

Book Proposal

From Accidental Anthropologist to Man in the Middle to the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change

By
Tony L. Whitehead¹, PhD, MsHyg.

Monograph 1 of the Proposed Series: *Codifying and Reading Culture as an Interpretive Human Science*

Tony L. Whitehead PhD, MsHyg, Series Editor

Introduction to the Proposed Monograph Series

On July 1, 2014, I retired as a member of the full time faculty of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maryland in order to try to complete a series of interrelated monographs that reflect my 40 Year career straddling 2 professional cultures, anthropology & public health. Over that period, I have developed a research, training, and technical assistance system, titled the *Cultural Ecology of Health and Change (the CEHC)*, which integrates theories and methods from both anthropology and public health, and includes three conceptual paradigms, and four program systems that have provided a guide to my work in community health research, and in the design, implementation, and evaluation of intervention programs.

I had initially planned to produce a single book. But once I started writing, I realized that the enormity of the CEHC would produce a book so long and cumbersome that finding a publisher could be very difficult. So Instead, I decided to chop all of the CEHC content and tools into a number of interrelated monographs, ranging between 60-300 pages. The focus of the current document however is a synopsis of the first monograph tentatively titled, *From Accidental Anthropologist, to Man in the Middle, to the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change*. Following are brief abstracts for each of the chapters that are being proposed for this Monograph 1, with the exception of Chapter 1, as here I felt I needed a little more length to introduce the reader to the background and rationale for the series title, *Codifying and Reading Culture as an Applied Human Science*.

¹ © The property of TL Whitehead. If quoted, please cite as following: **Whitehead, TL, (2014a) Chapter 1, "Introduction to 'From Accidental Anthropologist to Man in the Middle to the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change'.) Book in Preparation, Vol. 1 of the Planned Monograph Series, Codifying and Reading Culture as an Interpretive Human Science, TL Whitehead Associates. <http://tony-whitehead.squarespace.com/tools-products/>. Do not duplicate or distribute without permission from tonywhitehead1122@gmail.com, or 703-620-0515.**

Chapter 1, *Introduction*. This chapter begins with my professional journey as represented in the monograph's title. The label of the accidental anthropologist is not originally my own, but a faculty perception of me during my graduate student years, as shared by one of those faculty members twenty years later. However, upon reflecting how I stumbled upon the discipline while studying for my masters degree in public health, and the marginality I experienced throughout graduate studies in anthropology, I soon accepted this description. The chapter then moves on to a discussion of my experiences of ongoing views by a number of my colleagues in public health to my approach to research in their field as fascinating, but not science; while at the same time some of my anthropology colleagues view what I do as not being *anthropology*². This experience of marginality in two professional cultures is reflected in the phrase in monograph's title of a "Man in the Middle." The remainder of this Chapter 1 provides brief introductions to the remaining chapters in this Monograph 1.

Chapter 2, tentatively titled *Foundational Contributors to the Evolution of a Man in the Middle: Guy Steuart and the UNC Department of Health Education at the University of North Carolina*. This chapter focuses on the foundation of not only my evolution as this professional man in the middle, but also on my evolution as a community health anthropologist/ ethnographer while at the University of North Carolina. In this first chapter of monograph 1, I recognize and thank my former chairperson during my 11 1/2 years on the faculty of Health Education Department (HEED) at the University of North Carolina's School of Public Health, Dr. Guy Steuart, for putting me into this somewhat precarious position by first threatening to fire me for wasting my time and theirs by putting so much time and effort into trying to become a quantitatively oriented epidemiologist or biostatistician, rather than applying anthropology and ethnography to public health. However, in Chapter 2, I discuss not only Steuart's influence, but also about what I learned from other colleagues and students in UNC's Health Education Department, other health educational professionals, and probably most of all from residents in North Carolina communities with whom I worked during my time in North Carolina, most specifically residents of Johnston, County, and members of the Johnston County Citizens Association.

In **Chapter 3,** tentatively titled *Towards an "Interpretive" Human Science: Paradigms and Programs of the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change*, I begin by continuing my discussion of how Dr. Steuart's challenge and support for letting me find my own way in straddling the two fields, eventually led over the years to the evolution of the CEHC (the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change), and its orientation toward developing an alternative, but complementary approach to the dominant paradigm of the scientific process. I discuss this dominant scientific paradigm (DSP) view of science as a research process demonstrating an investigator controlled testing of hypothesized relationships between investigator-determined variables. The DSP I argue, often times drowns out the development of other approaches to understanding the complexity of the human condition, as well as the complexities of designing and implementing social or health interventions that may effectively improve the quality of life of those suffering poverty, lack of education, and other socio-cultural contributors to one's health status and overall life chances.

