Applied Ethics: Anthropology and Business

Barry R. Bainton
B. R. Bainton Associates

Applied Ethics is society's response to need to resolve social control problems posed by cultural crisis. Applied ethics is a term used to describe attempts by non-philosophers, or ethicists, to use philosophical methods to identify morally correct courses of action in human life. Business anthropology is a relatively new subfield of traditional anthropology. Business anthropologists represent a mix of traditional academic researchers, business teachers, private consultant practitioners, and technical staff members of business enterprises. We define these as "career anthropologist." As a group they face a wide variety of ethical conflicts based on their status and role in the business context. In this paper we explore these conflicts and how the anthropological institutional establishment has attempted to address the needs of "career anthropologist." We do this by applying a structural-functional analysis of the role ethics plays in our understanding of socio-cultural institutions. Then we apply this to a review of the evolution and institutional development of ethical thinking in anthropology for the past 75 years as manifested by the AAA, SfAA, and more recently, NAPA. Finally, we propose an applied ethical approach as a solution to the crisis based on a return to core values represented by what we call, The Boasian Code.

INTRODUCTION

Today, professional ethics has become a hot topic in the lecture halls of our universities, the board rooms of private and public corporations and with the public.

Camelot, Countrywide, Tyco, WorldCom, Thailand, Enron, Tuskegee, Lockheed, Banana gate, Human Terrain Analysis, Nurnberg Trials, War Relocation Authority, Stanley Milgram, and Darkness in El Dorado These are a few of the many scandals in recent years that have raised the public's concerns about the moral and ethical implications of our scientific and corporate practices. The scandals raise questions of our trust in the ability of science and business to act in the best interests of society and the communities they are a part of. Scandal undercuts the public's trust in all of its institutions and raises questions about the government's ability and role in regulating these private and public institutions in the public interest.

As we entered the 21st Century, we found a world dominated by scientific-based management structures, revolutionary business models, exotic financial instruments, instantaneous global communications, automated manufacturing and logistical systems, and rapid technological

obsolescence. This revolution has and is challenging our 19th and 20th century traditions and socio-cultural institutions that we rely on to assign social authority and responsibility. Further, the revolution is exposing the gaps and weaknesses in our traditional mechanisms that our institutions have used to hold members accountable for their stewardship of the community and public trust.

These traditional mechanisms include: religion, philosophy, ethics, law, and etiquette. Where religion and philosophy attempt to explain the context and consequence in which human actions take place, ethics and law proscribe the rules by which the actions and the consequences are to be evaluated. Etiquette are the rules that we accept to define "proper" behavior in a social context. In a stable world, these work together in a moral dance resulting in a dynamic equilibrium.

Today, living in secular nation-states composed of diverse interests, and cultures, the power of religion and law to control and maintain discipline have been weakened and are often in conflict. The grand scientific discoveries and theories of 20th century physics and biology challenge our century old philosophies and the metaphysical principles upon which we have formed our beliefs about the nature of the universe and humanities place in it. Our philosophies and the understanding upon which we form our beliefs in ourselves and of the human mind, are being challenged and undercut by advances in neuroscience and cybernetics. At the same time, our laws fall further and further behind society's need and ability to insure personal and corporate accountability.

Our ethical systems stumble along attempting to adapt to the changes in individual rights and responsibilities that these technologies make possible. Should our ethics be rule-based, normative or consequential? If rule-based, whose rules? If consequential, which takes priority, ends or means? Should our ethics be absolute or relative? Should it be universal or situational? These questions form the core of the moral and ethical crisis we, as anthropologists, and our business subject/clients face today.

Cultural Crisis: As society changes, the boundaries and gaps between our personal authority and our personal responsibility and society's means for assigning accountability undergo change. Areas of over and under regulation become exposed. The disconnection between authority and responsibility creates opportunities for exploitation and abuse. As a result, the good faith and trust, which form the social contract between society's members, is weakened and/or eroded. This erosion leads to what Bidney defines as a "cultural crisis". "A cultural crisis, properly speaking, is the direct result of some disjunction inherent in the very form and dynamics of a given form of culture" (1946: 537).

A cultural crisis may take two forms, according to Bidney, "Since,… the cultural process provides both the means and ends of social living, one may distinguish two corresponding types of crises, namely, survival or existential crises and axiological or value crises. Survival crises involve the preservation of social existence; axiological crises refer to transformations in the form or system of values of a given culture. In a survival crisis, the question is: *to be or not to be;* in an axiological crisis, the problem is: *how to be, what kind of life is worth living and preserving"* (1946: 543).

Applied Ethics: We, as a profession, face the question: Do we support and impose a universal "one size fits all" professional ethic; or, do we recognize the functional diversity in our discipline, and that of our business subjects, and accept a more relativistic ethical system? Applied Ethics is a response to society's need to resolve social control problems posed by cultural crisis. Applied ethics is a term used to describe attempts by non-philosophers, or ethicists, to use philosophical methods to identify morally correct courses of action in human

life. Applied ethics includes such fields as Bioethics, Environmental, Organizational, Social, Professional and Business ethics. The applied ethicist assumes that the practitioner is addressing the ethical meaning of real life moral choices made in the normal pursuit of one's professional activity (Brody 1975).

The Problem: In this paper, I will explore the nexus of cultural crisis and professional ethics as it applies to the business anthropology. I will draw upon anthropological and business theory to identify the sources and distinctions between the ethical demands facing the anthropological discipline and the business sector today.

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE:

Anthropology is a paradox of science and humanism. At its core is the focus on the concept of culture. Culture is the collective response of human beings to their basic physiological (e.g. food, shelter, reproduction, etc.) and psychological (e.g. sexual satisfaction, self esteem, companionship, etc.) needs. Needs are defined as the basic elements, or conditions that an individual requires to survive and prosper (Maslow 1954). The collective response to these needs is a social phenomenon which Malinowski (1960: 34) termed "institutional needs."

The Function of Structure: When the social phenomenon becomes the established, routine response for the members of the group to their individual needs, the response becomes a social institution. A social institution may be defined as a group of human beings who gather together on a regular, or predictable, basis to perform in a manner that produces a high degree of certainty of a desired outcome. The social institution supplies the means and context in which the individual can satisfy his/her individual and collective physiological and psychological needs. In order for the social institution to satisfy those needs, the members require a script that they share and to which they are committed. This script is a culture.

