This paper evaluates the effects of anthropological theory and methods on development programs and studies. The objective is to answer the question of whether or not more or better social analysis leads to better development outcomes and, if so, how and why. The first part looks at this question from the perspectives of academic anthropologists concerned with the analysis of development as a cultural, economic, and political process. The second part discusses the views of practicing anthropologists working within development agencies and thus more concerned with the use of anthropology as applied to the pursuit of development programs. Both sections summarize the key arguments of the main advocates and detractors of the anthropology and development convergence. Key Words: anthropology, development, applied research, social analysis, Rapid Rural Appraisal

The success of biodiversity conservation projects, like other development interventions, depends upon a thorough understanding and careful consideration of social, political, and cultural factors.

—Cr uz and Davis 1997

The time has come for anthropology, with growing demands for its skills and insights in development, to consolidate its place, fostering the potential of the new relationship and building on its maligned applied tradition.

—Sillitoe 1998

The scope for noneconomic social scientists to influence the design and implementation of development policies and projects has expanded considerably since the 1970s. Many factors have contributed to this convergence between anthropology and development, and given the broad scope of these issues and the vast literatures that exist on each, this paper is by necessity synthetic. In it I have tried to identify a number of key themes and trends and to sketch some basic propositions about two aspects of this relationship that appear to me to be the most significant from the standpoint of motivating ongoing debates in the social sciences and development circles about the relevance of the contributions of social science concepts, theories, and methods to development studies, projects, and policies.
First, it should be noted that a fundamental shift in approach is occurring among the various development agencies (World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Canadian International Development Agency, USAID, Department for International Development, etc.) as they search for better ways to address the increasingly broad spectrum of sociocultural and institutional challenges now recognized as necessary for achieving their mandates to support measures designed to produce lasting material and social improvements. This shift in thinking is particularly evident in the framework for action put forward in the World Bank’s (2001) *World Development Report* for 2000–01, which stresses the priorities of creating opportunities, empowerment, and security. Other specific examples of this trend include the adoption of policies and practices to improve the gender and ecological effects of development projects and to ensure the cultural appropriateness of such projects to indigenous peoples (Francis and Jacobs 1999). A net effect of this expanding demand for social analysis among development agencies has been the growing number of professional anthropologists and social scientists employed by development agencies both as regular staff members and as consultants (Francis and Jacobs 1999:347).

The second key factor responsible for the ascendance of anthropology in development circles is the increasingly large numbers of academic social scientists keen to demonstrate the policy relevance and maximize the beneficial effects of their research contributions. The number of such academics trying to understand and provide better solutions to crucial human problems relating to the interactions among culture, the environment, and development is expected to continue to increase in the decades ahead (Rappaport 1995). Two well-known examples of this trend are the engagement of anthropologists in indigenous land claims negotiations and those explicitly attempting to make their research processes and products more relevant and valuable to local people by adopting participatory approaches. The latter include attempts to develop and refine locally meaningful indicators for monitoring social effects and environmental changes. The effects of this parallel trend in academia can also be seen in the fact that North American universities are being advised to hire more applied anthropologists to meet student expectations for training with nonacademic careers in mind (Givens and Jablonski 1997).

And yet, perhaps because of this very prominence achieved by proponents of an applied-based development anthropology, an influential academic countertrend—variously known as the anthropology of development “discourse,” the “poststructural” critique, or “postdevelopment”—evolved during the 1980s and 1990s. As I show in this paper though, the all-too-frequently partial, overheated, and sterile accusations that characterized much of these dependency theory—and postmodernist-inspired critiques have in turn been taken to task by a series of researchers concerned about how anthropological theory and methods can more adequately be mobilized to deal with pivotal aspects of planned interventions and social transformations.

The goal of this paper is to assess the effects of these two trends on development operations and academic research. The specific objective is to answer the question of whether or not more and better social analysis leads to better development outcomes and, if so, how and why. The first section looks at this question from the perspectives of academic
anthropologists concerned with the analysis of development as a cultural, economic, and political process. The second section discusses the views of anthropologists working within development agencies and thus more concerned with the use of anthropology as applied to the pursuit of development programs. Both sections summarize the key arguments of the main advocates and detractors of the anthropology and development convergence.

I conclude that despite significant challenges and limitations, both trends present unique opportunities to influence the nature and course of development in ways that can have profound consequences for the quality of life of current and future human generations. Furthermore, I submit that our ability as social scientists—both academics and development practitioners—to grasp these opportunities will depend significantly on the level of our commitments (both professional and moral) to articulating the kinds of fine-grained definitions of local experiences that are the specialty of anthropological analyses with comprehensive, applied theoretical frameworks about how to change this world for the better. The final section presents some concluding thoughts on how anthropologists can more effectively realize this potential.

ANTHROPOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT

Unfortunately, there is still a strong but erroneous opinion in some circles that practical anthropology is fundamentally different from theoretical or academic anthropology. The truth is that science begins with application. . . . What is application in science and when does “theory” become practical? When it first allows us a definite grip on empirical reality.

—Malinowski, 1961 (see Cernea 1995:1)

Development, modernization, and progress have been constant themes in the social sciences since at least the 19th century. The founders of the modern social sciences—Marx, Weber, and Durkheim in particular—created sophisticated foundations for the theoretical and empirical study of social and economic change that continue to inspire researchers to this day. As it is essentially the post-1970s time frame that concerns me in this paper, suffice it to say here that prior to WWII anthropologists were pretty much the only professional group of social scientists studying in what would eventually become known as the countries of the “Third World” (Hulme and Turner 1990). Jumping ahead quickly to the post–World War II period, the salience of this disciplinary peculiarity arguably became a major factor in determining the prominent trouncing the discipline would receive at the hands of emerging nationalist, anticolonial, and anti-imperialist movements and their academic sympathizers. The following abridged historical parenthesis on anthropology and colonialism will attest to the fact that some of the most spirited contemporary theoretical, methodological, and ethical debates that are the focus of this paper about applied anthropology and the desirability of contributing to development programs originated during this period. In fact, I argue that it is impossible to under-
stand the substance of these current debates in anthropology without appreciating the extent to which the colonial legacy of the discipline continues to shape the vocabulary, imagination, and political commitments of anthropologists to this day.

