taps

Working Paper Series

Measuring Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Does Knowledge Mean Skill?

Kightley, Eric P.[1], Victoria Reyes-García[2,3], Kathryn Demps[4], Ruth V. Magtanong[5], Victoria Ramonez[6], Gayatri Thampy[7], John R. Stepp[1,8]

1) Department of Anthropology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

   Email: kightley.1@gmail.com

2) Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA, USA

3) ICREA and Institut de Ciència i Tecnologia Ambientals, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellatera, Barcelona, Spain

4) Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

5) Department of Anthropology, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, USA

6) Department of Anthropology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

7) Department of Anthropology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

8) Center for Latin American Studies, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Abstract *We test whether traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) about how to make an item predicts a person's skill at making it. The rationale for this research is that the failure to distinguish between knowledge and skill might account for some of the conflicting results about the relationships between TEK, human health, and economic development. We empirically test the association between individual* knowledge *about how to make an arrow or a bag and a measure of individual* skill *at making these items among the Tsimane' (Bolivia). We find no association between our measure of knowledge and of skill. While we cannot rule out the possibility of a real association between these phenomena, we interpret our findings as support for the claim that researchers should distinguish between methods to measure knowledge and skill when studying trends in TEK.*

Introduction

Traditional ecological knowledge refers to people's knowledge, practices, and beliefs about the relationships between organisms and their biophysical environment (Berkes, 2008, p. 16). Many researchers are concerned that this knowledge is being lost and that this loss may have negative consequences for human health (Carlson and Maffi, 2004); however, research on the relationship between TEK and economic development has returned inconsistent results. Some studies find a negative association between economic development and TEK (Zent, 2001; Nolan and Robbins, 1999; Srithi et al., 2009; Benz et al., 2000), but others find no association (Zarger and Stepp,

2004; Reyes-García et al., 2005a; Ayantunde et al., 2008) or even a positive association (Guest, 2002), and still others find that the direction of the association depends upon the measures used (Byg and Balslev, 2001; Quinlan and Quinlan, 2007; Reyes-García et al., 2007).

Studies analyzing the association between TEK and health, limited thus far to horticulturalists in the Bolivian Amazon, show a relatively more consistent positive association, but the magnitude of the association is small. Knowledge of useful plants is associated with nutritional status (Reyes-García et al., 2008) and with several indices of children's health (McDade et al., 2007), but knowledge of edible and medicinal plants is not associated with height (an indicator of health and nutritional status) (Godoy et al., 2008).

A possible explanation for the inconsistencies in these trends is that much of the previous research on the associations between TEK and economic development and health does not discriminate between *knowledge* and *the application of knowledge*, such as skill or behavior (Byg and Balslev, 2001; Reyes-García et al., 2005b; de Albuquerque, 2006; Reyes-García et al., 2006). For clarity we refer to this distinction as *knowledge* vs. *skill*. In this paper we present arguments from other disciplines identifying the importance of the distinction, and some evidence from TEK research suggesting that the distinction matters here too. We then present data comparing a common measure of TEK that measures knowledge to an instrument we designed to measure the skill of applying this knowledge. The purpose of this comparison is to test the extent to which we can use such measures of knowledge when we really want to be measuring the application of the knowledge.

Knowledge and Skill

Much of a person's knowledge cannot be articulated explicitly, but is rather "contained in the ability to perform special tasks" (Feyerabend, 1987, p. 106): it is *tacit knowledge* (Polanyi, 1967). Tacit knowledge includes critical skills like the ability to read people's faces, or interpret sound patterns in a wood (Feyerabend, 1987). A large portion of TEK is undoubtedly tacit knowledge (see Byg and Balslev, 2001; de Albuquerque, 2006; Ladio and Lozada, 2004; Srithi et al., 2009).

Various ideas related to the concept of tacit knowledge have been articulated, such as the difference between "knowing-how" and "knowing-that" (Ryle, 1949; Ryle, 1971) and knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description (Russell, 1912). The epistemological validity of these distinctions is debated (Stanley and Williamson, 2001), but differentiating between knowledge and skill is of practical importance in several fields of research.

For example, scholars in nursing education differentiate between theoretical and practical knowledge (McCaugherty, 1991) and scholars in knowledge management differentiate between explicit and tacit knowledge (Nonaka et al., 1996) and articulate and inarticulate knowledge (Werr and Stjernberg, 2003). Researchers in these disciplines study how to measure skill because it is important to be able to evaluate someone's ability to perform a job. Some of their research suggests that measurement instruments focusing on *knowledge* fail to measure the *skill* that is actually needed for employees to perform a job (the skill is *tacit*). In nursing, for example, performance on course exams (knowledge) does not necessarily predict performance with

patients (skill) (Corlett et al., 2003). Similarly, familiarity with written procedures about software engineering projects (knowledge) does not predict an understanding of how to complete those projects successfully (skill) (Ryan and O'Connor, 2009).

