Introduction

Educating Anthropologists and Teaching Anthropology

LORENZO CAÑÁS BOTTOS, JAKOB KRAUSE-JENSEN AND IOANNIS MANOS

Introduction

This volume offers a cross-section of the challenges, possibilities and creative strengths shaping anthropology education in the early twenty-first century. While anthropology advances through methodological, theoretical and empirical research typically published in peer-reviewed journals, it is reproduced primarily through university-based study programmes. Scholars have extensively reflected on research methods (e.g. Biehl and Locke 2017; Marcus 1998; Pink and Salazar 2017) and revised analytical frameworks to address changing global conditions (e.g. Collier and Ong 2005; Tsing 2015). In contrast, pedagogical practices, the very means through which the discipline is sustained and transmitted, have received far less critical scrutiny. This imbalance underscores that for anthropology to remain vital, teaching must be recognised not as peripheral, but as a core site of disciplinary reflection and renewal.

The founding suspicion that defines the book is that the discipline's history and defining profile have been focused on its research practices at the expense of its pedagogy and teaching practices. Education is arguably the central arena where the discipline of anthropology is reproduced, challenged and renewed. The core curricula and the content of courses and formats of teaching are, even if contested, probably the space where colleagues (and students) have to come to some general agreement about what the contested pursuit we call anthropology is about.

To address these concerns, this volume pursues three central aims: first, to examine how anthropology is taught in varied institutional and cultural contexts; second, to explore how teaching practices reproduce or reconfigure disciplinary norms critically; and third, to consider how

educators respond to broader global transformations in higher education. Drawing on comparative, ethnographically grounded case studies, the volume positions anthropology education as a dynamic space of educational innovation, where institutional constraints, epistemological debates and pedagogical practice are reflected and actively reshaped.

We present first-hand accounts that explore how shifting educational practices, institutional structures and conceptual frameworks impact and are formed by teaching anthropology across diverse global settings. These chapters show how teaching anthropology grows in dialogue with local social contexts and the discipline's international development. Furthermore, anthropology is increasingly being taught outside traditional departments, within interdisciplinary programmes, and to students from various academic and professional backgrounds. The contributions demonstrate remarkably creative responses to political, technological and epistemological pressures while questioning taken-for-granted conventions in pedagogical practice.

While the teaching of anthropology has gained visibility in recent decades, concerns over pedagogy have existed since the discipline's early institutionalisation. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, US anthropologists called for combining theoretical knowledge with practical training, experiential learning and interdisciplinary awareness, supported by museums and fieldwork (Boas 1919; MacCurdy 1902). In the UK, Malinowski's fieldwork-focused seminar at LSE in the 1920s–30s laid the foundation for anthropological training (Mills 2008: 29–48). In post-war US education, teaching anthropology was framed as a path to professional training and a contributor to liberal learning and critical thinking (Ehrich 1954).

Although pedagogical debates remained informal in Europe, scholars emphasised the need for coherent graduate training in fieldwork and curriculum design (Leach 1959; Evans-Pritchard 1959). The expansion of undergraduate programmes in the 1960s and 1970s led to a proliferation of textbooks. These aimed to standardise teaching while promoting accessible, student-centred learning (Naylor 1977). By the late twentieth century, the rise of mass higher education intensified tensions between research-oriented practices and student-centred teaching (Schippers 1999), while concerns about pedagogy and proper training gained prominence across institutions (Dracklé et al. 2003; Dracklé and Edgar 2004). In the twenty-first century, shifting fieldwork conditions, digital transformations and growing ethical complexity have renewed calls for curriculum reform and reflective, critical approaches to teaching and training (Handler 2017).

Building on these earlier developments and debates, the current collection originates from the EASA Teaching Anthropology Network (TAN). The network was established in 1996 in Barcelona, as part of a broader institutional step to reflect on and reshape anthropological education. Its efforts were documented in two early volumes: *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology* (Dracklé et al. 2003) and *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education* (Dracklé and Edgar 2004), which coincided with a period of intensified European educational integration, mainly through the Bologna process. Building on this foundational work, the collection now broadens the geographic and conceptual horizons by incorporating perspectives from Asia, Africa and Latin America. This expansion not only provides comparative insights into the teaching of anthropology across diverse institutional and sociopolitical contexts but also highlights enduring hierarchies in the global politics of knowledge, positioning teaching as a crucial arena for challenging and transforming these dynamics.