The Cultural Link: Culture can be observed and operationalized through the study of human groups and how they organize around some shared central purpose or theme. The organizing theme, or purpose, creates a context of culturally derived institutional needs. These institutional needs focus on a set of specific missions or processes designed to sustain the social institution. These missions are: a system of social control, a system for the distribution of power, a system of education or transmission of collective knowledge, and a system for obtaining and distributing resources. These systems require an institutional mechanism to carry out their mission. This is the ethical system.

Malinowski (1960:38) argues that these missions can be conceptualized as four basic "instrumental imperatives" or needs which he identifies as economics, social control, education, and political organization. Malinowski focused on the question: "What is the function of social institutions?" He describes the nature of an institution as follows: "Each institution has personnel, a charter, a set of norms or rules, activities, material apparatus (technology), and a function" (Goldschmidt 1996:510; Voget 1996:573).

Malinowski argues that uniform psychological responses are correlates of physiological needs. The function of the institution is the process of satisfying those needs which are transformed into the culturally defined instrumental activity. This activity is thus transformed through repetition, or psychological reinforcement, into an acquired drive (or habit) at the individual level.

The Structure of Functions: Another way to look at the question is to ask: What is the structure of these institutional functions? From this perspective, a function or purpose is the

result of an action taken by an individual to satisfy a need. Max Weber (Wikipedia "Max Weber Methodology, viewed 4/28/2011) defines a social action as an act which accounts for the actions and reactions of individuals (or agents). Talcott Parsons (Parsons 1951) tackled this problem by identifying the four basic elements on the social action system. These elements are: pattern maintenance, goal orientation, integration and adaption (Parsons 1966). This formulation links the individual's action to the social institution.

Pattern maintenance is that set of actions which function to maintain the institution. In the Malinowskian formulation this is the institutional Charter, the norms and rules that support the charter. **Goal Orientation** is the collective of individuals and their activities, i.e. the roles they play that are directed toward satisfying a basic individual or collective need. **Integration** is the set of norms and rules (i.e. statuses) taught to members and that define the proper relationships between individuals, the individual and a group, and between groups. **Adaptation** is the set of activities, material apparatus and techniques that enable the institution to interact with its environment to satisfy the needs of its members and itself.

THE INSTITUTION AND ETHICS

Ethics is a critical part of a cultural system. From an institutional perspective, ethics are the ideas, values and habits that form the institution's shared cultural core or script. Ethics are those elements making up the institutional "Charter," which Malinowski defines as "… the system of values the pursuit for which human beings organize or enter organizations already existing" (Malinowski, 1960, p.52). The Charter is "the rules and norms of an institution [that] are the technically acquired skills, habits, legal norms and ethical commands which are accepted by the members or imposed upon them" (Malinowki, 1960, p. 52). The Charter performs the institution's pattern maintenance function which is "…that concerned with maintenance of the highest 'governing' or controlling patterns of the system [of values]" (Parsons 1966 p. 7).

The Role of the Charter: An institution's Charter defines and links the societal demands with the individual's own goal orientation. The Charter links the individual's emotionally driven/needs to society's instrumentally driven/needs. The ethical principles set forth in the Charter apply to the whole socio-culture system and to the functions performed by the instrumental institutions that direct individual and collective actions. Individual actions are generally motivated by a psychological need, or needs, at the system level. These are translated into psychological drives. Thus, there is an affective, or emotional, quality to the way individuals perceive their needs. It is this affective dimension that leads us to the question whether an action is right or wrong.

The charter is the institutional reference point we use to evaluate the potential and/or real consequences of the action. The individual's question, based on the institutional charter, is: "Does this action, if carried out according to the established rules or norms, accomplish my intended end?" Society's question is: "Did "X's" action produce the desired outcome and was it performed according to our proscribed rules?"

Metaphorically, another way to express the Charter priority is to ask: "What would you be willing to die for?"

Ethical Standards: The ethical standards found in the institutional charter establish the rules and context in which future actions will be ethically justified. The charter can be formal or informal. In government, business, and most social relations, the charter is found in the formally established constitution, compact, covenant, contract, or other written agreement. These

documents serve to establish a long term emotional and psychological commitment to the relationship between members and with their environment. Informal charters, established by customs and traditions, are observed by the membership as if they were formal agreements. Some examples of informal ethical practices are --"this is the way we do things," "a gentleman's agreement," "the handshake," or "the founder's syndrome."

ETHICS, STATUS AND ROLE

The institution is humanity's method for organizing itself in order to satisfy its basic needs. Organization implies the presence of purpose and predictable relationships. These relationships join members together in a manner that ensures that the purpose will be carried out in a predictable fashion. The organization assigns responsibility to individual members for a set of tasks that are required to achieve the purpose. The members are expected to carry out these tasks in a proscribed manner. The relationships are defined in two ways -- structurally and behaviorally.

Structural Relationships: Structurally, duties and responsibilities are assigned to status positions within the network of relationships. Duties are the tasks assigned to the position, while the responsibilities are the outputs that we expect the status to contribute to the network's overall goal. The network and its status positions perform the integrative function for the institutional action system. Individual and organizational statuses may be ascribed or achieved.

Ascribe status: An ascribed status is a status that society assigns to an individual based on who that individual is "socially." Social criteria are employed to classify and label the individual independent of her abilities. One's social classification then is used to assign rights and responsibilities. Kinship, tribe, ethnicity, race, gender, caste, class, physical appearance, sexual orientation, mental competence, etc. are categories that can be used as criteria to ascribe an individual status. Such ascription limits the individual's opportunity for social advancement by defining his "proper" relationship to others and place in society.

Achieved Status: An achieved status is a status that society defines in terms of a set of duties and responsibilities, which are to be filled from within or by the membership. Assignment is based on a set of objective qualifying tests. In order to be considered an eligible candidate for the status, the individual is required to take and pass the test. For example, such a test might be: "go to college" => college graduate, "graduate goes to graduate school" => MBA, "MBA applies for job" = > accounting job, etc.

Institutions based on achieved statuses, classify their members by the individual's demonstrated knowledge, experience, and problem solving skills, as these relate to a specific institutional need. Individual members are free to compete for the status based on these criteria. Status is awarded on the basis merit (meritocracy) determined by the test results.