**From Armchair Travelers to Architects of Empire**

Contrary to the often-cited examples of those who have sought to portray anthropologists as the handmaidens of colonial administrations (Malinowski and Evans-Pritchard are just two of the favorite villains), considerable evidence from the historical literature suggests that this relationship was frequently more complex and critical than most post-colonial accounts have been willing to acknowledge (King 1999). For example, Erasmus (1954) and Gulliver (1985) provide good descriptions of how anthropologists advised colonial planners and administrators on the merits of incorporating the findings of ethnographic research on land tenure, customary law, and agricultural technology into colonial policies. Their apparent motivation was to help make colonial policies more accountable, and thus acceptable, to the needs of at least some local people (Brokensha 2001).

Granted, such early interests in the question of how cultural factors encroached on colonial social policies did not amount to genuine considerations of the meanings of colonialism for the colonized themselves, as in hindsight it now appears would have been preferable. But is it therefore accurate to conclude that the anthropologists of the day were, on the whole, uncritical, if not deliberately willing collaborators in the interests of perpetuating the domination and exploitation of the peoples they studied? The point that I am trying to make here is that just as more recent scholarship has tended to reevaluate the degree of control exercised by the colonial powers and to emphasize local initiatives and even the benefits gained by some of those who lived under colonial regimes (Hodder-Williams 2001), some anthropologists have moved away from the kinds of two-dimensional readings that characterize the earlier dependency- and literary theory–inspired analyses of the political role of the textual strategies of colonial discourses (Pels 1997).7

These earlier, often overtly (if not always overly) political readings of the roles of anthropologists during the colonial era have also helped to perpetuate the long-standing practice within the discipline of delegating the study of development to a much maligned subfield of applied anthropology. To those who view themselves as primarily engaged in furthering knowledge of the human condition through constructing and teaching anthropological theory, development anthropologists—and their applied brethren in general—often seem opportunistic, devoid of theoretical perspective, and methodologically and even morally suspect. However, practicing anthropologists (esp. the increasing numbers of those who maintain no direct ties to the academy) prefer to see their work as practical and both theoretically and politically relevant. The latter criticize their more academically inclined colleagues as unrealistic and inconsequential “ivory-tower” intellectuals (Gow 2002). These debates have figured prominently in what has been characterized as something of an ongoing family feud within the discipline (Ferguson 1997, in Gow 2002).

The downside of such shortsighted professional infighting has been significant in at least two important respects. First, the negative characteristics attributed by each side to
the other, as well as the monopoly of positive qualities claimed by each, are not inherent reflections of any significant differences in the scope of either’s work. These strengths and deficiencies should, rather, be associated with good and poor anthropology, irrespectively of whether the research aims to challenge basic theoretical assumptions or to test those believed to link particular outcomes with specific events (Chambers 1985). Second, these false dichotomies between applied and basic research in anthropology have encouraged isolation and ignorance about the role and the value of anthropological concepts and methods to the processes of development.

The mutual mistrust and confusion that permeate so much of the relationship between anthropology and development continues to obscure and undermine the importance of considerable anthropological research concerned with the issues of development but conducted outside the context of development projects (Little and Painter 1995). Fortunately, as the literature reviewed in this paper attests, repairing this gulf in the “epistemic terrain upon which the divided house of anthropology now stands” (Gow 2002:300) has become an abiding concern even among some of the its previously most ardent proponents.

The Triumph of Economics

With decolonization and the intensifying geopolitical struggles of the Cold War, development began to take on a decidedly more economic orientation (Brokensha 2001). It was during this time that justifications for attempts to apply Keynesian principles of macroeconomic management to the development of poor countries became known as the specialized field of “development economics.” Over the years, the field has become a proactive mixture of structuralist, neoclassical, and Keynesian positions advocating, among others, technological progress in agriculture and labor-intensive industrialization (Peet and Hartwick 1999). The theories, methodologies, and policies of this field have also come to dominate most theoretical and practical aspects of the fields of development policy making and development studies (Hulme and Turner 1990).

During the 1960s and especially throughout the 1970s, social scientists and others in civil society were becoming increasingly disillusioned with what they saw as the often overly simplistic assumptions about human behavior implicit in the dominant economic theories of growth and development then being advocated by development economists. These critics pointed out that it is especially unrealistic to treat individuals as independent entities with inherently utilitarian preferences rather than as socially and culturally situated subjects (Peet and Hartwick 1999:57–58). This disenchantment spread and became more vehement as the often disastrous social and environmental effects of the centrally planned megaprojects popular at the time became increasingly apparent. This line of questioning eventually inspired a series of political economy and cultural ecology critiques of development, to which anthropologists contributed greatly by emphasizing the role of outsiders and government policies in pushing indigenous peoples to intensify their production of commodities for market transactions (Godoy 2001). These early critics of development economics and their followers drew extensively on the political economy of
collective action and dependency theoretical frameworks to argue similar conclusions about the exploitative nature of capitalist economic relations of production and civil institutions.\textsuperscript{10} I briefly alluded to some of the profound effects of these critiques on development agencies above, and I will return to these changes below. For the moment I wish to continue to focus on these events from the anthropological research side of the equation.

**The Anthropologist Strikes Back**

By the 1970s, these debates had in many instances become full-blown power struggles between rival ideological attempts to understand and to govern the political and institutional domains that continue to disproportionately constrain the social and material aspirations of the majority of humanity. This politically charged atmosphere encouraged a series of anthropologists to call for more rigorous analytical attention to the understandings of the social context of development that both academics and development practitioners were using as a background for analyzing their theories and practices (Myrdal 1972, in Pitt 1976). Pitt (1976), writing on the heels of the Ninth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences held in Chicago in 1976, lamented the “fragmented and divided structure” of the academic research world of development studies at the time. He believed that several important consequences resulted from this state of affairs. Most significantly, both scholars and administrators tended to be woefully ignorant of “the complexity of the social relations involved in the exchange of goods and services” (Pitt 1976:17). Pitt (1976:17) found the extent of this ignorance to be especially appalling when it came to understanding the different conceptions of development that existed at grassroots levels.

According to Grillo’s tripartite classification scheme, the views of Pitt and those anthropologists similarly prepared to become directly involved with development projects and policies place them in a category that can be called the “reformers” (1985, in Brokensha 2001:3588).\textsuperscript{11} Rounding out this trilogy of anthropological perspectives on development are the “principled rejectionists” (i.e., those adopting an almost Manichean view of development as monolithic, technocratic, and irredeemably flawed) and the “monitorists,” who take a more measured approach toward the study of development without becoming directly engaged in the project or policy processes (Brokensha 2001:3589).\textsuperscript{12} Because of the fluidity that typically characterizes the employment status of the vast bulk of the development consultants engaged in the aid industry, the views of many of the so-called reformers—although perhaps based in academia—tend to overlap considerably with those of the smaller core of anthropologists permanently employed by development organizations. For this reason, these will be discussed together below. The rest of this section considers the respective contributions and critiques of the key proponents of the rejectionist and monitorist discursive, theoretical, and pragmatic standpoints.