The distinction between knowledge and skill may also be important for research that seeks to identify trends in TEK (Byg and Balslev, 2001; de Albuquerque, 2006) or to measure its returns (e.g. (McDade et al., 2007; Reyes-García et al., 2008; Godoy et al., 2008). The majority of studies investigating trends in TEK exclusively measure knowledge (e.g. (Benz et al., 2000; Nolan and Robbins, 1999; Quinlan and Quinlan, 2007; Zarger and Stepp, 2004; Zent, 2001; Reyes-García et al., 2005a; Ayantunde et al., 2008); for example, by asking people to list plants (Nolan and Robbins, 1999; Quinlan and Quinlan, 2007) or to identify their names or uses (Ayantunde et al., 2008; Zarger and Stepp, 2004; Zent, 2001). Sometimes, however, measures of knowledge may be appropriate only to the extent that they approximate people's *use* of that knowledge. For example, one causal explanation offered for the association between TEK and health is that people with more TEK have greater access to nutritional and medicinal plants than people with less TEK (McDade et al., 2007; Reyes-García et al., 2008). These studies use a measure of *knowledge* and assume that it captures people's *behavior* and *ability to use* that knowledge. The slight magnitude of the associations in these studies might be due to a difference between knowledge and skill.

Evidence From TEK Research

There is some evidence to address the possibility that measures of knowledge and skill capture different aspects of TEK. Among the Mien in Thailand, for example, people had never used many of the medicinal plants they know of, and had only used a third within the last five years (Srithi et al., 2009). In Madagascar, knowledge of certain uses of the *Dypsis fibrosa* palm is unrelated to the actual use of the palm, which is predicted by other factors, such as village of residence, and many known uses were not employed by anyone reporting them (Byg and Balslev, 2001). One study finds that the association between knowledge of plants and the use of these plants depends on the ecosystem from which the plants were derived: people used plants they knew about from the forest more than they did from other environments (Ladio and Lozada, 2004).

In two Tsimane' villages in the Bolivian Amazon, greater knowledge of plant uses predicts greater use of plants in the more remote village, but this relationship disappears in the village closer to an urban center (Reyes-García et al., 2005b). Another study with the Tsimane' compares several measures of knowledge, including agreement with experts about plant uses and knowledge of local ecology, to measures of use, including average plants used and total plants used and total species used, and finds that measures of use were only weakly correlated with measures of knowledge (Reyes-García et al., 2006). Further research among the Tsimane' compares individuals' knowledge about plant uses (knowledge) to their self-reported ability to produce certain items (skill). The two measures are only weakly correlated, and they interact differently with measures of economic development (Reyes-García et al., 2007).

These findings suggest that there may be a difference between measures of knowledge and of skill. Here, we build on this body of research by refining the measures of knowledge and skill in order to provide a more direct test of the relationship between measures of knowledge and of skill.

Methods

The Estimation Strategy

To test the relationship between knowledge and skill, we compare how much people know about the production of a fishing arrow (for men) or a carrying bag (for women) to their skill at crafting those items. Previous research in TEK comparing knowledge to skill has used knowledge about the uses of randomly selected plants to predict an ability to produce items (Reyes-García et al., 2007). Here we use a measure of knowledge that is more directly associated with the relevant skill. *Knowledge* here refers to knowledge of facts about how to produce an item and is measured by how much an individual agrees with everyone else over a series of questions about the production of the item. Our measure is comparable to those used in other TEK studies (e.g. (Atran et al., 2002; Benz et al., 2007; Reyes-García, 2001; Casagrande, 2004; Miller et al., 2004; Boster and Johnson, 1989; Guest, 2002). To measure skill, we asked participants to evaluate the quality of traditionally produced items. This measure differs from previous research, which measures skill by self-reporting (Reyes-García et al., 2007) or by behavior (Byg and Balslev, 2001).

We fit three models to the data using OLS regression analysis. Each model predicts skill as a function of knowledge, controlling for covariates. We used the following as our core model:

$$\boxed{}$$

where S_{ivs} is the skill at producing an item of person i from village v and sex s, K_{ivs} is the person's knowledge of how to produce the item, A_{ivs} is the age of the item, D_{ivs} is a set of dummy variables for a person's sex and village, and ε_{ivs} is a normally distributed error term. The parameters of the models are estimated using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. If the measures of knowledge and skills are associated, then β_1 should be positive and statistically significant.

In the core model (n=43) we include interaction terms for knowledge by sex and by village because measures of TEK often vary according to sex (Ayantunde et al., 2008) and village of residence (Reyes-García, 2001; Benz et al., 2000). We also fit a second model (n=43) excluding these interactions, and a third model excluding the interactions and including women only (n=28), because the low variation in the men's knowledge scores may influence the results.

Study Location and Sample

The Tsimane' are a horticulturalist and foraging society of ~8000 people (~100 villages) in the Bolivian Amazon. Tsimane' traditional subsistence focused on hunting, fishing, and horticulture (Vadez et al., 2004). Over the last several decades, Tsimane' have been experiencing a process

of integration to the market economy that has led them to adopt other economic activities, such as cash crop agriculture, logging, and wage labor (Godoy, 2001). For the last ten years, the Tsimane' have been the subjects of a panel study focusing on how integration to the market economy affects their economics, health, and traditional ecological knowledge (Godoy, 2001; McDade et al., 2007; Reyes-García et al., 2005a). Ethnographic descriptions of the Tsimane' can also be found in recent books and dissertations (Huanca, 2008; Reyes-García, 2001).