² As another of my former professors commented during 1996 interviews at his alma mater, "I am still not sure what you do is anthropology, but we are interested in your coming here because it seems that we have an increasing number of students who are interested in this applied stuff."

I go on to place my sense of marginality in two professions was further exacerbated by a position held by some anthropologists that cultural anthropology is not a science, and we might be better served by giving up on such misdirected perceptions (e.g., See Geertz, 1973). I go on to share my experiences of seven years working on the PhD in a very theoretical department of anthropology, followed by a long career working with public health professionals who advocated the necessity of the DSP in community health research, and the more than 35 years of mentoring graduate students, and new PhDs in Anthropology. These experiences convinced me that general absence of codification or standardization in the use of culture and ethnographic methods resulted in a host of difficulties for young anthropologist pursuing employment outside of simply teaching in an anthropology department. This dilemma became even more problematic as the increasing number of those with PhDs in anthropology quickly outstripped a continuing decline in job opportunities teaching anthropology. I became convinced that at the core of this dilemma was the inability of cultural anthropologists (as well as those trained in similar disciplines using culture and ethnography) to articulate and demonstrate the usefulness of the theoretical concepts and research methods in which anthropologists continue to be trained. But beyond the difficulty of achieving employment outside of the academy, there is also often a loss of effectiveness in the desire to contribute to the enhancement of the quality of life for those less fortunate—which is a goal of many activist anthropologists.

But even for those who do find employment in the academy, I argue, this lack of codification results in frustrations in training their students how to articulate their sense of who they are professionally when and if they find themselves having to pursue employment outside of academy based anthropology departments. I also argue that some degree of standardization in what we do, could possibly help in securing research funding that actually supports the work needed to adequately carry out the research, let alone support graduate (or undergraduate) research assistants who may then receive training and fiscal support from their mentor's efforts, as well as support for establishing their own professional track record (research experience, co-authored publications, and funding)--which increases their marketability when they graduate.

I then go on to argue that if not currently a science, cultural anthropology has the potential of being a very powerful one in interdisciplinary efforts to improve human quality of life issues. To do this, I share Stuart's recommendation to me thirty-seven years ago move away from viewing the DSP as this single notion of the scientific process, particularly when studying the complexity of the human condition, and place more time and energy into developing alternative but complementary approaches to the scientific process. I suggest that perhaps the most important thing to remember about the scientific process is that it is more about the rigor of the methodology, epistemology, and ontology in which one pursues one's research, rather than being dependent on a single methodological, epistemological, or ontological approach.

I then offer my own alternative complementary approach to science that has evolved over the past 40 years, and one that has its roots in cultural and linguistic anthropology. I discuss my view of science as a "language," a view rooted in ideas first put forward in cultural anthropology as *ethno-semantics* (the analysis of words and other components of language as the key to understanding meaning and culture) and *componential analysis*, which views culture as having interrelated components that can be analyzed, similar to the way that language has

interrelated components that can be analyzed (i.e., phonemes, morphemes, words, syntax, etc). I go on to point out that a major characteristic of language is that it becomes a standardized form of communication that makes it possible to clearly explain to oneself and to others their cultural (or professional) view of their worlds (or expertise). I argue that this focus on standardization and linked processes has made it possible for the dominant science paradigm to develop a body of knowledge into which new knowledge can be included as time goes on.

Drawing on views of ethno-semanticists I then argue that the concept of culture can be operationalized to address the complexities of the human condition, but has not achieved its potential in that respect not only because of the positivist views of the DSP, but also because of epistemological traditions in humanistic fields such as cultural anthropology and ethnography (or if one prefers the more popular concept of qualitative methods) of a sort of aversion to standardization in interpreting culture, or doing ethnography (the set of research methods used in studying culture). Rather than any degree of standardization, the concept of culture has been characterized more by hundreds of different definitions, ongoing debates, and misuse and abuse of the term from different sources; or simply the avoidance or even rejection of the concept³.