During the 1980s and especially throughout the 1990s, development discourses and institutions became the targets of a significant reappraisal in anthropology and other social sciences. Much of the inspiration for this upsurge of social science contributions to development studies has been attributed to Michel Foucault and the poststructuralists’
problematizing of power. Judging by the amount of criticism provoked, Arturo Escobar (1991, 1995) is probably the most familiar proponent of this influential approach. Despite the often passionate and sometimes even personal tone of these rebukes and counterdebates (see, e.g., Edelman 1999; Grillo and Stirrat 1997; Little and Painter 1995), it is for the most part generally acknowledged that the postmodernist critique constitutes a valuable corrective to mainstream development theory in several important respects.

The most notable contribution has come from the way poststructuralists consistently highlight the role of language and meaning in the constitution of social reality. Poststructuralists claim that the goal of development discourse is to construct a neutral-seeming tool kit in which reality is presented as predictable and subject to control. This emphasis helps to clarify the role of key policy narratives in defining development problems and justifying specific actions or oversights (Gow 2002). By inquiring about the ostensibly unintended consequences of development interventions and their repeated failures to improve the lives of their intended beneficiaries, the poststructuralist critique effectively confronts these powerful myths of development as politically neutral and technically proficient. It thus manages to challenge the political economy of truth that such myths seek to establish and to ask important questions about the prospects for achieving desirable alternative development outcomes (Van Ausdal 2001).

Lost in Translation: Rehistoricizing the Textual and the Technical

These are certainly legitimate reasons for opposing many of the ideas and practices commonly promoted by development institutions. But critics of the poststructuralist approach have also been quick to dismiss some of its most cherished tenets. For instance, first, the poststructuralists’ near exclusive focus on how power is achieved through development discourse is generally thought to be too narrow (Everett 1997). Their lack of attention to the historical context of actual power relations and local political struggles means that they tend to ignore the more material aspects of the physical and social reproduction of wealth and poverty (Edelman 1999)—for instance, geographic isolation, lack of infrastructure, asset distribution, and so on.

Second, poststructuralists like to portray “development” as monolithic and all-powerful, thereby not only disregarding the important political and professional differences that exist within governments, NGOs, and development institutions but also misunderstanding the profoundly cultural and contentious nature of the development process itself (Edelman 1999:207–208). As a result they have frequently ignored the considerable contributions to understanding the social, cultural, and ecological processes of development that have come from anthropologists working outside the context of development projects (Little and Painter 1995). The list of such contributions is much too long to go into in any great detail in this paper, but several notable contributors will be discussed below.

In sum, poststructuralists have tended to overlook both the achievements of development (however modest these may be in particular cases or even what the costs of opting out might have been) and the ways it can and has been locally appropriated and reshaped (Van Ausdal 2001). By implication, poststructuralists have found it difficult to offer spe-
cific and viable alternatives to the often deplorable situations they decry. This shortcoming is attested to by poststructuralists’ often uncritical celebration of imagined differences, traditions, and autonomy. The implication is that somehow by simply talking critically about development discourse, anthropologists can demonstrate political solidarity with the oppressed (Little and Painter 1995). This penchant has earned poststructuralists a well-deserved reputation for preaching a rather weak version of politically correct anthropology (Grillo and Stirrat 1997).

These theoretical and methodological objections to the poststructuralists’ anthropology of development constitute the basis of what I understand to be the monitorists’ critical engagement with development issues. On the whole, monitorists tend to agree with the poststructuralists’ assumption that the “languages of development constitute an important representational field in which the meanings and intentionalities of development policies can be grasped and analysed” (Arce 2000:32). But whereas poststructuralists have portrayed development programs as little more than elegant log frames and techniques of control, monitorists have preferred to recognize them as embodiments of at times highly idiosyncratic interests and desires (Arce and Long 2000a). For example, the notion of *ujamaa* or “familyhood” appealed to in state-sponsored efforts to forcibly reorganize Tanzanian pastoralists in village cooperatives during the 1970s (Husain 1976) were likely very different from more recent invocations in Africa and elsewhere of the virtues of participation or women’s land rights. Development discourse can thus more accurately be conceived of as a fairly mutable blend of rhetoric, official practices, and political theory (Rew 1997).

Neither do the monitorists accord this discourse the same ability to control peoples’ actions as do the poststructuralists. The former see actors as maintaining their own interests, resources, and power and playing an important role in representing their own demands and practices (Arce 2000). Thus we find among the monitorists many actor-oriented researchers who focus on the “intricate interplay and joint appropriation and transformation of different bodies of knowledge” (Arce and Long 2000b:24). One of the key strengths of the monitorists’ approach to development is thus the way they highlight the need to analyze the dynamic interpretations, strategies, and practices of local actors and not just their reactions to outside interventions. The crucial task for anthropology then becomes to develop methodologies and theoretical interpretations of the different knowledge interfaces inherent in intervention processes and ongoing local and global changes (Arce and Long 2000b:24–27).

The following examples will briefly illustrate the value of adopting an anthropological approach to development that focuses on how local political economies link human activity, capital, and nature in specific forms. Lois Stanford’s (2000) study of peasant resistance to international agribusiness in Mexico recognizes local peasants’ agency and capacity to take action without losing sight of the dangers they face in doing so within the structural constraints of an international commodity system. One of the strengths of her approach is therefore to effectively demonstrate the importance of understanding the many factors contributing to development opportunities and constraints within the multivocal and multisited dynamics of their unique sociocultural contexts. A similar point about the importance of contextualizing local-level data within the broader histor-
ical processes of development has been made by Painter (1995), whose chief concern is, rather, to assess the environmental implications of such changes.