Behavioral Relationship: Behaviorally, the institution depends on the proper workings of each status position with all the others in a network of social actions. This is to ensure a predictable performance and outcome. The occupant of a specific status is expected to act in a specific way that we define as the Role. Role is the behavioral component of status. A Role is the bundle of acceptable and required behaviors and actions that the institution proscribes for the occupant of a specific status. Role performance is the institutional goal orientation function. It defines the purpose for a member's action and legitimatize it.

Applied Ethics Test: The institution's ethical context is defined by its status/role system. In an applied ethics sense, the individual's status and role are the criteria one would use to evaluate

whether an individual's actions are ethical or unethical. From the applied ethics perspective, the distinction between status appropriate and status inappropriate role behavior is the ethical test most appropriate for a professional context, such as a business. In certain contexts, the criteria might be the means used, while in another it might be the ends achieved.

Determining what is ethical and unethical can be a very complex process for the practitioner under these circumstances. For example, Marvin Sussman identified 6 different basic roles that a consultant can be asked to or choose to play. Each places the consultant in a different status position in the consulting context. Each calls for a different role behavior and ethical choice. The *Back Patting* role is when the consultant is hired to valid a decision already made. *Merlin* role is when the consultant works directly for and with the top authority and serves his/her needs. The *Broker* role is when the consultant is expected to relate the interests and needs of one institution to another and vice-versa. The *Shotgun* role is when the consultant is called in on a one time basis to offer advice to the client. *Arbitrator* role is when the consultant is asked to help parties to find a common solution to a problem that they have already committed to disagreeing about. *Self Generating* role is when the consultant establishes his/her own expertise as an advocate for a position and recruits client who share the position (Sussman 1975 pp.7 -12).

BUSINESS - ACTIVITY AND INSTITUTION

Business is a social activity. Business is that particular social activity that we define as economic activity. The function of business is to facilitate the exchange of goods and services between individuals and between groups both within and between socio-cultural systems. Business can be carried out by an individual, or collectively by a group for the benefit of the individual and/or group.

Definitions: "The term *trade or business* generally includes any activity carried on for the production of income from selling goods or performing services." (USIRS 2010). *Trade* is carried on through the exchange of goods and services in a social context between trading institutions. *Business* is a special case of a trading institution, a business enterprise, carried out through and mediated by a medium of exchange -- money. (e.g. R. H. Coase 1937). A *business enterprise* is in general any endeavor where the primary motive is profit and not mere employment for oneself and others (Business Dictionary.com). It is a social institution that has as its primary function the systematic and organized exchange between two classes of people and institutions -- buyers and sellers.

Business Institutions: The business, as a status/role institution, is a very simple structure consisting of two statuses: Buyer and Seller. Its charter is "survive and grow". Metaphorically, another way to express the business charter priority is to ask the question: "What would you be willing to kill for in order to survive?"

Buyer is the status of an institutional representative who seeks to acquire a solution to an institutional need. Business needs are instrumental needs -- needs that arise from an objective institutional purpose rather than an emotion response to a situation.

Seller is the status of an institutional representative who seeks to exchange a good or service that the institution owns for a price or a specific good or service that the institution needs or wants to satisfy its own institutional needs.

The Buyer role is to find a solution that meets the institution's instrumental need at a price the institution can afford.

The Seller role is to exchange its ownership rights in the good or service for an institutionally acceptable, or preferred, price or instrumental value.

Structure and Organization: The business enterprise describes a very broad spectrum of institutions. These take many different forms and engage in many different types of exchange processes. These range from the sole proprietor (e.g. individual peddler) to the family-based business (e.g. family farm or bodega), to the partnership or alliance of individuals (e.g. a fishing boat or law practice), to the legally created superorganic corporation and its many forms (e.g. Fred's Fried Chicken, LLC or Google, Inc).

These different enterprises may be classified by their institutional form which is based on the nature of the status/role structures i.e. ascribed vs. achieved status; the membership style, i.e. openness vs. exclusiveness; and the organizational form, i.e. formal vs. informal.

A SHORT HISTORY OF AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGY

As Business anthropologists, we must be prepared to answer the question: "What is the anthropological ethic that the anthropologist and anthropology can bring to the business environment?" "How are we different from our competition?" To answer these questions, we need to know who we are and where we came from in order to understand the paradox that is American anthropology.

How Others Have Seen Us:, Foreign observers and subjects have noted over the years that American anthropology is a distinctly American/western European institution,

"Anthropology … is the science of man, but it is also a trait of European civilization and its point of view is that of the European observing the rest of mankind. So the growth of the science is intimately bound to the knowledge and outlook of Europe" (Mitra 1933: p. 1).

"To date, the theory of applied anthropology has been one of the items imported into the underdeveloped countries - an imported item, as many others. We receive from producing [western developed] countries…many well-elaborated theoretical postulates, some of them perfectly adjusted to our reality and to our needs; but others are infused with a different spirit, foreign to our interests and on occasions, decidedly contrary to them" (Battala 1966: 253) .

"The massive volume of useless knowledge produced by anthropologists attempting to capture the real Indians in a network of theories has contributed substantially to the invisibility of Indian people today. …Over the years anthropologists have succeeded in burying Indian communities so completely beneath the mass of irrelevant information that the total impact of the scholarly community on Indian people has become one of simple authority. Many Indians have come to parrot the ideas of anthropologists because it appears that the anthropologist know everything about Indian communities" (Deloria, 1969 pp.81 -82).

"The relationship between anthropologists and development agencies is characterized by mutual misunderstanding that at times tends to translate into sever tensions if not outright hostility" (Babiker 2005 p.137).

Initial Conditions: American anthropology arose in the mid-19th century as an avocational activity carried out in social clubs and learned societies by individuals sharing their humanistic interest and curiosity about antiquities and traveler reports of strange encounters with exotic peoples. As American science was blossoming, anthropology was recognized as an emerging scientific and scholarly discipline. It was invited to become a member in the newly formed American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in 1851, under Section B,

Natural History. In 1882 it was assigned to Section H, where it resides to this day. Lewis Henry Morgan was its first President (Mitra 1933:203).

At the turn of the 20th century, when our modern organizational structure was being formed, there arose a sharp division over the question: "What form should the discipline take?" Should anthropology, as a new scientific/scholarly discipline, continue to organize on the inclusive principle found in its local learned societies; or should it be organized on an exclusive principle of scientific status, such as Section H in the AAAS? This question created an axiological crisis centered on the values of inclusiveness or exclusiveness and framed the question: "Who is an anthropologist?" This is a question that persists today and is a source of continuing tension in the profession.