We collected data in three villages near the town of San Borja, department of Beni (Bolivia), from June to August 2008. Eligible participants consisted of all adults (>18 years of age) who self-identified as household heads. The study included a total sample size of 43 people (15 males and 28 females). The subjects and villages were spread through a continuum of integration to the market economy, which should increase variation in the two variables of interest, knowledge and skill.

Selection of Items

We selected items for inclusion in the study and developed questionnaires on the construction of these items. Each participant in the study was given one of the final questionnaires (to measure knowledge) and had his or her item ranked by peers (to measure skill).

To select items for the study, we first used interviews and observations to construct a full inventory of plant-made household items. The list contained 15 items produced by both men and women. We then narrowed the items in the inventory according to the following criteria: 1) items

with ubiquitous distribution, 2) items displaying variation in craftsmanship, 3) items with

important practical function, and 4) feasibility of borrowing the item for several days for the

study. Because Tsimane' men and women typically craft different items from plants, we selected

two sex-specific items: fishing arrows for men and hand-woven carrying bags for women.

The Knowledge Variable

Knowledge is defined as information about the production of bows and arrows (men) and the

production of traditionally woven bags (women) was measured using responses to a

questionnaire on how the item is produced. To construct the questionnaire, we first conducted

open-ended interviews with key informants, identified by the community as especially

knowledgeable about either bows and arrows or bags. We used the information from open-ended

interviews to generate a list of dichotomous (true/false) questions. Questions were pre-tested for

comprehension and for variation in answers. The arrow questionnaire contained questions about

whether certain species of plants or birds (for feathers) could be used at particular stages in the

process of creating an arrow or a bow and ultimately contained 16 questions. The carrying bag

questionnaire contained questions about whether each of eight plants could be used to create a

dye of each of four colors (all bags used colored thread), and ultimately contained 32 questions.

Men (n=15) were given the arrow questionnaire and women were given the bag questionnaire

(n=28).

The Skill Variable

Skill is defined here as the ability to make a useful item and is measured by the quality of an item produced by a participant, as judged by his or her peers. Participants were asked to lend their best fishing arrow (men) or their best hand-woven bag (women). These items were grouped into sets by type of item and village; for example, all of the arrows from village *a* form a set, as do all of the bags from village *a*. We asked all male participants in a village to rank all arrows in a set against each other item, and all female participants to rank all woven bags in a set. Therefore, each male participant who provided an arrow ranked all the arrows from his village and each female who provided a bag ranked all the bags from her village. This approach limited the number of items to be ranked together to a maximum of 10, the upper limit for ranking tasks (Weller and Romney, 1988; Bernard, 2006). For the ranking exercise, we took individuals one at a time and presented them with all of the items in their set. We asked them to choose the best one and recorded the answer. Then the best item was removed from the set and the process was repeated with the remaining items until only one item remained (the worst item). Men were asked to choose the best arrow to shoot a fish in the river and women were asked to choose the most well crafted bag.

Data Analysis

We constructed a measure of knowledge by analyzing responses to the true/false questionnaires using cultural consensus analysis, hereafter CCA (Romney et al., 1986; Romney et al., 1987). This analytical tool is used across the social sciences (Weller, 2007), including TEK research (Atran et al., 2002; Benz et al., 2007; Reyes-García, 2001; Casagrande, 2004; Miller et al., 2004; Boster and Johnson, 1989; Guest, 2002). CCA works by obtaining a principle axis factoring on

person-by-person matrices of responses to a systematic questionnaire, calculating the extent to which variation in responses across people can be reduced to a single factor. The loadings on the first factor indicate individual knowledge; these loadings are termed "competence scores" in the model. We use these competence scores as our proxy for individual theoretical TEK. When a respondent did not know the answer to a question, a randomly generated value was inserted with a probability of .5 for yes and .5 for no (Weller, 2007). Each questionnaire was analyzed using the formal consensus model (Romney et al., 1986) in the ANTHROPAC © software (Borgatti, 1996).

We use standard diagnostics to evaluate the goodness-of-fit of the cultural consensus model to the data (Weller, 2007). To validate the assumption that there is only one set of correct answers, the first and second eigenvalues can be compared. The ratio of the first to second eigenvalue is a measure of the dimensionality of the data; the higher the ratio, the more likely it is that there is only a single pattern (a single set of answers) to the responses. The ratio of the first to the second eigenvalue was 18.46 for the arrow questionnaire and 7.69 for the bag questionnaire, above the conventional threshold of 3:1 used to determine whether consensus exists. A second indicator of the goodness-of-fit of the model to the data is the range and magnitude of the competence scores (first-factor loadings). Competence scores should fall between 0 and 1 and the mean should ideally be above .5, indicating that people actually agree about the answers. The mean competence score in our data was .71 for women and .9 for men (Table 1), indicating that there was consensus. Third, to avoid spurious patterns, there should be no more than 10% missing values. In our data, missing values occurred when informants did not know the answer, and account for 6.5% of the data. Fourth, to ensure that there is enough variation in the data, the

balance of positive to negative responses in a dichotomous questionnaire should fall between 30% and 70%. Once we exclude the missing values from our data, 91% of the responses to arrow questionnaire and 30% of the responses to the bag questionnaire were positive. Therefore, the ratio for the arrow questionnaire falls outside of the ideal range. It is not clear what effect this bias has on the results of CCA (Weller, 2007).

<TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE>

The knowledge variable is the combination of competence scores for men and for women, with a combined mean (sd) of .77 (.21) and a range from .29 to .99. As is typical for competence scores, the values are not normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, W=.895, p=.0009). Power- and log-transformations did not produce a normal distribution.

To allow comparisons across sets of different sample sizes, the *skill* variable was generated by dividing the mean rank of each item by the number of items in its set and subtracting this value from one. This transformation produced values with range from 0 (all participants ranked the item as worst) to .9 (all participants ranked the item as best).

To check for meaningful variation in the skill variable, items' ranks were compared by obtaining a one-way ANOVA on each set of items followed by post-hoc comparisons between each pair of items using Bonferroni's method (with $\alpha = .005$ to correct for multiple comparisons). Each ANOVA was significant at $p < .00001$ (Table 2) and post-hoc Bonferroni comparisons resulted in two to four groups per set at $p \leq .005$ (to correct for multiple comparisons, results not shown).

The skill variable, transformed from the item rankings, was normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk normality test, W=.9730, p > .4) with mean (sd) of .44 (.22), and range from .03 to .89 (Table 2).

<TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE>

In sum, analyses to test the validity of our measures showed that our knowledge variable met all of the assumptions of CCA and passes all diagnostic tests except for balance of answers: 91% of the responses to the arrow questionnaire were positive, which falls outside of the ideal 30-70% range. Additionally, the knowledge variable was not normally distributed. The skill variable represents statistically meaningful variation in quality of items and is normally distributed.

Results

Testing the Model

Knowledge is not significantly associated with skill in any of the models (Table 3), and none of the models is significant (model 1: $F_{6,36} = .91$ p > .5; model 2: $F_{5,37} = 1.17$, p > .3; model 3 $F_{4,23} = 1.27$, p > .3). Therefore, none of our variables predict skill, and the failure of knowledge to do so is not due to the presence of a covariate.

<TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE>

Robustness

We tested the robustness of our statistical analysis and of our models in several ways. First, we tested the assumptions of OLS regression analysis by performing standard diagnostic tests and by substituting an alternate knowledge variable in an instance where an assumption is violated. Then, we substituted alternatives to several variables to test for methodological biases. None of the changes we made affected the direction, magnitude, or significance of the association. Unless stated, all tests are conducted on model 2.

Robustness of Statistical Analyses

First, we tested three standard assumptions of regression analysis: (1) homoskedasticity (by obtaining a Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity), (2) independence of errors (by obtaining variance inflation factors for each predictor variable), and (3) normal distribution of errors (by plotting residual vs. predicted values and by obtaining influence statistics, DFBetas, for each value). Results from these tests indicated that the assumptions were not violated.

Second, because the knowledge variable was not normally distributed, we substituted a dichotomized variable for the knowledge variable in model 2. Dichotomizing variables results in a loss of information, but removes the assumption of normality. The dichotomized variable took a value of 0 for $\leq 50^{th}$ percentile and a 1 for $> 50^{th}$ percentile of the knowledge score. The substitution did not change the magnitude, direction, or statistical significance of the results.

Third, we calculated the sample size required to identify a significant association, given the number of parameters and the correlation coefficient from the regression (Cohen et al., 2003; Soper, 2009). For model 2, with Type I error rate (α) = .05 and Type II error rate (β) = .2, the calculated sample size should be 87, indicating that there is an increased risk of Type II error (failing to find an association when one really exists). Therefore, we calculated the power of the regression, a measure of the ability of the regression analysis to detect real associations (Cohen et al., 2003; Soper, 2009). For model 2 the power is .43, far below the conventional threshold of .8. This confirms that the regression analysis is more likely to miss a real association than is conventionally accepted. Lastly, we obtained a scatterplot of skill vs. knowledge by sex and village (Figure 1) to look for obvious linear or non-linear patterns; none is apparent.

<FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE>

Robustness of the Models

We made all justifiable adjustments, substitutions, and transformations to challenge the results. First, because knowledge varies by sex and village, it is possible that the knowledge variable used here should be measured by how much a person agrees with informants from their village or with the entire sample, instead of how much they agree with informants from their own sex. We substituted knowledge variables measuring (a) agreement with own village and (b) agreement with the entire sample, instead of with own sex. This was accomplished by applying the CCA procedure to different subsets of responses: (a) each village separately and (b) the entire sample (all participants took the male and female questionnaire).