By carefully extrapolating from the findings of such analyses, I believe that it may actually be possible to predict some of the likely consequences of specific policy changes and development interventions. This is at least the theory behind the increasingly popular use of social impact assessments in the early stages of development planning. In the case of Mexico, economic reforms introduced in the 1980s reduced agricultural subsidies and dismantled a highly regulated support system for agricultural producers and agroindustries, substituting these with incentives to increase productivity that were more responsive to real comparative advantages (Lopez et al. 1995). Stanford’s analysis of the globalization of agricultural commodity systems in Michoacán suggests that to effectively support the transition from a government-directed to a market-driven agricultural sector, it is crucial to provide assistance to farmers who may be negatively affected by the reforms in the short run. This could be done through direct income supports, help to change to more profitable crops, and assistance for transforming their cooperatives and associations into viable and productive socioeconomic units. It seems that had such measures been more effectively implemented, it may have been possible to avoid the tragic episodes of sabotage that eroded agribusiness confidence and profits—ultimately undermining the economic well-being of the perpetrators, local peasants themselves.

As I noted in the beginning of this paper, further examples of the vitality of this global movement in anthropology and related social sciences toward more strategic engagements with development issues can also be seen in the large number of initiatives challenging the more conventional, top-down approaches to indigenous peoples’ rights and development. For instance, numerous anthropologists have been involved in cases of common property–related innovations (i.e., community forestry, multiple-use ecological reserves, comanagement of fisheries, giving land rights to herders and nomadic peoples, indigenous land claims, etc.) that have tested various hypotheses regarding the necessary elements of an enabling legal framework and the desirability of specific policy actions for improving the livelihoods and respect for the rights of affected populations. The results of these studies and similar experiences include policy recommendations for (1) strengthening groups for holding rights to land and other resources and for negotiating with the diverse interests of various stakeholders and (2) establishing a platform of relevant knowledge, technological options, and policy instruments for managing resources internally for achieving local aspirations (Lane 2001). These needs have been perceived to apply to a wide range of contexts including the devolution of natural resource management from the state to local groups, the administration of protected areas, market development, redistributive land reform, conflict prevention and resolution, the provision of social and community services, and so forth, all of which are well beyond the scope of this paper.

My goal in mentioning these examples here is simply to reinforce a key argument of those whom I have sought to characterize as the “monitorist” faction in debates about the anthropology of development: namely, the crucial importance of detailed ethnographic work on the production and transformation of the social practices of development and, hence, the need for ethnography in shaping development policies (Arce and Long...
As the following section will further attest, the relevance of such insights is now frequently acknowledged by development practitioners.

**DEVELOPMENT ANTHROPOLOGY**

Any generalized adoption of social anthropology would be, I believe, merely an expensive way of avoiding a few, not very costly, mistakes by OFR/FSP teams.

—Simmonds, 1984 (see Cernea and Guggenheim 1985:507)

As I mentioned at the outset of this paper, anthropologists have become key players—both in absolute numbers and in institutional weight—within the development industry itself. The numbers of anthropologists now working for multilateral development agencies (e.g., the World Bank, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the Inter-American Development Bank) or the bilaterals (e.g., Canadian, U.S., and British aid agencies) are quite revealing in this respect. The World Bank’s in-house corps of professional anthropologists and sociologists increased from one lone practitioner in 1974 (i.e., Michael Cernea) to over 50 by the mid-1990s (Cernea 1995). Similarly, the number of “social development advisors” (mostly anthropologists) at the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development increased from just two in 1988 to more than 50 only ten years latter (Stirrat 2000).

A fairly broad consensus attributes these increases to shifting definitions of development and growing awareness of the importance of social and cultural phenomena to effective development policies and planning. In the previous section, I showed how these changes have helped to promote greater academic interests in the anthropology of development, an approach that I suggested is most successfully articulated in the so-called monitorists’ engagements with development as a collection of cultural, economic, and political processes. And yet there are other equally legitimate approaches to rethinking the relationship between anthropology and development, perhaps most significant among them the “development anthropology” approach (e.g., Grillo’s [1985] reformers). Contrary to the academic terms that dominated debates about development within the discipline throughout the 1990s, development anthropologists focus on more pragmatic issues such as the what, when, and how of anthropological contributions to development practice. This section is devoted to exploring some key aspects of the effects of these efforts on the evolution and current status of anthropological concepts and methods in the discourse and practice of development organizations.

**Secretary to the Nonbelievers**

The growing acceptance of the relevance of anthropology in development policy and studies circles is to many not so much astonishing as it is overdue. But then we should not underestimate the significance of such a shift, given that many professional development economists most likely still prefer to see themselves as engaged in the purely scientific endeavor of analyzing clearly quantifiable survey data for measuring statistically signifi-
cant correlations. A particularly revealing episode in the ongoing struggle to establish the relevance of anthropology to development occurred with agricultural economists, many of whom sought to deny a role for the social sciences in Farming Systems Research (FSR; Cernea and Guggenheim 1985).

Cernea and Guggenheim (1985) contend that agricultural economists often fail to grasp the interplay among the social sciences that jointly inform FSR. They argue for recognizing the social and cultural variables that must be studied under the FSR approach and outline reasons why anthropological and sociological concepts and skills are indispensable to FSR teams. For example, anthropologists and sociologists have a number of procedures for participant-observation, informal surveys, in-depth case studies, and so on to gather and interpret reliable field data for understanding a range of issues and variables—many of which even the most avowedly scientific economist would be forced to profess a passing interest in: for instance, the relationship between landowning and social structure, the social organization of family labor resources, the causes and consequences of cognitive and behavioral changes, and so on (Cernea and Guggenheim 1985).

Why, then, should there continue to be a need to make the case for the value of adopting social science methods to obtain the relevant knowledge to identify significant issues and key questions without which an adequate survey questionnaire could simply not be constructed? At least two key reasons have conspired to exclude professional social scientists from development planning and policy making, at least one of which is largely self-induced. First of all, much of the knowledge produced and the skills taught in university social science programs tend to be too general or abstract to be of much practical utility or relevance beyond the discipline. As a result, even the most technically capable social scientists have encountered widespread ignorance and skepticism from their colleagues in development agencies and government departments (e.g., the “nonbelievers”) as to the ways in which they can contribute to development initiatives (Hulme and Turner 1990).

Such semantic and epistemological confusions were likely influential in the World Bank’s limited recourse to professional anthropologists before the 1980s, preferring instead to rely on the general experience of its professional staff (often overseas-resident technical specialists) for advice on what were considered the sociocultural aspects of their projects (Husain 1976). Hence we had a situation during the 1960s where much of the valuable knowledge produced by social scientists was effectively ignored by development planners and policy makers until a decade or so later, when a series of more applied social scientists began to develop policy and operational solutions to help solve some of the thorniest problems of the day (Cernea 1995). Key examples of this process have included lessons learned from the often disastrous experiences of development projects with issues like involuntary resettlement, environmental damage, gender discrimination, and cultural assimilation.