On the inclusive side was W. J. McGee. McGee led the movement for the formation of a specialized and independent national anthropological learned society, the American Anthropological Association (AAA), which would include all those who had a demonstrated interest in anthropology. The goal for such an organization would be to increase anthropology's status through increased public awareness, interest, and involvement in anthropological subjects. McGee had the support of the Anthropological Society of Washington (ASW) and the Women's Anthropological Society (WAS) (Bainton 1979 p. 87 - 88). At stake was control of the ASW's journal, The *American Anthropologist*, and the chance to control its contents.

On the exclusive side was Franz Boas, who argued that a national American anthropological learned society should continue to be organized under Section H of the AAAS. The goal would be to enhance anthropology's status among scientists by excluding or limiting the role of amateurs. Membership would be based on the AAAS exclusionary principle of Rule 2, which limited membership to "Collegiate professors, also civil engineers and architects and those nominated and elected by members" (AAAS, 1859). Boas was supported by the American Ethnological Society (AES) and the Anthropological Club of New York (ACNY) (Bainton 1979 p. 88 - 89). In this case, anthropological publication along with those of the other disciplines would appear in the journal, *Science,* under the editorial control of the AAAS.

In 1902, the AAA incorporated as an inclusive, national, learned society dedicated to the promotion of anthropology as a science (McGee, 1903:183).

It's All About Membership: The AAA membership was able to grow based on this inclusive policy until the mid- 1940s. During which time, the AAA served to foster the development of three major affiliated national learned societies representing the emerging specialization taking place in the discipline. It began with the linguistic anthropologist who formed Linguistic Society and their journal *Language* in 1925 with both philologists and anthropologists as members. This was followed by the American Association of Physical Anthropology with 83 members, of whom 18 were anthropologist, and its journal, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* in 1929. This was followed by the archaeologists, twenty five men and 6 women who formed the Society for American Archaeology and its journal *American Antiquity* in 1934 (Patterson 2001:65). World War II marked a watershed in the Association as pressure grew from these new specialized societies to separate from the AAA.

The 1946 Reorganization The war time effort and the semi-independence of the physical, linguistic, and archaeological sub-disciplines put pressure on the AAA. It raised questions about the AAA's proper role in professional anthropology. It created a cultural crisis for the AAA leadership. The crisis took two forms: The axiological question was, "Who, or what, is an anthropologist? And the survival question was, "Whether the AAA would remain the umbrella organization for American anthropology?"

In response to these pressures, the AAA formed a Committee on Professional Standards in 1944. The committee issued a report, "Suggested Requirements for Professional Status in the Field of Anthropology"(AAA 1946), which called for a reorganization of the discipline and establishing two membership statuses, Fellows (voting members) and Members (non-voting dues payers).

Fellowship was defined as: (a) one who had a significant published contribution in the field of anthropology; or (b) must possess a bachelor's or master's degree in anthropology or a doctorate in an allied field and be actively engaged in anthropology; or (c) must possess a doctorate in anthropology; or (d) have been a life member of the association as of December, 1946. (AAA, 1946: 690)

The recommendations were accepted and included the new AAA 1946 constitution. This reestablished the AAA's central role in American anthropology. It also opened the door for representation by applied anthropologists when the Society for Applied Anthropology (SAA, aka SfAA, organized in 1940), to become the fifth sub-discipline.

In the process, the AAA was transformed from a learned society toward a professional society. More important, there was the shift in the political power within the Association to the "professional" scientist membership and away from the amateur humanists. At this time "professional" essentially meant "making a living being as an anthropologist."

The 1970 Reorganization Between 1969 and 1971 the AAA membership again questioned the association's purpose and mission, its membership criteria, and sought to redefine the rights and responsibilities of member statuses. This questioning was brought on, in part, by the cultural crises of the period. This included the tremendous growth in the baby boomer generation and the Viet Nam War era draft which fed into the AAA's student membership; and by tax issues that threatened to affect the association's tax exempt status (Foster et al, 1969). Between 1950 and 1970, there was a tremendous growth in academic anthropology as measured by the average faculty size per anthropology department in response to student demand: (1950) 3.9, (1960) 6.4 and (1970) 34.2 (Bainton 1979 p.106). This resulted in a value, or axiological, crisis focusing again on the question: "Who is an anthropologist? Only this time, instead of the professional vs. amateurs, the voting rights for the association's student members came into question.

The effect, referred to as "Extending the Franchise," (AAA March 1970, AAA January 1970) was to liberalize the exclusionary voting rights status by modifying the definition of anthropologists to include anthropology students. This allowed students full representation, while retaining the restriction on non-anthropologists to a non-voting membership option. The goal was to refine the AAA as a professional association (Foster et al 1969). The academic anthropologists' political power within the association was further strengthened by this effort.

The tax status issue was not addressed at this time but would have a profound effect throughout the decade.

The 1979 Constitutional Changes In 1979, the Constitution was again amended to reflect a change in membership classes. This reflected the survival crises of the moment brought on by falling paid membership numbers and a dilution of the academic faction's influence brought about by a poor, declining job market and the increased strength of the student membership. The change created two membership classes: members (voting) and institutional members (non-voting). The member category was open to "any person having a demonstrable professional or scholarly interest in the science of anthropology..." (AAA Constitution and By Laws of the American Anthropological) 1979 Article III, Sec 2).

The 1983 Reorganization In 1983, the AAA finally addressed the tax status issue by reorganizing itself into the membership organization that it is today. This is a consortium structure that serves as the administrative umbrella organization for other sub-disciplines and special interest groups organizational members (see AAA 2011 http://www.aaanet.org/sections/). To be a member in good standing, one is required to become a dues paying member of the AAA and at least one of its 38 special interest groups.

The need for change was brought on by the survival crisis that had set in during the 1970s. As the number of anthropology graduates produced by the departments grew, members began to game the system. While the number of graduates increased, many did not join the AAA as paying members. The AAA administration discovered that it was supporting many special interest groups that had a minimal legitimate institutional affiliation with the AAA. For example, in order to get space on the annual meeting program, one AAA member might front for some newly organizing special interest group, largely made up of non-members, to get on the agenda. Once on the agenda, they could promote themselves and their special interest at the expense of the AAA. This faux membership drained AAA resources and raised questions with the IRS about the AAA's non-profit purpose (Lehman 1976, personal communication).