Second, our measure of knowledge is based on agreement between individuals. A common alternative to this is to count the number of plants/birds identified as useful (Byg and Balslev, 2001; Srithi et al., 2009). In our questionnaire, a positive response indicates that the particular species of bird or plant can be used for a certain task, and a negative response that the species cannot. Therefore, we substituted the number of species that each respondent said was useful for the knowledge variable.

Lastly, because skill for females depends upon the material used to make the bag (two-sample t-test, df=26, t = 2.53, p = .0179), we fit model 3 with an additional binary variable for material (0=contains wool, 1=does not contain wool).

Discussion

We found no statistically significant association between our measures of knowledge and skill. There are several possible interpretations of this result, which fall under two categories: it is possible (1) that knowledge and skill are actually distinct, conceptually and/or methodologically, and it is possible (2) that the data are inadequate, because of a small sample size and/or inappropriate variables. We discuss the rationale for and implications of these potential explanations. While we cannot exclude the possibility of a real association between knowledge and skill, it is clear that our two *methods* do not measure the same thing, and we argue that this finding is applicable to other studies in TEK. We conclude that, for research on trends in TEK or

its returns, the choice of a method to measure TEK should be justified against the alternative methods available. This justification should include explicit *a priori* reasons to expect an association between the TEK variable and its hypothesized covariates.

Knowledge and Skill May Be Different

We anticipated that our approach would be more likely to identify a real relationship between knowledge and skill than previous research, because we constructed the variables to be conceptually closer to each other. We measured how much people know about how to make an item and how good they were at making the same item. We did not find any association between the two variables. Our results are consistent with several studies finding that measures of knowledge and skill or behavior are not necessarily associated (Byg and Balslev, 2001; Ladio and Lozada, 2004; Reyes-García et al., 2005b; Srithi et al., 2009). Previous research with the Tsimane', however, has found that measures of knowledge and measures of self-reported skill are positively associated, though weakly (Reyes-García et al., 2007; Reyes-García et al., 2006). The approach to measuring knowledge in these studies is the same that is used here (CCA on plant uses), but the measure of skill is different, defined instead as self-reported ability to make several items from plants. We interpret our findings in the context of this body of literature to indicate that measures of knowledge and skill in TEK research may not measure the same thing. While the evidence here and elsewhere may not conclusively show that measures of knowledge and skill are different, we find little support that these measures are interchangeable.

Researchers have used a broad diversity of methods to measure TEK (Reyes-García et al., 2007), and comparative tests of methods such as the one presented in this paper find that even methods designed to measure knowledge alone do not necessarily covary (Reyes-García et al., 2004; Reyes-García et al., 2006). Therefore, we reiterate the conclusions of previous research that it is critically important to justify the choice of method to measure TEK (Byg and Balslev, 2001; Ladio and Lozada, 2004).

Limitations of the Data

We cannot rule out the possibility that, because of the issues discussed below, our analysis failed to identify a real association between knowledge and skill. However, even if more data were to reveal the existence of an association, it appears that it would be slight in magnitude: no obvious pattern presents itself in the scatter plot of knowledge and skill (Figure 1). In fact, to get a positive association, further data would have to reverse an apparently negative trend ($\beta = -.2757$ for model 2, table 3).

Our test deviates from ideal conditions in three ways. First, the sample size is smaller (n=43) than the estimated minimum (n=87) given the correlation coefficient. This results in a higher probability of a Type II error, where a real association is missed. Second, the knowledge variable does not follow a normal distribution (regardless of log and power transformations), which violates an assumption of OLS regression. Third, the responses to the arrow questionnaire (males) fell outside of the ideal range of the ratio of positive to negative responses. The effects of this on the results of CCA are unknown (Weller, 2007); however, the resulting competence

scores for men (knowledge variable) had low variation and were right-skewed (mean=.90, sd=.12), which is not ideal for regression analysis. For this reason we included model 3, which excludes men from the analysis, though the sample size is even smaller (n=28). We note that all questions generated variation in answers during pretesting, suggesting that the pretest sample was not representative.

There are two potential sources of problems with our knowledge variable: the *method* itself and our application of it. We used CCA to derive the knowledge variable. A critical assumption of CCA is that greater *agreement* with everyone else in the sample is assumed to mean greater *knowledge* about the topic (Romney et al., 1986; Weller, 2007). In other words, there is a cultural model from which people draw, and the extent to which people agree with each other reflects the extent to which they draw from this model. This assumption has been challenged (Aunger, 1999; Handwerker, 2002); sometimes people draw from multiple models (Boster and Johnson, 1989; Chavez et al., 1995; Garro, 2000), even when the CCA goodness-of-fit diagnostics indicate a single model (Hruschka et al., 2008). This can be a problem for TEK research, for example, in situations where experts have a monopoly on specialized knowledge (Boster and Johnson, 1989). However, CCA is commonly used in TEK research (Atran et al., 2002; Benz et al., 2007; Reyes-García, 2001; Casagrande, 2004; Miller et al., 2004; Boster and Johnson, 1989; Guest, 2002), as are several other indices based on agreement (e.g. (Sternberg et al., 2001; Voeks and Leony, 2004). Any method that bases measures of knowledge on agreement, whether this is agreement with other individuals in the sample, with experts, or with an answer key, may be susceptible to a general form of this issue: we are assuming the existence of, and access to, the "right" answers. This is an unresolved issue in cognitive anthropology in the midst of ongoing debate, and we

introduce it only as a potential explanation for our results. We consider this controversy to further substantiate our conclusion that the choice of method to measure TEK must be made carefully.