In the remainder of this Chapter 3, I introduce *the categories and subcategories* of the three CEHC paradigms as the codification systems that have informed the almost three-dozen research and technical assistance projects in which I have led or been involved since 1974⁴. I also discuss how the CEHC has facilitated the design and implementation of these projects, as well as the analysis of the data that accrue from such projects. I point out that the CEHC paradigms (the *Cultural Systems Paradigm*, the *Cultural Systems Approach to Change*, and the *Cultural Systems Approach to Project Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation*) and the CEHC's four program systems (*Ethnographically Informed Community and Cultural Assessments Research System*, *Project Design and Implementation Planning*, *Project Implementation Programs*, and *Ethnographic Assessment and Evaluation Systems*) have facilitated the winning and completion of contract research funding, which often have severe time and fiscal constraints.

I then go on to discuss how over the years, of carrying out so many projects using CEHC paradigms and programs as codification systems, particularly while using such methods as observations, and in informal conversational interviews, has provided an ability to "read" socio-cultural texts (behavioral interactions as well as written), as well as predict behavioral outcomes or verbal responses to specific interactions. I point out that these two attributes of using these codification systems is why I refer to this alternative approach to science as an interpretive science (the capability to read and predict). And finally, I point out that a major difference between the DSP and the CEHC approach to an interpretive science is in the area of standardization. Where the DSP is rigid in its approach to standardization and codification, the CEHC offers an open, flexible, and creative systems. That is the CEHC system is open to changes

³ Given the dilemmas in the use of the term as listed in this sentence, there have been calls from some anthropologists suggesting that the discipline should move away from the term because of its complexity, abuse/misuse, or, ironically its lack of standardized usage ().

⁴ This discussion will be detailed in Monograph 1, which is currently being completed.

in the original categories in which data are placed, and open to the possibility of new research findings that may not fit existing CEHC categories⁵.

In **Chapter 4**, tentatively titled *The Theoretical Foundations of the Cultural Ecology of Health and Change*, I continue the discussion of evolution of the CEHC, by first referring back to the discussion in Chapter 3 regarding the DSP domination in community health research, with particular attention here to the long domination in this research paradigm in the use of psychological theories in the development of psychometric scales used for measuring the strength of external validity of health behaviors, attitudes, and behaviors. I point out that while psychometric frameworks are very valuable in designing and implementing studies that focus on the analysis of the (health) knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of individual study participants, there are severe limitations in these frameworks in our understanding *socio-cultural contexts and processes, meanings* that underlie most human knowledge, attitudes and behaviors. I point out these limitations as my primary reasons never adopting these theories and techniques for designing or implementing my own community health research. As such, I explain, they were never dominant in the evolution of the CEHC, with its primary conceptual paradigms being oriented towards understanding human complexity and the socio-cultural phenomena of contexts, processes, and meanings. I do discuss that while I always felt that the Health Belief Model was also more of an individual focused model, components of it were used to inform the evolution of the CEHC. But it was the more socio-cultural contexts of health found in such community health models as PRECEDE-PROCEED, and other social ecology models. The bulk of this chapter, however, focuses on the range of theories outside of public health that made the greatest contribution to the evolution of the CEHC, including sociology, but predominantly from anthropology.

Beyond trying to conceptualize the concept of culture so that I can operationalize it in a community health research, another challenge that I experienced while at UNC was related to my being asked to teach a course in “qualitative” research methods. This challenge is discussed in **Chapter 5**, tentatively titled *Ethnography is More than Just Another Qualitative Research Methodology*. With HEED students asking for such a course soon after I arrived at UNC in 1976, while Steuart had made it clear that he hired me to provide students training in ethnography, I finally developed such a course in 1980. At the core of the challenge was the realization that although I had received a PhD in Anthropology, I had never received training in *how to do ethnography* or qualitative research. I also realized that as a cultural anthropologist, who actually had done ethnographic research for the PhD, there was very little written in Anthropology about *how to actually do ethnography*. My dilemma was once I had started my class in ethnography as a qualitative method, *how to do ethnography* was what students who signed up for the class, not only from HEED, but also from the other health professionals, sociology, social work, and education wanted to learn. Chapter 5 continues with how I drew on