The combined effects of these efforts to communicate the results of social science research to policy makers and the increasing recognition of the complexity of the socioeconomic dynamics affecting the context of development projects meant that the World Bank eventually recognized the need for more professional consideration of social variables. The initial aim of employing a sociocultural specialist on development projects was ostensibly to anticipate more of the previously unexpected results and to design out the
undesirable factors (Rew 1997). The role of the first social scientists brought in to work with the World Bank in the 1970s was thus to assist task teams in understanding the sociocultural and institutional concerns of a given project. The logic behind the annexation of anthropologists to project appraisal and evaluation teams in this manner derives from misunderstanding reality as a syncretic amalgam of technical issues wherein sociocultural variables are basically minor ingredients—as opposed to essential and structuring elements of the major problems commonly encountered in development interventions. These arguments in favor of the relevance of an add-on anthropological module earned several practitioners a glorified place at the margins of development planning and policy making (Cernea 1995). Some anthropologists may be perfectly comfortable in this familiar role as consummate outsiders. After all, a distinguishing hallmark of the discipline and considerable source of pride for many of its most avid practitioners continues to be the emphasis placed on long-term field research in any of the more culturally and geographically remote locations of our planet.

By insisting instead on criticizing the technocratic and econocentric rigidity of the blueprint thinking so prevalent in development work, the focus on commodities rather than social actors, the disregard for local knowledge, and the indifference toward grassroots institutions and organizations (Cernea 1991), a committed generation of social scientists has successfully argued the case for development anthropology in terms of its disciplinary competence for “revealing the models of social organization that underpin social processes and link social actors” (Cernea 1995:20). This alternative rationale for development anthropology as “the methodology for clarifying the social and behavioral mechanisms of development and change” (Cernea 1995:9) provides a powerful conceptual framework for analyzing the prevailing symbolic, cultural, and economic systems that link various actors together through networks of dependency and obligation. This approach has helped to redefine both development problems and solutions, and the recommendations of anthropologists were piloted, adopted, expanded, and refined throughout the 1980s. The knowledge and tools developed during this initial experimental phase of project involvement were gradually expanded and systematized, as “Do No Harm” became the prevailing focus of social development activities at the World Bank until the mid-1990s (Dani 2002).

**Rapid and Reliable Research Methods: An Oxymoron?**

Having thus successfully made the strong case for the relevance of social analysis to purposively pursued development initiatives, attentions shifted to the need for more systematic approaches to data collection. Chambers (1991) suggests that professional practices and development project approaches to social research have typically suffered from four common problems: first, the physical, biological, and numerical aspects of development projects have been the primary concern of planners, not the social dimensions. Second, because poorer people tend to be less accessible and less organized, their needs and priorities have often been neglected. Third, conventional methods of social
investigation have not been cost-effective, and fourth, information has generally only been acquired, owned, and analyzed by and for the uses of outsiders.

Traditional methods of social investigation based on lengthy and detailed field studies, although capable of providing more complete and usually less biased understandings of local sociocultural dynamics, are often unrealistic and impractical given the planning imperatives and time constraints of development project cycles. This is not to say that systematic, in-depth investigations are irrelevant to development projects—as I hope to have adequately demonstrated above in my discussions of the valuable contributions that such approaches are capable of making. Nonetheless, large-scale multidisciplinary surveys have proven to be notoriously inefficient from the standpoint of both the quality of the data produced and the amount of time required to analyze and publish the results (Chambers 1991).

At the other extreme, Chambers also cautions against the dangers of relying on “quick and dirty” shortcut procedures to elicit social information. Dirty is used here to mean not cost-effective, for the label refers to the common practice of sending urban-based professionals on superficial “rural tourism”—type visits to project areas (Chambers 1991:518). Inevitably in such situations, investigators are funneled toward the more successful people and places, where they nonetheless lack the rapport necessary for interpreting respondents’ replies. Furthermore, they are likely to see only a snapshot of the physical things and activities present in a location at a particular moment in time. All but the most remarkable investigators will completely miss the more significant dimensions of social life embodied in local cultural norms and informal organizations (Chambers 1991). The results are quite predictably biased and misleading assessments of local (esp. the poorest) peoples’ needs and priorities.

Enter Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), a multidisciplinary set of techniques adapted from social science interview and survey methods—initially designed to meet the diagnostic needs of Farming Systems Research. More recently, RRA has been adapted to provide relatively comprehensive sociocultural, economic, and ecological assessments of the population of a project area for the purposes of development project planning and implementation (Molnar 1991). RRA methods are frequently portrayed as comprising a menu of options from which to select and combine depending on the research project’s information needs, local characteristics, and resource/time constraints. Typically these options include secondary data reviews, direct observation, semistructured interviews, group interviews, mapping exercises, and so forth. According to Molnar (1991), these Rapid Rural Appraisal methods share four important characteristics. First, they are (as the name implies) rapid—allowing for research results to be made available quickly to decision makers. Second, they are eclectic—meaning that the precise combination of interview and survey techniques can be tailored to meet specific needs. Third, RRA methods are holistic, in the sense that they draw on multidisciplinary perspectives to produce a comprehensive picture of a locale. And finally, they are interactive—insofar as they allow for valuable communication between investigators and the population affected by the project (Molnar 1991:11–12).
The guiding principles of RRA—triangulation of research methods and information sources; deliberate actions to offset biases; optimizing trade-offs among the quantity, relevance, timeliness, truth, and actual beneficial use of information—are not so much innovative as they are unorthodox in the manner and sequence in which they are combined through the use of the various research techniques (Chambers 1991). RRA is therefore well suited to such tasks as identifying interesting questions, designing sampling strategies, assessing logistical needs, testing the appropriateness of survey questionnaires, and initiating rapport building (Bryant and Bailey 1991). Furthermore, the information generated through the use of RRA methods has proven to be most relevant where the researchers are themselves members of the project team, and not urban-based specialists with limited previous exposure to the area or vested interest in accurately assessing local concerns (Molnar 1991). The qualitative results of such research can be treated as hypotheses to be subjected to quantitative confirmation before these findings can be generalized to a larger population. In this sense, there continues to be a need for formal surveys as an essential companion exercise to confirm or disprove planning assumptions “made glibly over a five day period” (Molnar 1991:14).