It is also possible that the *content* of our questionnaires does not measure the relevant information: maybe knowledge about how to make these items *is* associated with the skill of making them, and our questions do not capture that knowledge. To develop the questionnaires, we asked several people to describe the process of creating bows, arrows, and bags, and chose questions about steps where there were discrepancies between people's descriptions. Each of these questions asks which materials can be used at a specific step in the process. It may be that the important variation in knowledge about making these items lies elsewhere (e.g., knowing the angle of curvature of the bow, the speed at which cotton must be spun, etc.). However, we chose our questions to be comparable to those used in other TEK research. The majority of studies measuring knowledge about uses of plants do so using yes/no questions asking whether a particular plant can be used for some purpose (e.g. (Reyes-García et al., 2005a; Srithi et al., 2009; Sternberg et al., 2001). This is an entirely reasonable and common sense approach; but we still do not know if our measure of knowledge captured the relevant knowledge and we cannot test this here. Since our method is comparable to other studies using CCA (Atran et al., 2002; Benz et al., 2007; Reyes-García, 2001; Casagrande, 2004; Miller et al., 2004; Boster and Johnson, 1989; Guest, 2002) and other agreement-based indices (Sternberg et al., 2001; Voeks and Leony, 2004) to measure TEK, we maintain that our findings are relevant.

We developed separate indices of knowledge and skill for men and women, so it is possible that these measures are not comparable and that they should not be combined in an analysis together. This is the consequence of accounting for the difference in TEK between genders (Ayantunde et al., 2008; Byg and Balslev, 2001; Dovie et al., 2008; Kristensen and Balslev, 2003; Quinlan and Quinlan, 2007; Samal and Dhyani, 2006; Wirf et al., 2008), and is unavoidable without a much larger sample size.

Because our approach to measuring skill is novel, we cannot compare its performance to previous applications. In conversations with participants, women indicated that they judged the bags by the quality of the pattern – tighter and more intricate weaves were considered better quality – and men indicated that they judged the quality of an arrow primarily by the straightness of the shaft and the balance of weight. The skill variable would be more reliable if we had systematic data on the criteria people used to rank items – do they all use the same criteria? It may be that these criteria are inseparable from each other and from the act of ranking, similar to the Gestalt effect, which maintains that the identification of an image or object is an instantaneous perception that cannot be reduced to the constituent components (Pelli et al., 2009).

 Also, we do not know if a higher-ranked item is actually more functional, which may be the more important question in some circumstances. Furthermore, it may be inappropriate to use the different measure of skill for men and women in the same analysis (as discussed in the *knowledge* section above). The advantage of our skill variable is that it ought to be more closely

related to our knowledge variable than alternative methods, such as frequency of use or self-reported ability to produce an item.

Conclusion

In this study we compared a measure of knowledge to one of skill, building on previous research by developing variables that are more likely to be related. We found no association between the variables. We conclude that research measuring trends in TEK or its returns ought to distinguish between methods that measure knowledge and methods that measure the application of knowledge, such as skill or behavior. The method selected to measure TEK should be justified against the alternatives, and this justification should include explicit *a priori* reasons to expect an association between the TEK variable and its hypothesized covariates.

References

Atran, S., D. Medin, N. Ross, E. Lynch, V. Vapnarsky, E. U. Ek et al., Folkecology, cultural epidemiology, and the spirit of the commons - A garden experiment in the Maya lowlands, 1991-2001, *Current Anthropology* **43** (2002), pp. 421-450.

Aunger, R., Against Idealism/Contra Consensus, *Current Anthropology* **40** (1999), pp. S93-S101.

Ayantunde, A., M. Briejer, P. Hiernaux, H. Udo, & R. Tabo, Botanical Knowledge and its Differentiation by Age, Gender and Ethnicity in Southwestern Niger, *Human Ecology* **36** (2008), pp. 881-889.

Benz, B., H. Perales, & S. Brush, Tzeltal and Tzotzil farmer knowledge and maize diversity in Chiapas, Mexico, *Current Anthropology* **48** (2007), pp. 289-300.

Benz, B. F., J. Cevallos, F. Santana, J. Rosales, & S. Graf, Losing knowledge about plant use in the Sierra de Manantlan biosphere reserve, Mexico, *Economic Botany* **54** (2000), pp. 183-191.

Berkes, F. (2008). *Sacred ecology* (2 ed.). New York and London: Routledge.

Bernard, H. R. (2006). *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed ed.). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Borgatti, S., *Tertiary ANTHROPAC 4.0* (1996),

Boster, J. S., & J. C. Johnson, Form or function: A comparison of expert and novice judgments of similarity among fish, *American Anthropologist* **91** (1989), pp. 866-889.