Today, the AAA is a complex "membership organization" representing all of anthropology and providing a degree of "professional" status to its diverse constituency. It performs a range of fiduciary operations, administers membership lists, schedules and promotes the annual meeting, oversees a publishing operation, serves as a liaison between member and affiliated organizations, and represents the membership in the wider organized social science, humanities, and scientific communities, both nationally and internationally. As a consortium, the AAA fulfills an administrative function for its diverse membership and has clarified its 501(c)(3) status with the IRS.

This change in mission, however, raises real problems for the profession. Not everyone agreed with the new structure. The SfAA withdrew from the AAA in 1983 in order to maintain its independence and continues as an independent organization today. In its place the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA) has been created to fill this space within the AAA for the practitioner and nonacademic anthropologist.

The change raises questions about what role special interest sections play in the AAA governance (Patterson 2001 pp. 147-148). It has also exposed the long running debate between the academy and the AAA over "What is anthropology?" and "What is Culture?" (Patterson 2001, pp. 135 -164, Green 2011 p.18)

For practitioners, the question is, "What role does the AAA serve for its individual members, especially when it comes to defining professional ethics?"

ETHICS AS A CONCERN

Initially, the Association and its members held an amoral position toward professional ethics. Instead it promoted the values of academic freedom, the freedom of scientific inquiry, and freedom of publication (AAA 1948). This attitude is best illustrated by the following remark by Julian Steward in response to the AAA's 1948 draft "Statement on Human Rights", that "…as a scientific organization, the association [AAA] has no business dealing with the rights of man" (1948:352).

The SfAA is First The end of WWII enabled the wartime anthropologists to reflect on their experience and their future. One issue that rose to the surface was the ethics of what they had

done. In 1948, after two years of internal discussion, the Society for Applied Anthropology put forward anthropology's first formal code of ethics. The Code emphasized the anthropologist's role, rather than his/her status vis-à-vis his/her client. It called upon the anthropologist to...

> "take responsibility for the effects of his recommendations, never maintaining that he is merely a technician unconcerned with the ends toward which his applied scientific skills are directed"

> "That the specific means adopted will inevitably determine the ends attained, hence ends can never be used to justify means and full responsibility must be taken for the ethical and social implications of both means and ends recommended or employed."

> "That the specific *area of responsibility* of the applied anthropologist is to promote a state of dynamic equilibrium within systems of human relationships. This means that the applied anthropologist is concerned either with maintaining a system of human relationships in a state of dynamic equilibrium or in aiding the resolution of a system into such a new state as to achieve a greater degree of well-being for the constituent individuals" (Mead, Chapple, and Brown vol.8 1949: 20).

In 1953, the code was revised and shifted to a status based code. The SfAA has had no formal Committee on Ethics; nor does it have a mechanism for implementing, enforcing or providing due process for code infringements by members or against members.

In 1983, the SfAA again revised its ethics position this time by changing the Code into a Statement of Ethical and Professional Responsibilities.

The AAA Follows More than a decade later, in 1971, the AAA drafted and adopted its first Code of Ethics, modeled after the SfAA 1953 code. The AAA code was amended several times until 1984 when it was proposed that it be revised to take into account the interests and concerns of the nonacademic members (see AAA http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/ethstmnt.htm). The Code was revised again in 1998, and again in 2009. (AAA 2/2011).

Between these amended versions, there have been two major attempts to refine the code to better reflect the true nature and uniqueness of anthropology as a discipline and enterprise.

In 1971, Margaret Mead (Mead, et al 1971) chaired a committee to look into the Thai Case, a major scandal of the period. As part of its report, the Committee recommended major changes in the scope and the wording of the 1971 code. The recommendation would limit the code's application to the academic researcher role. Applied and teaching roles could be addressed by such organizations as the SfAA and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Although the recommendation reflected an early recognition of a need for an applied ethic, they were voted down by the AAA membership (AAA 1972).

AAA 1984 revision In 1984, a revised Code was proposed by the Committee on Anthropology as a Profession, on which I served as member. This revised code was proactive. It focused on the role and duties of being an anthropologist rather than the reactive mode of the 1970 code that dictated how the anthropologist is supposed to react to specific audiences or status groups. The code addressed a number of issues of concern to practitioners and won support from this group. However, after much debate and discussion within the AAA, the draft code was not adopted by the membership.

AAA 1998 revision In 1998, the AAA membership approved another revision of the code. The Code's major focus, Section III, was the anthropologist's researcher role and the disposition

of that research. In this version the membership accepted language that reflected the federal mandates on protection of human and animal subjects. In Section III C. Responsibility to the Public (2), an advocacy role was added and deemed ethical. Sections IV and V, Teaching and Application, remained generic and reflected the same positions taken in the 1971 version. Both of these roles were given a very terse treatment in comparison to research (AAA 1998).

AAA 2009 revision According to the acknowledgements section, the AAA began a review of its Code in 1995-96, which led to the most recent revised 2009 version (AAA 2011). There is little change here from the 1998 version. Under Research III B (4) Section on Scholarship and Science, the code contains a warning about being honest to all stakeholders, and a prohibition on clandestine research was added. Section C, related to the public, contains a new paragraph (2) which again warns about relations with government. These sections reflect the schizophrenic attitude that exists within the profession toward the government, which have ethical implications.

AAA 2011 Draft Principles On June 30th, the AAA Ethics Task Force released a document entitled, Completed Draft Principles, for review by whole of the AAA. It seems the debate goes on. See Damon 2011.

When is an Ethics Code Not a Code? This is a linguistic problem. There is a difference between a set of professional principles and a code of behavior. The 10 commandments is a set of principles, while the IRS tax code is a set of rules and regulations designed to cover every situation and circumstance. The SfAA seems to have made this distinction, but not the AAA.

Despite nearly a half century of debate over professional ethics and the creation of a formal Committee on Ethics, the Association and the membership have yet to determine what the Association's appropriate status is and the role it should play in the development and enforcement of a professional ethic for anthropology.