This last statement points toward two related pitfalls that the advocates of RRA have frequently paid insufficient attention to: namely, first, the tendency to gloss over the complexities and efficacies of the participant-observation techniques used by social scientists in both shortcut and long-term research situations and, second, the risk of promoting complacency when making judgments from limited data (Molnar 1991). Short time frames also enhance the risk that intense research schedules will lead to sloppy interviewing. Carelessly applied, RRA can thus be indistinguishable from “information strip-mining,” producing a strong sense of intrusion and correspondingly low levels of acquired social knowledge (Finan and Van Willigen 1991). In this sense, short should never be seen as better but, rather, a necessary evil given development planning horizons. Another reason for the general lack of enthusiasm for RRA among academics has been attributed to the fact that the careers of those in the academy often depend on the intensive study of the livelihoods of those whom the practitioners of RRA seek to permanently change (Gow 2002).

Reactions to RRA from non–social sciences development practitioners have also been mixed. Since the early 1980s, for example, social scientists at the World Bank have consistently stressed comprehensive and systematic approaches to gaining a qualitative understanding of “peoples’ values and behavior in relation to a planned or ongoing intervention for social and economic change” (Salmen 1998:1). Salmen (1987) suggests that the World Bank’s use of Beneficiary Assessment (BA)—together with Participatory Rural Appraisal constituting the two most common methods the bank uses for what it calls “Systematic Client Consultations”—has helped projects achieve a better match between the services needed and the services being offered such that the overall costs of implementing a project were significantly lowered. And yet, even though project managers are reportedly overwhelmingly convinced of the value and benefits of BA, most of the funding for such activities has had to come from trust funds and project preparation grants—not the bank’s own operational budget (Salmen 1998:12).
Practitioners of RRA have also come under pressure to design more systematic approaches to improve the quality of the information generated through the use of shortcut techniques, to clarify management expectations (i.e., time and cost requirements, attainable confidence levels), and to identify the training needs of project staff. But RRA practitioners are justifiably reluctant to allow agencies to determine methodologies, as checklist-type approaches are likely to miss central issues visible only to more flexible uses of RRA (Molnar 1991). Molnar has also identified a series of yet-to-be-resolved methodological issues concerning the use of RRA in natural resource management projects: for example, when to prefer group versus individual interviews, what the valid indicators and proxies are, how not to miss the least visible groups during RRA, and what kinds of topics are inappropriate for RRA investigations (1991:12).

Another strategy that is increasingly being promoted in order to counter some of the problems affecting the quality of RRA research results—especially the fact that RRA has not contributed significantly to sustainable local action or institutional development—is to encourage the research subjects (e.g., the local community) to become partners in the research process. According to Finan and Van Willigen (1991), the guiding assumption of such participatory approaches to research is that local stakeholders possess valuable knowledge that they will be more willing to share with outsiders if they also share in the basic research objectives. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) methods are generally viewed as a subset of RRA whereby outsiders behave less as extractors of information and more as catalysts and facilitators. To accomplish these roles, PRA methods emphasize intensive interrogation and the use of role reversals and visual techniques in public places. But the social context (power, authority, inequality) of information elicitation can also bias PRA results—especially as the very poor may be reluctant to potentially compromise their economic or social security by publicly stating their needs (Rew 1997).

The value of PRA is also limited by the fact that an important component of cultural knowledge is encoded in technical routines and everyday experiences and therefore cannot easily be elicited verbally. This means that knowledge of both private and public events is needed and that public empowerment exercises need to be balanced with extended periods of critical observation. Other dangers commonly associated with the use of PRA include ritualism and insincerity, amateurish overenthusiasm, and hostility from participating disciplinary specialists (Rew 1997). Thus, although participatory research approaches continue to be widely promoted, they are frequently more difficult to implement. On the whole, PRA has been most successful in cases where the research objectives are quite specific and practical (e.g., where to locate a road) and the populations involved are literate (Finan and Van Willigen 1991).

The decisive factors in the evolution and use of RRA methods (and PRA as well) are likely to continue to revolve around two key features: it does not require a large team and can provide relevant results quite quickly, and thus, it has proven to be highly cost-efficient when compared with in-depth individual interviews and quantitative surveys. So despite the mixed reactions and lukewarm reception the advent and growing popularity of RRA have received from academics and non–social science development practitioners, increasing numbers of development decisions are being made on the basis of information generated through...
the use of these supposedly “quick and clean” methods. This broad acceptance of RRA in the 1990s by aid agencies (including in-house advisers and managers) contrasts considerably with the more cautious incorporation of individual social analysts in the 1980s. Even Participatory Rural Appraisal methods are now increasingly mainstream (Rew 1997).

As a result, there is now the added threat that the considerable pressures being brought to bear on development aid—most notably for effectiveness, accountability, disbursement, and visible impacts—will be turned into pressures on social development specialists for methods that increase the aid agencies’ and governments’ control over aid supply and over the management of “popular consultation” (Rew 1997:102). A similarly cynical view has been expressed about development agencies’ adoption of “participation” for purely instrumental reasons—that is, as a means to ensure compliance with project objectives. The significance of this danger must also be appreciated against the backdrop of ongoing calls for a “behavioralist” conceptual model of development anthropology. The problem with this line of argument is that while it emphasizes the need for individuals to amend the misconstrued perceptions and attitudes that encourage their detrimental behaviors (vis-à-vis the environment, public institutions, or other individuals), it pays insufficient attention to the group structures and vested interests that play an important role in shaping individual behavior (Cernea 1995).

Regardless of this potential for cooptation, these changes have meant a far greater scope for social analysts to influence project design and implementation—something that the academic discipline of anthropology has frequently been reluctant to acknowledge. And yet, contrary to what Rew (1997:101) writes about the limited nature of the significance of these reforms in favor of social action and participation, these changes have in fact encouraged numerous critical appraisals of RRA methods and their uses. This evidence is encouraging, as it testifies to the fact that development practitioners are increasingly willing to recognize that the choice of research technique is not as important as the need to vest planning responsibilities in appropriate groups and to have a good prior understanding of the social and cultural conditions governing effective participation in planning (Rew 1997:101). To advocate for the inclusion of such an approach in development initiatives is hardly to favor some new form of disciplinary imperialism for anthropology. These methods are intended to complement, not preclude, the use of quantitative techniques. The RRA approach is based on common sense and experience, both of which show convincingly that to ignore the methods and concepts of anthropology in development studies and projects wastes scarce funds on the production of inaccurate data, dilutes research efforts and lowers standards, entrenches the impunity of technocrats and ivory-tower academics, and breeds discontent among the objects of such research at the local level who desperately seek a better life.