Byg, A., & H. Balslev, Traditional knowledge of Dypsis fibrosa (Arecaceae) in eastern Madagascar, *Economic Botany* **55** (2001), pp. 263-275.

Carlson, T. J. S., & Maffi, L. (2004). *Ethnobotany and conservation of biocultural diversity* (15). Bronx, NY: New York Botanical Garden Press.

Casagrande, D. G., Conceptions of primary forest in a Tzeltal Maya community: Implications for conservation, *Human Organization* **63** (2004), pp. 189-202.

Chavez, L. R., F. A. Hubbell, J. M. Mcmullin, R. G. Martinez, & S. I. Mishra, Structure and meaning in models of breast and cervical-cancer risk-factors - A comparison of perceptions among Latinas, Anglo women, and physicians, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* **9** (1995), pp. 40-74.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3 ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Corlett, J., J. W. Palfreyman, H. J. Staines, & H. Marr, Factors influencing theoretical knowledge and practical skill acquisition in student nurses: an empirical experiment, *Nursing Education Today* **23** (2003), pp. 183-190.

de Albuquerque, U. P., Re-examining hypotheses concerning the use and knowledge of medicinal plants: a study in the Caatinga vegetation of NE Brazil, *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* **v** (2006), pp. 30.

Dovie, D. B. K., E. T. F. Witkowski, & C. M. Shackleton, Knowledge of plant resource use based on location, gender and generation, *Applied Geography* **28** (2008), pp. 311-322.

Feyerabend, P. (1987). *Farewell to reason.* London: Verso.

Garro, L. C., Remembering what one knows and the construction of the past: A comparison of cultural consensus theory and cultural schema theory, *Ethos* **28** (2000), pp. 275-319.

Godoy, R. (2001). *Indians, markets, and rainforest: Theory, methods, and analysis.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Godoy, R., S. Tanner, V. Reyes-García, W. R. Leonard, T. W. Mcdae, M. Vento et al., The effect of rainfall during gestation and early childhood on adult height in a foraging and

horticultural society of the Bolivian Amazon, *American Journal of Human Biology* **20** (2008), pp. 23-34.

Guest, G., Market Integration and the Distribution of Ecological Knowledge within an Ecuadorian Fishing Community, *Journal of Ecological Anthropology* **6** (2002), pp. 38-49.

Handwerker, W. P., The construct validity of cultures: Cultural diversity, culture theory, and a method for ethnography, *American Anthropologist* **104** (2002), pp. 106-122.

Hruschka, D. J., L. M. Sibley, N. Kalim, & J. K. Edmonds, When there is more than one answer key: Cultural theories of postpartum hemorrhage in Matlab, Bangladesh, *Field Methods* **20** (2008), pp. 315-337.

Huanca, T. (2008). *Tsimane' oral tradition, landscape, and identity in tropical forest.* La Paz, Bolivia: Wa-Gui.

Kristensen, M., & H. Balslev, Perceptions, use and availability of woody plants among the Gourounsi in Burkina Faso, *Biodiversity and Conservation* **12** (2003), pp. 1715-1739.

Ladio, A. H., & M. Lozada, Patterns of use and knowledge of wild edible plants in distinct ecological environments: a case study of a Mapuche community from northwestern Patagonia, *Biodiversity Conservation* **13** (2004), pp. 1153-1173.

McCaugherty, D., The theory practice gap in nurse education - its causes and possible solutions - findings from an action research study, *Journal of Advanced Nursing* **16** (1991), pp. 1055-1061.

McDade, T. W., V. Reyes-García, P. Blackinton, S. Tanner, T. Huanca, & W. R. Leonard, Ethnobotanical knowledge is associated with indices of child health in the Bolivian Amazon, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **104** (2007), pp. 6134-6139.

Miller, M. L., J. Kaneko, P. Bartram, J. Marks, & D. D. Brewer, Cultural consensus analysis and environmental anthropology: Yellowfin tuna fishery management in Hawaii, *Cross-cultural Research* **38** (2004), pp. 289-314.

Nolan, J. M., & M. C. Robbins, Cultural conservation of medicinal plant use in the Ozarks, *Human Organization* **58** (1999), pp. 67-72.

Nonaka, I., K. Umemoto, & D. Senoo, From information processing to knowledge creation: A paradigm shift in business management, *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society* **18** (1996), pp. 203-218.

Pelli, D. G., N. J. Majaj, N. Raizman, C. J. Christian, E. Kim, & M. C. Palomares, Grouping in object recognition: The role of a Gestalt law in letter identification, *Cognitive Neuropsychology* **26** (2009), pp. 36-49.

Polanyi, M. (1967). *The Tacit Dimension.* London: Routledge & K. Paul.

Quinlan, M. B., & R. J. Quinlan, Modernization and medicinal plant knowledge in a Caribbean horticultural village, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* **21** (2007), pp. 169-192.

Reyes-García, V., E. Byron, R. Godoy, V. Vadez, L. Apaza, E. Perez et al., Measuring culture as shared knowledge: Do data collection formats matters? Cultural knowledge of plant uses among the Tsimane' Amerindians of Bolivia, *Field Methods* **16** (2004), pp. 135-156.