⁵ I end this introduction of Chapter 2 in Chapter 1 expectations of critiques criticism from both the scientists and those taking a more qualitative or open approach to research, as well as from those who may disagree with some of the CEHC categories, or would prefer others. I also expect that ideas of codification and standardization presented here may not be adopted by all. But this series is being developed for current and future colleagues who might find some of the contents of the series helpful in the development of their own careers.

the work of Pelto and Pelto (1980) as one of the few guides that provided direction on how to do ethnography at that time, but was mostly influenced by the work of James Spradley. It was Spradley's work that also brought me to read more about componential analysis (CA) in Anthropology, as he used this approach in conducting his ethnographic research, and in exploring the relationship between language and culture. Spradley's use of CA suggested an analysis of cultural domains, such as specific observed behaviors (ways of doing things) as linked units such as acts, activities and events. These domains were further explored through additional and more structured and focused observations, as well as through the analysis of narratives provided by various forms of ethnographic interviews (e.g., conversational and other informal interview techniques, semi-structured interviews, group interviews, further cultural domain explorations, more structured interviews, etc.), and the analysis of written texts, material culture, and the organizations of objects in specific environmental settings (Spradley, 1979, 1980). As I would go on from this early period to train myself how to do ethnography, Spradley's work continued to have a significant position. This notion of culture being made up as linked units of human produced phenomena is reflected in all of three of the CEHC's conceptual paradigms. The Chapter goes on to discuss how over time as qualitative methods grew as an accepted method to quantitative methods in a binary, ethnography has been somewhat lost in this sort of binary paradigm in applied human research. I then discussed how focus group interviews became the primary qualitative method adopted for use in what became known as "mixed-methods." I conclude this chapter with a discussion of how after being asked to do so many focus groups as **the** qualitative method I have come to feel the need to explain that while qualitative research epistemology dominates in ethnography, ethnography is more than just another qualitative research method.

In **Chapter 6**, tentatively titled *So What is this Thing Called Culture?*, I refer back to the discussion of the problem of culture in cultural anthropology discussed in Chapter 3, and the lack of a standardized definition of the concept. Since the CEHC and all three of its conceptual paradigms have the concept of culture at their theoretical core, and they are presented as a way of standardizing and codifying the concept, meant that I have spent considerable time thinking about what is culture? The chapter then goes to draw on various definitions of culture with which I have become familiar over the years, and present what I have labeled attributes of culture.

In **Chapter 7**, tentatively titled *The Evolution of the Cultural System Paradigm* (the CSP). The CSP is the first of the CEHC paradigms to emerge. The chapter will first discuss the introduction of the CSP as a report on my food and culture research in a North Carolina County, published in a volume titled *Food in the Social Order* edited in 1984 by Professor Mary Douglas in 1984. The discussion, however how the paradigm had started evolving in my head during my dissertation research in Jamaica in 1974-75, and the writing of the dissertation in 1975-76, as well as in the planning and implementation of a rapid ethnographic study in Cameroon in 1981, and in the evaluation of a community organizing project in Norfolk Virginia in 1983. But the majority of the chapter will focus on the theoretical assumptions underlying the CSP major categories and subcategories, and the description of these various CSP units, leading to the CSP being offered as the CEHC's first codification system. The CSP system of codification also allows for the reading of various types of texts, both those written, found in material culture, and in observed social interactions.

In **Chapter 8**, tentatively titled *The Emergence of the Cultural Systems Analysis Group (CuSAG)*, provides a brief history of the factors that contributed to the initiation of the Cultural Systems Analysis Group (CuSAG), a small research unit I found during the fall of 1989, a year after moving to the University of Maryland as Chair of the Department of Anthropology. Much of this chapter, however, discusses how the more than two-dozen research and technical assistance projects generated through CuSAG over the past 20 years contributed to the further development of the CEHC, and its various paradigms and program systems.

In **Chapter 9**, tentatively titled *The Evolution of Ethnographically Informed Community and Cultural Assessment Research Systems (EICCARS)*, the EICCARS (See Appendix 3) is presented as the first CEHC program, and the third CEHC codification system to emerge. While the CSP allows for the reading of culture in any socio-cultural settings, from organizational meetings, to project dynamics, to wider community or societal activities, the programs and categories of the EICCARS promote the reading of human dynamics associated primarily with human health and social well being. As such it combines some of the traditional methods of community needs assessment or community diagnosis (e.g., the analysis of statistical data, Geographical Information Systems research methods, and survey research) with classical ethnographic methods (e.g., the analysis of various forms of secondary data, observation and participant observation, and various forms of interviewing). The development of the EICCARS led to the development of a mixed-methods toolkit from which various methods are then selected for carrying out specific research project activities in which CuSAG became engaged.