From “Do No Harm” to “Do More Good”

The above discussion of the effects of social science concepts and methods on development discourse and practice indicates greater recognition that economic institutions are embedded in social relations; that formal rules are often different from (or in conflict with)
informal ones; and that it is therefore necessary to understand not only who the key stakeholders are but also how they negotiate, maintain, enhance, and protect their interests, as this can make the difference between project success and failure (Dani 2002). In the case of the World Bank, this awareness is quite convincingly articulated in the principles emphasized in the agency’s flagship 2001 *World Development Report* (i.e., opportunity, empowerment, security). The significance of these achievements is also underscored by changes in the nature of social scientists’ contributions to the World Bank’s operations: not only have they helped to improve the appropriateness of the specific changes that projects have sought to induce, but they are increasingly involved in crafting the policies that seek to chart the paths toward achieving the desired outcomes and social effects (Cernea 1995:11).

Cernea is emphatic that this ability to recognize and incorporate sociocultural dimensions in development policies and projects has greatly contributed to project successes. For him (1995:12), there can be no doubt that good social analysis really does lead to better development projects. Chambers is only somewhat less optimistic when he argues that the use of RRA methods with a focus on social information “can substantively improve the current project process used by development and government agencies” (1991:529). For his part, Rew (1997) finds that aid agency practice has been illuminated and changed (for the better) as a result of participatory assessments. But other development anthropologists, for example, Gow (1995), Stirrat (2000), and Phillips and Edwards (2000), are less triumphant in their assessments of this fundamental question. Rew (1997) looked at how project planners and evaluation specialists from five different development agencies wrote about cultural issues in a sample of almost 400 projects implemented during the 1980s. The key questions that Rew asked are (1) Did the project preparation and evaluation teams recognize, either explicitly or implicitly, sociocultural dimensions as relevant to the project? and (2) If so, did they specify a methodology or approach for integrating these sociocultural factors with the economic and technical analysis and project recommendations? To his surprise, he (1997:90) found that fully 75 percent of the project reports refer to sociocultural factors (e.g., peoples’ behavior patterns) in ways that reflect a genuine awareness of the need to consider these factors in project planning and implementation. However, Rew also found that the interpretation and use of this sociocultural awareness are often arbitrary and inconsistent. Social and cultural considerations are portrayed as “outside” the agency’s core areas of concern—as somehow relevant to the customs of the locals, rather than as an essential element of technical assistance and project design. Even in the 10 percent of projects reviewed that had commissioned separate sociocultural studies, Rew (1997:91–92) suggests that it was not always apparent how these annexes were put to use in the actual projects.

Gow (1995) reaches a similar conclusion about generally improved projects but notes that the overall quality of the social analyses involved was not sufficiently rigorous or critical. He attributes these deficiencies to a number of structural and institutional factors, including the fact that, within any bureaucracy, to criticize too loudly can mean little or no impact; short-term consultants may be reluctant to bite the hands that feed them, as
this could compromise their future employment prospects; and the still common practice of concentrating social analysis activities (and the social scientists who perform them) in the project assessment and evaluation phases, which are of more limited consequence. Despite the existence of such formidable constraints to the full-scale deployment of the social sciences in development institutions, Gow is adamant that the real challenges facing development anthropologists lie elsewhere. For him, successful development has little to do with the quality of social analysis (e.g., “a bag of tricks and techniques for eliciting relevant information—processing and packaging it for consumption by decision-makers” [1993:392]) or even project design per se. Gow (1995:51) sees both essentially as advocacy documents written to obtain funding—not planning documents to facilitate implementation. In his extensive project experience, the crucial factor that determines the nature and extent of the influence of anthropologists is their authority and credibility vis-à-vis their development colleagues and higher political authorities, a coin of the realm that Gow (1993:394) suggests is best minted from a combination of objectivity, insider insights, and critical self-awareness.

Stirrat is similarly convinced of the limited importance of the pragmatic effects of social science contributions to development programs. He suggests that although it is widely claimed that social analysis has pragmatic objectives, “in practice it is judged in terms of aesthetics, judgement and taste” (Stirrat 2000:43). Thus, instead of worrying about how to improve social analysis and how it might be made to enhance an agency’s ability to help the poor, break down gender barriers, save tropical forests, and so on, Stirrat emphasizes the “cultural performance” elements inherent in social analysis as a particular form of “rational objectivity”—which continues to derive much of its substance and appeal from the modernist paradigm of empirical reality. In this view, even the claims of the self-styled critics of development (e.g., proponents of PRA and indigenous knowledge) to be empowering local people through access to and mobilization of knowledge are themselves firmly within the “culture of modernity” paradigm (Stirrat 2000:40–43). This paradigm may be fundamentally at odds with the eternally elusive elements of trust and mutual respect that have proven essential in cases of successful social change (Phillips and Edwards 2000).

**ANTHROPOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT: KEY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

Development is by its nature social. Its ends embody social values. Its means are social processes and institutions. Its benefits and costs are distributed across communities, social groups, and organizations.

—Francis and Jacobs 1999

The goal of this paper has been to assess the effect of anthropological theory and methods on development programs and studies. My main objective in doing so was to answer the question of whether or not more or better social analysis leads to better
development outcomes. Although the bulk of the evidence considered in this critical
evaluation of the anthropology of development and development anthropology litera-
tures suggests that the answer to this broad question is affirmative, a number of signifi-
cant caveats must be recognized. For the truth in this matter, as in so many of the social
science concerns dealt with throughout this paper, is not something that is simply “out
there” waiting to be objectively discovered through the technically proficient application
of expert research methods. My approach to the fundamental question posed at the out-
set of this paper has been to rely on some of the very principles guiding the search for
rapid and reliable research methods—for example, triangulation, offsetting of biases,
optimizing trade-offs—in order to produce a somewhat comprehensive and relevant
understanding of key anthropologists’ values and behavior in relation to ongoing or
planned interventions for social and economic change.