Digital technologies have expanded the conversation beyond Europe, enabling new forms of collaboration, teaching and exchange across borders without physical travel. This volume grew from two webinars hosted by TAN in 2020 and 2021 during the COVID-19 pandemic, where many contributing authors engaged in collective reflection. Such virtual spaces have become integral to anthropological education, normalising hybrid, remote, synchronous and asynchronous teaching models. The widespread availability of online platforms and mobile devices has transformed classrooms, introducing distractions and powerful pedagogical possibilities. Interactive digital tools have redefined how knowledge is produced, shared and accessed. They have also fostered new forms of engagement, feedback and connection across space and time. Concurrently, the rapid circulation of teaching materials, often outside paywalls, has helped democratise access to knowledge, even as structural inequalities and barriers persist. The rise of artificial intelligence and large-scale language models brings new pedagogical opportunities, bridging some boundaries while creating new ones. The volume contributes to these urgent debates by offering grounded, comparative accounts of how educators are revisiting anthropological teaching in response to these technological transformations, adjusting to societal changes and actively reshaping the field's pedagogical future.

Anthropology has long valued particularity and context, and this volume underlines how the content and modes of teaching the discipline vary significantly worldwide. While global connectivity, facilitated by

new technologies and a heightened sense of interdependence, might suggest increasing uniformity, anthropological education remains profoundly shaped by local histories, institutional structures and national academic cultures. Contemporary crises affect teaching environments unevenly, depending on regional contexts and historical trajectories. These differences reflect how anthropology is introduced, questioned, adjusted and practised. Anthropology is taught not as a unified model but as a plurality of often contested curricular frameworks and pedagogical forms shaped through the interaction of disciplinary traditions, institutional constraints and the lived experiences of teachers and students alike.

Anthropology is undergoing a complex, worldwide process of change shaped by asymmetries in epistemic authority, language, institutional power and disciplinary prestige. Anthropology's own global expansion and the emergence of diverse local traditions negotiating with Anglo-American centres of knowledge production take place through tensions, translations and strategic engagements that reflect and challenge broader global hierarchies. As testified in the contributions, there has been a world of difference between the conditions of teaching anthropology in Brazil under the autocratic regime of Bolsonaro, in Scandinavian welfare states, in post-imperial Britain, in post-Soviet Estonia, in post-colonial Morocco or in South Korea.

At the same time, anthropology's internal debates have continually reshaped how the discipline understands itself. Anthropology has long been marked by critical self-interrogation, repeatedly confronting its assumptions, methods and complicities. Emerging from the legacy of colonialism, the discipline has grappled with its entanglements in political and economic inequality structures. Foundational critiques of anthropology's imperial ties (Asad 1973) and orientalist frameworks (Said 1978) gave way to the 'writing culture' debates, which challenged how anthropologists represent 'the other' (Clifford and Marcus 1986). These moments of disciplinary reinvention recognised a shifting subject matter, prompting the development of new conceptual frameworks, including postcolonial and subaltern studies, feminist critiques, the anthropology of policy, STS, spatial and ontological turns, and multispecies ethnography. Together, these approaches reflect a discipline continually reshaped by internal critique and the complex realities of a world far removed from that of Mead and Malinowski.

Yet these histories are not experienced equally across the global anthropological field. The disciplinary history outlined above primarily reflects English-speaking anthropology. Yet the global hierarchical

organisation of anthropological knowledge is shaped by enduring epistemic hierarchies, not only internationally (Gerholm and Hannerz 1982; Lins Ribeiro and Escobar 2006) but also within national contexts, as seen in recruitment and recognition practices (Kawa et al. 2018). These inequalities operate through uneven distributions of symbolic capital across countries, universities, funding bodies, languages, journals and publishing platforms. That this volume is written in English, mainly referencing English-language scholarship, while none of the editors and only a few authors are native speakers, is a telling example.