In **Chapter 10**, tentatively titled *The Evolution of the Ethnographically Informed Community and Cultural Assessment Research Systems (the CSAC)*, the CSAC is discussed as the second codification system of the CEHC to evolve. In Chapter 7, we discussed the emergence of the CSP in the early 1980s as a consequence of my finding: (1) that there were too few and inadequate models for interpreting the range of complex factors often generated by holistic open-ended ethnographic approaches that most often yielded a body of data too large and/or difficult to manage and operationalize in applied settings (Pelto et al, 1980); and (2) the phenomenological and open-ended approach of ethnography yield narrative answers from informants that expressed a range of concerns that would go beyond the interest of the researchers, but appear to be of extreme importance to those being studied. However, while creating the CSP as a codification for designing and implementing ethnographic research, and analyzing the data from such research, working in an activist community health department at UNC brought me to realize the need for a codification system for planning, implementing and evaluation community health interventions. The CSAC became that system and the majority of this Chapter 9 will focus on the theoretical assumptions underlying the major categories and subcategories of the CSAC, and the description of these various CSAC units. As such the CSAC allows for the reading of various types of texts, both those written, found in material culture, and in observed social interactions, as they relate to the design, implementation, and evaluation of community based health and social initiatives.

In **Chapter 11**, tentatively titled *The Evolution of the Cultural Systems Approach to Project Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (the CSAPPE)*, the CEHC's Project Design and Implementation Plan (the PDIP), and the Project Culture Development (PCD) Workshop. The CSAPPE is the last of the CEHC's conceptual paradigms, but is simply a planning matrix organized around the categories of the CSAC. The PDIP is one of the four CEHC program systems, with only one program, a Project Culture Development (PCD) Workshop, in which the CSAPPE

Planning Matrix is used. The 2-day PCD Workshop can be used either in the development of a community based participatory research proposal, and/or shortly after funding, in the development of a project implementation plan, to make sure that all of those responsible for various project activities are on the same page with regards to: (1) project goals and objectives; (2) strategies and tasks for achieving project goals and objectives; (3) what project actors or organizational partners will be responsible for carrying out specific tasks or strategies; and (4) and the timelines for achieving specific tasks, strategies, objectives, and goals. This chapter will also include samples of worksheets used to generate this flow of activities, including a final planning matrix, or “logic model” for organizing the links between specific goals and objectives, the strategies and tasks related to achieving them, and the actor(s) or actor groups involved, and timelines involved in achieving strategies and tasks. Of all of the CEHCs paradigms, the CSAPPE’s logic model best mimics the idea of the components of language and culture similar to componential analysis, as I argue that the various categories of the CEHC and their relationship to each other are similar to the links in a chain, in which a lack of attention to any link can result in a break in the chain (project success). This chapter also divides a project’s logic model, once it is completed, into quarterly (3 month) components with quarterly desired outcomes (objectives), strategies and tasks, responsible actor groups, and timelines. This then becomes a plan for project implementation and evolves into the CEHC’s third program system, Project Implementation Programs (the PIPs).

In **Chapter 12**, tentatively titled *Ethnographic Assessment and Evaluation Systems* describes the subsystems and programs of the CEHC’s *Ethnographic Assessment and Evaluation Systems (the EAES)*. The EAES is the fourth and final CEHC program, and it consists of four subsystems: (1) Programs in *Formative Research and Evaluation*; (2) Programs in *Process Evaluation and Project Monitoring*; (3) Programs in *Outcome Evaluation*; and (4) Programs in *Impact Evaluation*. The EAES is the best example of the CEHC’s systemic qualities (interrelationships or overlap), as various subsystems or programs in the EAES systems utilize subsystems or programs of the other three CEHC systems (i.e., the EICCARS, the PDIP, the PIPs). For example programs in the EAES formative research and evaluation system include methods from the EICCARS toolkit, as well as an assessment of whether a workshop similar to the PCD Workshop from the PDIP was one of the strategies included in the project proposal. Similarly, programs in the EAES Process Evaluation and Project Monitoring System may include the implementation of a PCD from the PDIP, if one was not included in the project proposal. Methodologies from the EICCARS system are also used in the EAES process evaluation and project monitoring programs in conducting assessment or evaluation of various Project Implementation Programs (the PIPs). And finally EICCARS methodologies are also included in as one of the EAES systems for conducting Outcome and Impact Evaluation of project activities.