Both the AAA and the SfAA have disclaimed any authority or responsibility to oversee and/or adjudicate cases brought to them under their codes. Instead, they claim the codes are educational and advisory only. This point is not yet clear to the AAA membership. For example, The Committee on Ethics [COE] in its 2007 annual report complains that:

> "5a. The COE's mandate is an educational mission and its model is to use explanation and case studies. It does not have adjudication functions and does not adjudicate cases on particular ethical dilemmas. We see this as the COE's public face and it is vital to ethical issues and needed. However, the message has not gotten out to all of the AAA membership yet, even though this has been the mandate for many years. We know this because the COE continues to receive requests for such types of adjudication. A method must be found to inform members because there are still members who want to vindicate themselves or vilify their colleagues and who want the COE to judge their cases. This takes a lot of the COE members' time to sift through the cases presented and determine what the real situations and facts are" (Spring 2007).

This comment points to the problem facing the American Anthropological Association and other social science organizations that attempt to create an umbrella ethics code. It is time consuming on the members volunteering for the committee and ineffective, if not properly funded to do the job.

It is also a bad business decision. It is ignoring the apparent needs of a segment of the membership. When a business ignores its customer's demand and expectations, it creates opportunity for others with other goals to come in and fill the need. Business organizations face a

similar problem when they attempt to develop a code of ethics, or social responsibility, rather than a set of general principles that their members and employees can buy into. Rather than mandating rules, there is another way to do this, an ethnographic way.

THE EMERGENCE OF A BOASIAN CODE

For the first 50 years of organized American Anthropology, the question of ethics was largely left to the anthropologist's personal ethics; but, not completely. While the AAA was organizing anthropology's formal institutional structure, Franz Boas was establishing its traditions. These traditions formed an informal anthropological ethic.

The ethic was ingrained into the basic curriculum and training program Boas created at Columbia. In effect, he established a normative, rule-based, ethic which describes the basic ethical expectations for a career anthropologist. It is the ethic his students went out and replicated in the anthropology departments they established and staffed. It is the ethic at the heart of anthropology today.

Boas instilled a strong sense of skepticism toward broad theories of culture not based on a firm foundation of observable facts. This ethic is based on the principles of freedom of scientific inquiry and scholarly expression, but controlled by facts. According to Clifton, Boas taught that "…a science such as anthropology has to develop and mature for a sufficiently long period for general principles or theories to be formulated and tested before these theories can be usefully applied in some concrete situation so as to bring about a practical result" (Clifton 1970: viii).

Boas' influence in establishing these disciplinary traditions was summarized by Margaret Mead in 1959. She describes Boas' preoccupation with the need for anthropologists to become recognized as scientist within the scientific community.

> "The form that these very preoccupations took when he taught us was a curious amalgam, with consequences which have outlived him. He never talked about science or scientific method as such... When it came to the study of culture, there was no discussion of a law of parsimony or controls or of sampling, no invocations of models, none of the paraphernalia of the natural sciences with which students of human behavior were beginning to surround themselves. We did not doubt that we were doing scientific work; that we had to live up to scientific standards and use all the methods, qualitative and quantitative, that were or would become available. But we did not talk about methods, instead, we talked about problems, the problems that should be tackled next… [W]hen we went into the field, we made such methodological innovations as seemed called for by the problem and the local setting" (p.31).

The 11 Boasian Rules for Anthropology: In terms of a tradition or an ethic for anthropology, we can identify eleven points that Boas and his students established as the informal rules of anthropology. As the founder, and thus "god-head," of American anthropology, these Boasian rules or principles became the normative ethic for future generations. These rules are:
1. a combination of humanistic and scientific values;
2. a focus on the concept of culture;
3. an emphasis on non-literate, small scale sociocultural systems as the subject of study;
4. a holistic perspective in the study of sociocultural phenomena;

5. a reliance on the comparative method of analysis;
6. a tradition of employment in a research setting associated with a museum or university;
7. an orientation toward historical particularism, i.e. understanding the role and function of sociocultural phenomena in context;
8. a tradition of participant-observation in a personal field work experience;
9. the ideal of the scientific role as a standard for judging professional status;
10. an objective and relativistic moral and ethical position;
11. a four field approach in the basic training of recruits to the profession and in the organization of the profession. (Bainton 1979: 127 - 128)

It is amazing how well these rules have held up despite the monumental changes that have taken place in the social sciences and in the world at large. In my judgment there are only two of these principles which have not stood the test of time. "Principle 3: an emphasis on non-literate, small scale sociocultural systems as the subject of study." And "Principle 6: a tradition of employment in a research setting associated with a museum or university."

ANTHROPOLOGY AS A BUSINESS INSTITUTION

The world has changed and so have our subjects. To understand the changes and what it means for anthropology, we need to look at the anthropological market filtered through a business rather than academic lens. That business lens is the "institution."

If we assume that the Boasian Rules represent both the core foundational ethics of anthropology and the anthropological business model, we can analyze them to see how appropriate that model is for today's anthropology and academic market.

Today's academic world is in tumult, facing a cultural crisis -- departments face budget cuts, a high cost structure, declining tenure opportunities, increased uncertainty and low reward for adjunct and part time appointments, a public demand for career education vs. "liberal arts," deceased federal research funding, changing research funding priorities toward the hard sciences, etc. If we examine the Boasian business model we see that there are some areas in need of revision and others where we need to reposition our anthropological product.

Principle 3 is a case in point. While the principle is still valid, especially as it relates to small scale sociocultural systems, our "non-literate subject" is a rapidly disappearing species. Anthropology has expanded into areas that include "literate" subjects (e.g. Lynd and Lynd 1959, West 1969, Spicer et al 1969, Deloria 1969, Nader 1972). If we drop the emphasis or qualification on "non-literate" peoples as our subjects but continue to focus on the small scale system such as the institution, e.g. business firm, the principle remains valid. Most of our subjects today are literate or have access to technological resources that make them effectively literate. This fact alone creates an ethical dilemma that the AAA and SfAA have attempted to address in their codes and that Boas and many of his students did not have to be concerned about.

Anthropology successfully established itself in the nation's universities and museums in the 20th century (Patterson 2001) and today produces a wide range of products (Dominguez 2011). So successful have we been, in fact, that we have saturated that market. And today, we continue to produce far more anthropology degreed graduates than this market can absorb. While the 1960s saw a period of tremendous growth in the academic market, ever since the 1970s, this

trend has reversed. Yet, many students are still being recruited with the idea of pursuing a traditional career in the academy.

For the past 40 years Principle 6 has been invalid and has stood in the way of growing and expanding the anthropological brand. A recent study, *The Changing Face of Anthropology*, by the AAA (Fisk et al 2009) demonstrates the viability of the emerging market for the Masters Degree anthropologist and a special training niche for some academic departments. Today Principle 6 should be changed and new brand created to account for the current market potential for professional anthropological services in government and private sector.