Traditions such as Franglus (French-Anglo-US) anthropology (Verdery 2007) dominate curricula globally, while intellectual contributions from other regions are often sidelined. Practices like 'anthropology at home' and 'autoethnography', long embraced in non-hegemonic contexts, only gained theoretical legitimacy once adopted by Western scholars. This volume takes such asymmetries seriously. It asks what it means to establish anthropology departments in regions once seen primarily as sites of study. How do these shifts reshape research, teaching and the formation of disciplinary agendas? What kinds of 'others' are legitimised or marginalised across different anthropological traditions? In responding to these questions, the collection addresses the undertheorisation of pedagogy and the limited incorporation of perspectives beyond the discipline's dominant centres.

As anthropology's objects of study have altered, so has its student population. Across many countries, universities have transitioned from elite institutions to so-called 'mass universities'. This shift has unfolded alongside growing political interference and pressure to participate in neoliberal transformations, with the primary ambition of contributing to the so-called 'knowledge economy', as many volumes in this series testify (Hyatt et al. 2015; Urciuoli 2018, 2022; Wright and Shore 2017). In this context, reforms promoting 'Mode 2' learning (Gibbons et al. 1994) and transdisciplinarity have challenged anthropology's coherence as a discipline and its teaching practices. These reforms are often advanced by powerful international agencies who identify disciplines with silo thinking unsuited to the needs of the ever-changing demands of the 'knowledge economy'. The OECD put it bluntly: 'The University is no longer a quiet place to teach and do scholarly work at a measured pace and contemplate the universe as in centuries past. It is a big, complex, demanding, competitive business' (OECD 2007: 5). These dynamics are not confined to the Global North. Governments in Asia, Latin America and elsewhere have expanded access to higher education, driven by development goals, labour market demands and

shifting imaginaries of merit and mobility (UNESCO 2017). Much of this growth has been led by private institutions, especially in middle-income countries (Brunner and Labraña 2020). Despite structural constraints, anthropology educators have developed inventive pedagogical strategies, rethinking curricula, experimenting with collaborative teaching practices, and using technology to engage critically with their changing educational environments. The chapters in this volume thus situate anthropology education within these changing political and economic conditions, highlighting how educators respond to, resist and reimagine their role.

Organisation of the Book

This book is divided into three parts, each addressing a different scale of teaching and learning in anthropology. We begin with how the teaching of anthropology is shaped by national and regional contexts in dialogue with dominant disciplinary centres. We then move to settings where anthropology is taught outside its disciplinary boundaries – to students in other academic fields and interdisciplinary programmes. Finally, we turn to the classroom itself, focusing on new strategies for educating anthropologists in response to technological and societal change.

The first part, 'Global Contexts: Localising Anthropology', is formed by four chapters that present a panorama of diverse ways and particular dilemmas of teaching anthropology when the discipline is unmoored from its traditional (and colonial) centres. This reveals its ensuing rooting and localisation worldwide according to differing national, political, educational and economic contexts. A shared recognition of an uneven positioning of the different local traditions within the global field of anthropology is present in all of these chapters, from the inheritance of colonial pasts as subjects of study to the development and establishment of local disciplinary traditions. These four chapters share central common concerns regarding the definition of anthropology that is being taught in relationship with its specific teaching context, including the definition of legitimate 'others' as objects of study, as well as types of research problems deemed relevant.

In the opening chapter, José Luis Escalona Victoria examines social anthropology education in Chiapas, Mexico, which is defined through two historical tensions. First, he highlights the recent emergence of anthropology programmes in Chiapas, a region that has been a long-standing fieldwork site for metropolitan universities. Second, he points out that an unnuanced, activism-inspired interpretation of anthropology

in local education tends to reinforce the global division of scientific labour by focusing on immediate, localised issues rather than broader historical questions. Escalona then focuses on the transformation of education of anthropologists in Mexico, which is occasioned by shifts in objects of study from Indigenous and rural communities to more urban settings. This is a shift towards industrialised and bureaucratised spaces with new forms of wealth and poverty, as well as different forms of social movement, organisation and rebellion. The chapter discusses how these developments impact the teaching of methods and theory, and the subsequent employment possibilities of university candidates.