Chapter 13 is tentatively titled *Planned Future Monographs in the Codifying and Reading Culture as an Applied Human Science Series*. While certain chapters in Monograph 1 thus far have introduced the various CEHC paradigms and program systems, a better understanding of the different components of these systems will come from future monographs as they detail project experiences that gave rise to these systems, as well as the design and implementation of projects that were informed by them. As such this chapter will provide brief summaries of future monographs planned for completion over the next 10 years with the following tentative titles, and estimated length in terms of pages:

- **Monograph 2:** *An Ethnographic Assessment of a Community Based Participatory Research Focused Ethnographic Field School.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 3:** Whitehead, T.L. and C.L. Hall, *The African American Incarceration Epidemic and its Impact on Personhood: Cultural Meaning and Broken” Gender Selves* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages)
- **Monograph 4:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *Incarceral Narratives: The Anthropology of the African American Incarceration Epidemic in an Urban Context.* (Estimated Length: 200-350 pages).
- **Monograph 5:** Whitehead, T.L., M. Kearney, and C. Thornton, *Ethnographic Assessment of a Human Service Organization: DC’s Office on Returning Citizen Affairs.* (Estimated Length: 60 pages).
- **Monograph 6:** Whitehead, T.L. *Retirement as a Rite of Passage: Using the CSAPPE to Plan and Implement an Anthropological Event.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 7:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *Human Difference, Cultural Understanding, and Social Healing.*). (Estimated Length of between 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 8:** Whitehead, T.L., et al. *The Planning and Implementation of an Ethnographic Assessment of the Village Health Committee Concept in the Kadey Region of Cameroon.* (Estimated Length: 60 pages).
- **Monograph 9:** R. Lundgren and T.L. Whitehead, *The Cultural Ecology of Youth and Gender Based Violence in Northern Uganda.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 10:** Whitehead, T.L. *Basic /Classical Ethnography and the Cultural Systems Paradigm.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages)
- **Monograph 11:** Whitehead, T.L. *The Evolution of a Reflexive Anthropologist/Ethnographer: The US Peace Corps, Turkey, and the Good Life.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 12:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Education and Emancipation of a Negro Anthropologist.* (Estimated Length: 150-300 pages).
- **Monograph 13:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *Basic/Classical Ethnography, Rapid Cultural Learning, and Study Abroad.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 14:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Racialized Urban Ghetto.* (Estimated Length of between 60-150 pages).

- **Monograph 15:** Whitehead, T.L, et al, *The Ethnographic Assessment of a Planned Change Project in an Urban Setting. The Norfolk Assemblies.* (Estimated Length of between 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 16:** Whitehead, T.L., et al, *Ethnographic Lessons Learned from Planned Change Projects in Rural Settings.* Estimated Length of between 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 17.** Whitehead, T.L, et al., *The Focus Group as Ethnography: An Ecological Approach to Exploring Social Determinants of Sexual Infectious Disease in a High Risk Population.* Estimated Length of between 60-150 pages.).
- **Monograph 18:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Big Man-Little Man Complex: A Cultural Systems Approach to the Exploration of Masculinity in Two Plantation America Populations.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 19:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Cultural Ecology of African American Foodways* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 20:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *Black Expressive Culture as a Survival Strategy* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 21** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Ethnography/Anthropology of the African American Church.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 22:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Ethnography/Anthropology of African American Family Systems.* (Estimated Length: 200-350 pages).
- **Monograph 23:** Whitehead, T.L., et al. *A 20-Year Follow Up of the Ethnographic Overview and Assessment of Independence National Historical Park.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 24:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *Ethnography as a Quintessential Approach to Mixed Methods Research: The Ethnographically Informed Community and Cultural Assessment Systems* ((Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 25:** Whitehead, T.L., et al, *A Cultural Systems Approach to the Planning and Implementation of Projects in Applied Ethnography.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages;).
- **Monograph 26:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *Conducting a Project Ethnography: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Community Based Participatory Research Projects.* (Estimated Length of between 200-350 pages).
- **Monograph 27:** Whitehead, T.L, et al. *The Urban Health and Human Ecology Project.* (Estimated Length: 60-150 pages).
- **Monograph 28:** Whitehead, T.L. et al. *Race, Nat Turner, and Social Healing.* (Estimated Length: 150-300 pages).

