in the program for educational change housed in the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundations, College of Education.

In preparing for the PhD Preliminary Examinations, the student focuses primarily on social organization—ie, education, social, religious, economic, and political systems; data and theory relevant to anthropology in the modern world, especially complex societies, culture change, culture and personality, ethnic relations, society and health, education, applied anthropology, and role theory; and quantitative and other relevant methods. Short-term processes of culture change, with basic concepts, principles and theory pertaining to innovation, dissemination and integration, are emphasized. The course materials in applied