Reyes-García, V., N. Martí, T. McDade, M. Tanner, & V. Vadez, Concepts and methods in studies measuring individual ethnobotanical knowledge, *Journal of Ethnobiology* **27** (2007), pp. 182-203.

Reyes-García, V., T. McDade, V. Vadez, T. Huanca, W. R. Leonard, S. Tanner et al., Non-market returns to traditional human capital: Nutritional status and traditional knowledge in a native Amazonian society, *Journal of Development Studies* **44** (2008), pp. 217-232.

Reyes-García, V., V. Vadez, E. Byron, L. Apaza, W. R. Leonard, E. Perez et al., Market economy and the loss of folk knowledge of plant uses: Estimates from the Tsimane' of the Bolivian Amazon, *Current Anthropology* **46** (2005a), pp. 651-656.

Reyes-García, V., V. Vadez, T. Huanca, W. Leonard, & D. Wilkie, Knowledge and consumption of wild plants: a comparative study in two Tsimane' villages in the Bolivian Amazon, *Ethnobotany Research and Applications* **3** (2005b), pp. 201-207.

Reyes-García, V., V. Vadez, T. Huanca, W. R. Leonard, & T. McDade, Economic development and local ecological knowledge: A deadlock? Quantitative research from a native Amazonian society, *Human Ecology* **35** (2007), pp. 371-377.

Reyes-García, V., V. Vadez, S. Tanner, T. McDade, T. Huanca, & W. R. Leonard, Evaluating indices of traditional ecological knowledge: A methodological contribution, *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* **2** (2006),

Reyes-García, V. E. (2001). *Indigenous people, ethnobotanical knowledge, and market economy: A case study of the Tsimane Amerindians in lowland Bolivia.* University of Florida, Gainesville.

Romney, A. K., S. C. Weller, & W. H. Batchelder, Culture as Consensus: A Theory of Culture and Informant Accuracy, *American Anthropologist* **88** (1986), pp. 313-338.

Romney, A. K., W. H. Batchelder, & S. C. Weller, Recent applications of cultural consensus theory, *American Behavioral Scientist* **31** (1987), pp. 163-177.

Romney, A. K., S. C. Weller, & W. H. Batchelder, Culture as consensus - A theory of culture and informant accuracy, *American Anthropologist* **88** (1986), pp. 313-338.

Russell, B. (1912). *The problems of philosophy* (35). New York: H. Holt and company.

Ryan, S., & R. V. O'Connor, Development of a team measure for tacit knowledge in software development teams, *Journal of Systems and Software* **82** (2009), pp. 229-240.

Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ryle, G. (1971). Knowing how and knowing that. In *Collected Papers* (pp. 212-225). New York: Barnes and Nobles.

Samal, P. K., & P. P. Dhyani, Gender in the management of indigenous knowledge: reflections from Indian Central Himalaya, *Current Science* **91** (2006), pp. 104-108.

Soper, D. S. (2009). The free statistics calculator website. Retrieved May 2, 2009, from http://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc.

Srithi, K., H. Balslev, P. Wangpakapattanawonga, P. Srisangac, & C. Trisonthi, Medicinal plant knowledge an its erosion among the Mien (Yao) in northern Thailand, *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* **132** (2009), pp. 335-342.

Stanley, J., & T. Williamson, Knowing how, *Journal of Philosophy* **98** (2001), pp. 411-444.

Sternberg, R. J., C. Nokes, P. W. Geissler, R. Prince, F. Okatcha, D. A. Bundy et al., The relationship between academic and practical intelligence: a case study in Kenya, *Intelligence* **29** (2001), pp. 401-418.

Vadez, V., V. Reyes-García, R. A. Godoy, V. L. Apaza, E. Byron, T. Huanca et al., Does integration to the market threaten agricultural diversity? Panel and cross-sectional data from a horticultural-foraging society in the Bolivian Amazon, *Human Ecology* **32** (2004), pp. 635-646.

Voeks, R. A., & A. Leony, Forgetting the forest: Assessing medicinal plant erosion in eastern Brazil, *Economic Botany* **58** (2004), pp. S294-S306.

Weller, S. C., Cultural consensus theory: Applications and frequently asked questions, *Field Methods* **19** (2007), pp. 339-368.

Weller, S. C., & Romney, A. K. (1988). *Systematic data collection* (10). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Werr, A., & T. Stjernberg, Exploring management consulting firms as knowledge systems, *Organizational Studies* **24** (2003), pp. 881-908.

Wirf, L., A. Campbell, & N. Rea, Implications of gendered environmental knowledge in water allocation processes in central Australia, *Gender Place and Culture* **15** (2008), pp. 505-518.

Zarger, R. K., & J. R. Stepp, Persistence of botanical knowledge among Tzeltal Maya children, *Current Anthropology* **45** (2004), pp. 413-418.

Zent, S. (2001). Acculturation and ethnobotanical knowledge loss among the Pairoa of Venezuela: demonstration of a quantitative method for the empirical study of TEK change. In L. Maffi (Ed.), *On biocultural diversity: linking language, knowledge, and the environment* (pp. 190-211). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.