Completing 28 monographs over a 12-year period, particularly given my advanced age. But this list is laid out as a planning document to keep myself focused on certain writing objectives from year to year. And indeed, I am quite cognizant that a lot of the proposed monographs may not be completed. But I am enthusiastic with my agenda for several reasons, including the following:

- As the writing of these monographs evolve, I expect some of them may be dropped as some of the content within these titles as currently named, will be merged into other manuscripts as chapters or sections.
- Much of the content for most of the proposed monographs have been written, but in need of organization and updating some of the literature and other materials ([some found on my website](#)). As monographs, most of these manuscripts are being proposed of as few as 60 pages in length, which also means organizing materials from already written documents into these short manuscripts.
- Quite a number of the monographs were written as research reports over the last 40 years. Many of these reports will be turned into *case studies* that demonstrate either how they informed the development of the CEHC, or specific paradigms of the CEHC were used to design and implement these studies.
- Colleagues and future, current and former graduate students (whose work overlap with specific ones of these monographs, will be invited to assist in completing those manuscripts with which there is overlap (as is the case with Casey Hall, Maya Kearney, and Rebecka Lundgren mentioned in Monographs 3,5, and 9 above). This will be facilitated by sharing the first of forthcoming monographs, beginning with Monograph 2 above.
- Many of these monographs will be produced as non-peer reviewed manuscripts, cutting down on the amount of time and continually rewriting that peer reviews take. Peer review submissions will be considered for those colleagues who would like to join me as co-authors, co-editors, or chapter contributors, but want their work to be published in peer review outlets.
- The enumeration of the future monographs is *not set in stone*. Changes are expected due to such factors as: (1) future collaborators are excited about collaborating on a topic suggested by a specific title, and would like for me to make a shift in my planned schedule to get them started with this collaboration; or (2) if some future consultation or research project overlaps with a monograph that I currently have scheduled at a later date.

Market for the Proposed Monograph and the Proposed Series

Once published, this Monograph 1 should be of interest to persons interested in science and different epistemological orientations regarding research. It should also be of interest to both theoretical and applied anthropologists, and those in related fields interested in a range of health and social issues. While ethnography is not mentioned in the title, anyone picking up this book with an interest in applied ethnographic research methods will consider it a must read upon viewing its table of contents. Those monographs planned after will be of interest to a broader market of health and social researchers and professionals interested in those issues implied in specific monograph titles (e.g., ethnographic and other qualitative research methods, mass incarceration and reentry, training in ethnography, evaluation research, the African American church, foodways and nutrition, sexually transmitted infections, etc). Those who read later monographs once published will want to acquire Monograph 1 because of the interrelationship between the various monographs. Also because of the interrelationship

between monographs, as more monographs are published there will be a market for sets of multiple monographs.

APPENDIX 1: Acronym Glossary

CAR	Community Assessment Research
CBI	Community Based Initiative
CA	Componential Analysis
CEHC	Cultural Ecology of Health and Change
CSP	Cultural Systems Paradigm , one of three CEHC conceptual paradigms
CSAC	Cultural Systems Approach to Change , one of three CEHC conceptual paradigms
CSSAPPE	The Cultural Systems Approach to Program Planning, Implementation and Evaluation , one of three CEHC theoretical paradigm
CuSAG	Cultural Systems Analysis Group , an anthropologically based unit at the University of Maryland College Park
DSP	Dominant Scientific Paradigm
EAES	Ethnographic Assessment & Evaluation Systems , the CEHC system of evaluation programs
EICCARS	Ethnographically Informed Community & Cultural Assessments Research Systems , the CEHC system of community & cultural systems research
PBERF	Project Barriers and Enablers Recording Form
PCD	Project Culture Development
PDIP	The CEHC System in Project Design and <u>I</u>mplementation <u>P</u>lanning
PIPs	The CEHC System of Project <u>I</u>mplementation <u>P</u>rograms
PTMs	CEHC Program Technical Manuals

APPENDIX 2

THE CULTURAL ECOLOGY AND HEALTH AND CHANGE: *Integrated Conceptual Paradigms for the Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation of Community Based Planned Change Programs*

(See Attached Document for full illustration of the CEHC)

APPENDIX 3

Summary of Research Methods in the *Ethnographically Informed Community*

and Cultural Assessment Research Systems (EICCARS) Multi-Method Toolkit⁶.