Anthropology cannot afford the academic/research "elitism" and class structure that has pervaded the discipline since the mid-1940s. This elitism is costing anthropologist in more ways than one, as Spicer observed back in 1970s (Spicer 1973, 1976). Today, there are similar signs when the number of academic postings decreases and, although budgeted, position openings are being lined out (Terry-Sharp, 2009). Meanwhile, the academic based ethic condemns careers, e.g. corporate consulting, human terrain analysis, and proprietary research, which may require conditional or outright "violations" of the universal AAA ethical code, as unethical.

A new business model is needed, one which places a heavier emphasis on training the "career anthropologist." A career anthropologist is someone who has undergone and completed an enculturation process in the anthropological discipline at the post secondary education level; and who is committed to pursuing a career where they expect to utilize their anthropological knowledge in a rewarding and productive career.

The career anthropologist has the right to know that the time and money invested studying for the degree has a potential of producing a positive return on investment (ROI). The only way he/she will see this is if there is some evidence that the profession he/she is committing to, is committed to defending and expanding the occupational territory.

Meanwhile, the public that employs these graduates needs some guarantee that the graduate is technically qualified to do "anthropological" tasks and that the degree has value. This calls for accreditation, certification, and the possibility of licensing practitioners. In the public's mind, a Code of Ethics implies accountability. It implies that the professional association is certifying the authenticity of the practitioner's claims to be a professional and is bound by the code. The code also carries an implied threat to the practitioner that he/she will be held accountable for her/his actions and could lose his/her certification. Such a process protects the public and it protects the practitioner from being pressured to act unethically.

CLARIFICATION OF THE ETHICAL PROBLEM: A PERSONAL NOTE

To become an anthropologist is to achieve the status of "anthropologist" within some institutional structure, a voluntary association, which represents anthropology and its interests. One of the roles that a voluntary association such as the AAA, SfAA or NAPA, plays is to prepare and enable its members to achieve a status in the association, to enhance their achieved professional status, and to protect the members' achieved status from internal and external attack (Officer 1964). Our formal professional institutions fail to provide this institutional protection

In 1983, I served on an AAA tasks force that was asked to review proposed changes in the AAA Code. I was the lone "applied" or "practitioner" representative. The Committee took a position that looked at the anthropologist's "role," rather than her "status," as the focus for the building an ethics code. Our recommendations were turned down by the membership.

Later in 1985, I was asked to chair a NAPA Task Force on the AAA Code of Ethics (Bainton et al 1986). Out of that effort, NAPA has developed its own "Ethical Guidelines for Practitioners" (NAPA 1988). These are principles far more relevant to the practitioner role.

TODAY'S ETHICAL MAZE

For the individual anthropologist, ethics can be a babble of moral claims creating cognitive dissonance as he/she tries to navigate through a sea of professional roles and responsibilities. Anthropology, as a "discipline," is organized into a large number of voluntary associations and interests, each with its own professional or career requirements. Each has its own ethics codes which sometimes are in direct conflict with one another. These include: American Anthropological Association 2009, *Code of Ethics;* American Board of Forensic Examiners n.d., *Code of Ethical Conduct;* Archaeological Institute of America 1991, *Code of Ethics*; Archaeological Institute of America 1994, *Code of Professional Standards;* National Association for the Practice of Anthropology 1988, *Ethical Guidelines for Practitioners;* National Academy of Sciences 1995, *On Being a Scientist: Responsible Conduct in Research*; Society for American Archaeology 1996, *Principles of Archaeological Ethics*; Society for Applied Anthropology 1983, *Professional and Ethical Responsibilities*; and Society of Professional Archaeologists 1976, *Code of Ethics.*

This situation does not create clarity for anthropologists or accountability for the public. Today the profession once again faces an axiological crisis. The class or caste divide between academic research anthropology and applied/practitioner is moving us toward the creation of two separate disciplines. This crisis is being brought on by forces both internal and external to the AAA and beyond the control of its traditional leadership. Business anthropology provides us an opportunity to address these issues by finding a common ground based on principle of applied ethics.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Anthropology is a paradox summed up in the following definition of Anthropology as "…the most humanistic of the sciences and the most scientific of the humanities." We have been asked to adhere to the values of science, and yet we seek to understand humanity in human terms. Our organizations favor the scientist role while advocating for the needs of the humanity. An applied ethic would recognize and accept this paradox. It will help us to integrate these roles for both career anthropologists and the public.

On a personal level I have found that *Reinhold Niebuhr's* Serenity Prayer has served me well as a simple applied personal ethic that is transferable to the many roles I have played as a career anthropologist. *"God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; courage to change the things I can; and wisdom to know the difference."*

REFERENCES

AAA (1970). Broader Enfranchisement Proposed. In *Association Affairs, Newsletter of the American Anthropological Association* Vol. 11, No.1 pp 1, 7 (January).

AAA (1970). Amendment Passed to Extend Franchise. In *Association Affairs, Newsletter of the American Anthropological Association* Vol. 11, No.3 pp 1, 7 (March).

AAA (1972). Council Rejects Thai Controversy Committee's Report. In *Association Affairs, Newsletter of the American Anthropological Association* Vol. 13, No.1 pp 1, 9. (January).

AAAS (1859). Constitution of the Association. *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science* (Springfield, MA: 13TH Meeting) Vol. 13, Retrieved 5/1/2011 from World Wide Web http://archives.aaas.org/publications.php?pub_id=1033

Babiker, M. (2005). It Takes Two to Tango: Anthropology and Development Agencies. *The African Anthropologist* Vol.12, No, 2, pp. 137-157 (September).

Bainton, B. R. (1975). Society of Professional Anthropologists Formed in Tucson. In *Other Organizations, Anthropological News Letter, American Anthropological Association,* Vol. 16, No 8 p 4-6.

Bainton, B. R. (1979). *Anthropology and the Social Engineer: A case study in the elaboration and professionalization of the social scientist's role.* (University of Arizona, Tucson: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).

Bainton, B. R. (Chair). Alexander, J., Bishop, R. J., Dubinskas, F. G., and Sherry, J. F. (1986) Report of NAPA Task Force on AAA Code of Ethics. (Unpublished report).