This meant looking back at the discipline’s prominently contested postcolonial legacy
and at the enduring debates about the epistemological status and ethical merits of
applied social science research endeavors. I then showed how the tenor of these academic
debates set the stage for the emergence of three influential anthropological perspectives
on development. Although prone to overstating the significance of their own antidevel-
opment rhetoric, the poststructuralist-inspired rejectionists’ emphasis on the key role of
language and power in the constitution of social reality has helped to clarify the role of
policy narratives in defining development problems and justifying politically motivated
choices. This section underscored the importance of detailed ethnographic work in shap-
ing development policies by reviewing a series of valuable contributions to understand-
ing the social, cultural, and ecological processes of development that have come from
anthropologists working outside the context of development projects. The evidence from
these cases has led me to agree that a crucial task for anthropology is to develop method-
ologies and theoretical interpretations of the different knowledge interfaces inherent in
intervention processes and ongoing local and global changes.

The following section reviewed how a number of highly pragmatic ethnographic con-
tributions to development programs have come in the form of contextualized observa-
tions of social actions that allowed for more rigorous understandings of what people do
and the ideas and beliefs that shape these behaviors. I argued that recognition of this fact
is driving a considerable amount of experimentation with social science research meth-
ods that seeks to make social analysis more rapid and reliable. Finally, I assessed the evi-
dence of the effects of these anthropological approaches to development on sectoral
(agriculture, forestry, water) and cross-sectoral policies (resettlement, indigenous peo-
pies, NGOs), on socioeconomic and environmental policies (poverty alleviation, partic-
ipation), and on the improved performance of development projects and their relevance
in the eyes of their intended beneficiaries.

On the basis of the evidence and arguments put forward in this paper I believe that
there are now considerable opportunities for anthropologists to influence the nature and
course of development in ways that can have profound consequences for the quality of
life of current and future human generations. By articulating the kinds of fine-grained
definitions of local experiences that are the specialty of anthropological accounts with a
detailed knowledge of the wider world within which project managers negotiate and implement their interventions, anthropologists can make significant contributions to the design of and experimentation with theoretical frameworks for the application of anthropological knowledge to development policies and interventions. To be effective at this task, anthropologists must go beyond the conventional focus on “bottom-up” development and include actions to address the political and institutional constraints that prevent people from realizing their full potential (Gow 1995).

However, the phenomena that I have considered here relate almost exclusively to the “scientific” side of the development business—the what, when, and how questions around which at least some common language exists. I have barely scratched the more textured and opaque surface of the equally if not more important “artistic” or aesthetic dimension of the issues insinuated above. This corresponds to the who and why types of questions that are still so frequently inadequately dealt with in an arbitrary and uncritical manner.

NOTES

1. See Bozzoli 2000; Brokensha 2001; Chaiken and Fleuret 1990; King 1999; Pottier 1993b.
2. For examples of the relations between academics and indigenous peoples involved in land claims negotiations, see Howitt et al. 1996; Hvalkof 2002; Mohamed and Ventura 2000; Scott and Mullrennan 1999.
3. For more on social science, participatory research, and development, see Berardi 2002; Chambers 1992; Pottier 1997; Rocheleau 1994. For good discussions of the role of anthropologists and also the strengths and weaknesses of impact assessments, see Chase 1990; Gasteyer and Flora 2000; O’Faircheallaigh 1999; Vanclay 2002.
6. See, for example, Asad 1973; Deloria 1969; Lewis 1973. Lewis (1973) describes the early 1970s as a time of crisis for anthropology, when some fieldworkers were occasionally forced to pose as economists or sociologists just to gain access to the countries they wished to enter.
7. See, for instance, Bellier and Legros (2001), who argue that the recent political activism of Canadian indigenous peoples in favor of territorial rights and self-determination has frequently been an unacknowledged consequence of participation—both voluntary and forced—in state education programs.
8. For a sampling of development economics perspectives, see Alston et al. 1999; Deininger 2003; De Janvry and Sadoulet 2001; Feder 1999; Kanbur 2002; Prebisch 1972; Sen 1999; Soto 2000.
10. Although a detailed discussion of neo-Marxist and dependency theories of development is clearly beyond the scope of this paper, it should be noted that these critiques have had a profound influence on the more contemporary poststructuralist critiques of development discussed below.
11. Notable anthropological reformists have included Barlett (1986), Gow (1991), Pottier (1997), Sillitoe (1998), and Stone (2003). My usage of this category excludes the many practicing reformists employed directly by development institutions (e.g., Cernea 1995; Cruz and Davis 1997; Davis 1993; Francis and Jacobs 1999), although considerable overlap exists between the views and even the memberships of these two groups (see, e.g., Stirrat 2000 on the nature of development consulting).

13. For a good example of the heterogeneity of development institutions, in this case the World Bank, see Clark et al. 2003; Fox and Brown 1998. See Fox and Brown 1998 in particular for a discussion of the various internal (reformers, managers, operational staff, etc.) and external (governments, NGOs, project beneficiaries, etc.) constituencies and their respective roles in setting World Bank policy and project priorities.

14. Other notable attempts to take up this challenge have recently been made by Haugerud et al. (2000), Loker (1999), Phillips (1998), and Sillitoe (1998).

15. For a detailed discussion of the predictive capacity of the social sciences and its implications for development policy, see Sillitoe 1998.

16. For detailed discussions of the theory and practice of social impact assessments, see Barrow 1997; Becker 1997; Burdge et al. 1995; O’Fairchallaigh 1999; Vanclay 2002.

17. For in-depth regional reviews of such initiatives being developed in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and North America, see Buckles 1999; Lewis et al. 1996; Poole 1989; Wells et al. 1992.

18. See, for example, Berry 1993; Borrini-Feyerabend 2003; Howitt et al. 1996; Hvalkof 2002; Richards 1997; Young 1999.

19. For a summary discussion of the range and diversity of these methods, see also Baker 2000; Chambers 1991.

20. For more detailed discussions of experience with participatory approaches to research, see, for example, Berardi 2002; Bhatnagar and Williams 1992; Huizer 1997; Mosse 1994; Pottier 1997; Rietbergen-McCracken and Narayan 1998.

21. For examples of critical evaluations of the application of social science methodologies in development interventions, see Bhatnagar and Williams 1992; Brown et al. 2002; Dani 2002; Hay 2000; Huizer 1997; Krueger et al. 2001; Pottier 1993a; Renshaw et al. 2001; Rietbergen-McCracken and Narayan 1998—only two of which had been published at the time Rew was writing.
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