A. Classical/Basic Ethnographic Methods

1. *Secondary Data Analysis* including websites and other databases, project reports and other types of documents, archival data, and more popular data sources such as fiction and non-fiction print texts (e.g. newspapers, books, blogs and other electronic sources), existing maps and other formats showing the spatial distribution of objects within a cultural or community system, as well as existing audio-visual records.
2. A Variety of *Observation and Participant Observation* Methods customized for the study of different community/cultural systems, including *descriptive “windshield”* and *“walking tours,”* and participation in various study community/cultural based activities and events.
3. A Variety of *Interview Methods*, both *individual* (informal, conversational, ethno-semantic/domain analysis, semi-structured, “Key Community/Cultural Experts,” structured and survey), and *group* (including focus groups).
4. Methods for the *Interpretation and Analysis of EICCARS* data sets, including *integrated data analysis*, and the development of *Rich Ethnographic Case Studies*.

B. Complementary Ethnographic Methods and Development Research Methods

Particularly Useful in Applied Work

1. Selection of EICCARS Topic to be Studied (e.g., housing, HIV/AIDS, diet, etc.).
2. Selection of Community Profiles (economic, demographic, educational, etc.), or other units of analysis to be studied.
3. Development of an *EICCARS Research Design*.
4. The Use of *Mapping Technologies*, such as Geographic Information Systems, to study the spatial distributions of various objects of interest within community/cultural systems, and the perceptions of the members of those systems regarding such distributions.
5. The Use of *Audio* (Taping) and *Visual* (Photography, film, etc.) Methods for recording and eliciting community/cultural systems data.
6. Strategies for training members of the target or client cultural systems (communities, organizations, etc.) in EICCARS methods so that they can carry out EICCARS studies to inform their own or their systems’ future project ideas.
7. Methods of *Team Approaches in Ethnography* including technically trained persons from outside of the system that is the focus of research (*Cultural Outsiders*) and members of that system (*Cultural Insiders*).
8. *Computerized Data Storage and Retrieval Systems*

⁶ © The property of Tony L. Whitehead. If quoted, **please cite**. **Do not** duplicate or distribute without the permission of Dr. Whitehead at tonywhitehead1122@gmail.com, or 703-620-051

9. Methods for the *Development of Data Collection/Recording Instruments* and Other Materials in the use of all the methods outlined above.

C. The Ethnographic Analysis of Human Settings and Other Socio-Cultural Categories

1. The Ethnographic Study of Various Types of *Social Systems* (total societies, local communities, physical or virtual, ethnic or tribal groups, household, family, and kinship systems, organizations and institutions, etc.).
2. The Ethnographic Study of Temporary *Social Events* (e.g., holidays and festive occasions, rites of passage events such as weddings, funerals, etc), *Social Activities* within events (e.g. the rehearsal dinner in a wedding, or the wake as part of a funerary event), and *Social Settings* (e.g. meetings, street corner settings, night clubs, places of worship etc.)
3. The Ethnographic Study of *Physical* (Natural and Human Built) and *Social Environments*
4. The Ethnographic Study of Select Behavioral Patterns (*behavioral acts* as the smallest units of behavior, *activities* as linked acts, and *events* as linked activities).
5. The Ethnographic Study of *Ideational* or *Meaning* Systems (Cognitive Constructs as found in *Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs, Values, and Other Interpretive Frameworks*)
6. The Ethnographic Study of Expressive Culture (Cognitions expressed through such productions as language, music dance, verbal narratives, “talk,” art, non-verbal expressions, and other significant symbolisms).
7. The Ethnographic Study of Material Culture (human produced material products such as objects, technology, artifacts, etc).
8. The Ethnographic Study of Select *Human Needs*, such as: (a) *Organic* or *Biological Needs* (e.g. food, water, air, shelter, health care, reproduction, security, and space); (b) *Instrumental* or *Social Needs* (i.e., economic, educational, governance, and communal); and (c) *Expressive* or *Cultural Needs* including *Cosmological* and *Spiritual, Affective* (e.g., self and group identity, need to be loved or liked, and need for social status), and *Communicative Needs*.