Bennett, J. (1948). Science and Human Rights: Reason and Action. *American Anthropologist, Brief Communications.* pp. 329 - 336.

Bidney, D. (1946). The Concept of Cultural Crisis. *American Anthropologist N. S.,* 48, pp. 534-551.

Brody, E. (1975). Rights, Privileges, and Obligations: The Physician as Bioethicist. In Maday, B. (ed.) *Anthropology and Society* (Washington, DC: The Anthropological Society of Washington).

Business Dictionary.com n.d. Retrieved 6 /20/2011 from World Wide Web http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/business-enterprise.html.

Coase , R. H. (1937). The Nature of the Firm. *Economica, New Series*, Vol. 4, No. 16., pp. 386-405.

Deloria Jr, V. (1969). Chapter 4: Anthropologists and Other Friends. *In Custer Die for Your Sins.* (New York: The Macmillian Company) pp. 78 – 100.

Demon (2011). Complete Draft Principles Released by Ethics Task Force. Retrieved 7/1/2011 from the World Wide Web http://blog.aaanet.org/2011/06/30/complete-draft-principles-released-by-ethics-task-force

Dominguez, V. R. (2011). Anthropology's Value Legacies, Tidemarks, Surprises and Measures. In *From the President, Anthropology News* . Volume 52, Issue 4, page 43, (April).

Fiske, S. J., Bennett L. A., Ensworth, P., Redding, T. and Brondo, K. (2010.). *The Changing Face of Anthropology: Anthropology Masters Reflect on Education, Careers, and Professional Organizations. AAA/CoPAPIA 2009 Anthropology MA Career Survey*. (Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association).

Foster, G. M., Wagley, C., Aberle, D., Belshaw, C., Gibbs Jr, J. L., Hammel, E., Hyme, D. and Schneider, D. (1969). *Memorandum to the Fellows of American Anthropological Association*. (Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association).

Goldschmidt, W. (1996). Functionalism. In *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 2.* Levinson, D. and Ember, M (eds.) (New York: Henry Holt and Company).

Green, S. (2011). "What is a Tidemark?" In *Association News, Anthropology News.* p.18 (March).

International Organization For Standardization (2011) ISO 9000 essentials. Retrieved 5/25/2011from the World Wide Web http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_9000_essentials.

Kaur, S. (2007). Applications of Anthropology: Meaning of applied, action and development anthropology. Retrieved 5/1/2011 from the World Wide Web http://www.pdfstock.com/d/Applications+of+Anthropology+Meaning+of+applied,+action+and+development+anthropology+Dr.+Suninder+Kaur

Lehman, E., AAA Executive Director (1976). Personal Communication.

Lynd, R. F. and Lynd, H. M. (1959). *Middletown: A Study in Modern American Culture* (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich).

Malinowski, B. (1920). Kula; the Circulating Exchange of Valuables in the Archipelagoes of Eastern New Guinea. *Man.* Vol. 20, pp.: 97–105.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea.* (London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd.).

Malinowski, B (1960). *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays.* (New York: A Galaxy Book, Oxford University Press).

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*, (NY: Harper).

McGee, W. J. (1903). The American Anthropological Association. *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 178-192.

Mead, M. (Chair), Davenport, W., Olmsted, D. and Freed, R. (1971) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate the Controversy Concerning Anthropological activities in Relation to Thailand to the Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association: Part II Guidelines on Future Policies. September 27. Reprint.

Mead, M. (1956). Apprenticeship Under Boas. In *Anthropology of Franz Boas*. Goldschmidt, W. (ed), American Anthropological Association Memoir 89, vol.61, no.5, part 2, pp 29 -45.

Nader, L. (1972) Up the Anthropologist - Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. In *Reinventing Anthropology*, Hymes D. (ed.) (New York: Pantheon Press) pp. 287 - 312.

Officer, J. (1964). *Sodalities and Systemic Linkages: The joining habits of urban Mexican Americans.* (University of Arizona, Tucson: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).

Parsons, T. (1966). *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives.* (Engelwood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.).

Parson, T. (1951). *The Social System* (New York: The Free Press).

Patterson, T C. (2001). *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States* (New York: Berg).

Reining, C. C. (1962). "A Lost Period of Applied Anthropology" in *American Anthropologist,* Vol. 64: pp. 593-600.

Spicer, E. H., Hansen, A. T., Luomala, K, and Opler, M. K. (1969). *Impounded People; Japanese-Americans in the Relocation Centers*. (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press).

Spicer, E H., (1974) The Problem and the Meaning Of Structural Change in the AAA. *Newsletter of the American Anthropological Association*, Vol. 15 No. 2 February, pp 1, 10-13.

Spicer, E. H. (1976) Beyond Analysis and Explanation: Notes on the Life and Times of the Society for Applied Anthropology. *Human Organization* Vol. 35, No. 4 Winter, pp. 335- 343.

Spring, A. (2007). Committee on Ethics Annual Report, 2006. *American Anthropological Association*, Retrieved 5/25/2011from the World Wide Web http://www.aaanet.org/about/Annual_Reports/2006Reports/COE%202006.pdf)

Sussman, M. B. (1966). The Sociologist as a Tool of Social Action. In Shostak, A. B. (ed) *Sociology in Action: Case studies in Social Problems and Directed Social Change*. (Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press) pp. 1 -12.

Terry-Sharp, K. (2009) 2009 Anthropology Faculty Job Market Report. In *2006 Annual Report American Anthropological Association* Retrieved 5 /25/2011 from the World Wide Web http://www.aaanet.org/about/Annual_Reports/2006Reports/

USIRS (2010). Trade or Business. Defined. Retrieved 5/14/2011 from the World Wide Web http://www.irs.gov/charities/article/0,,id=158841,00.html

Voget, F. (1996). Functionalism. In Levinson, D. and Ember, M., eds. <u>Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology</u>, Vol. 2. .(New York: Henry Holt and Company).

Wax, M (nd) Some Issues and Sources on Ethics in Anthropology. In Cassell J, and Jacobs, S-E. (ed) *Handbook on Ethical Issues in Anthropology: a special publication of the American Anthropological Association, Number 2,* Retrieved 4/25/2011 from the World Wide Web http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ch1.htm

Weber, M. (n.d) Max Weber Methodology. Wikipedia Retrieved 4/28/ 2011 from the World Wide Web http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Weber#Methodology

West, J. (1961). *Plainville, USA* (New York: Columbia University Press).