Guillermo Vega Sanabria's contribution explores the challenges and opportunities in teaching anthropology to a diverse student body in Brazil. The chapter highlights the transitional nature of the first year of university and the impact of students' varied sociocultural backgrounds on educational goals. Vega Sanabria examines the objectives, content, bibliographies and student feedback on mandatory anthropology courses in a Brazilian social sciences programme, and discusses Brazil's historical context of racialised domination and the effects of affirmative action policies, which have increased representation of marginalised groups in higher education. Vega Sanabria underscores the importance of recognising diversity and implementing curricular changes to enhance students' intellectual, moral and ethical development and concludes with a call for a critical reappropriation of the canon that incorporates everyday life, classrooms and student interactions.

The chapter by Subhadra Mitra Channa looks at the historical and ongoing challenges faced by Indian anthropology in transitioning from objects of study to anthropological producers of knowledge. It highlights how Western epistemology, imposed during colonial times, positioned Western scholars as knowledge producers and Indian natives as subjects. The entry of native anthropologists began to challenge the colonial dichotomy, leading to an indigenous critique of externally imposed concepts. However, Western theoretical dominance persisted in Indian anthropology education, with global recognition often favouring those with Western affiliations. The chapter also discusses the limited global resonance of Indian-developed theories and the ongoing struggle of Indian anthropologists to be recognised as knowledge producers in a field still dominated by Western epistemic hierarchies.

Lastly, Lorenzo Cañás Bottos focuses on the formation of the Chair of Social and Cultural Anthropology at Tallinn University as part of a broader realignment of Estonia with Western capitalist Europe. This involved the development of an anthropology study programme that

conformed with the dominant anthropological traditions that were absent during the Soviet period. The chapter addresses the ongoing debate about decolonising anthropological knowledge and its canon. It argues for balancing two needs: first, maintaining a recognisable disciplinary identity so students are accepted globally as professional anthropologists; and second, developing distinctive interpretive approaches that reflect local context and appropriation.

Taken together, these four chapters examine the dilemmas of how to understand the localisation of anthropology in changing contexts. They highlight the complex interactions between dominant world trends and changing sociopolitical contexts. Two simultaneous shifts have been at work in Mexico, India and Brazil. On the one hand, as modernisation, development and industrialisation processes advanced, anthropologists followed their traditional research subjects from rural to urban settings. On the other hand, the distance narrowed between the professional anthropologists and their subjects. Doing anthropology 'at home' was not a novelty but a normal state of affairs, and the teaching of the discipline had to take this into account, together with the locally relevant 'social problems' (which affect teachers and students directly). Educators appear as intermediaries, negotiating a dialogue between world trends and local necessities, or between universality and particularity.

While Part I focuses on the localisation of anthropology through institutional grounding, the next set of chapters shifts attention to how anthropology is taught beyond its core disciplinary spaces. Part II, titled 'Contested Spaces: Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries', explores the practical and institutional challenges that arise when anthropological thinking is introduced in interdisciplinary settings, highlighting how educators rethink their methods to engage diverse learning environments. Each author teaches in interdisciplinary programmes or institutions, where they must demonstrate the discipline's relevance to students unfamiliar with it. These anthropologists must constantly reposition their discipline within their institutions, navigating labour market pressures, interdisciplinary competition, and nationalist (Greece) or religious influences (Morocco). In such contexts, they must develop alternative teaching strategies to engage students and make anthropology meaningful. By integrating ethnographic exercises, virtual learning, multimodal approaches and performative methods, they cultivate critical thinking, ethnographic sensibility and an understanding of anthropology's relevance in broader social and professional settings.

Jakob Krause-Jensen examines teaching organisational anthropology in Denmark, where increasing pressure to align education with

labour market demands risks diluting anthropology's academic and disciplinary identity. Conceptualising disciplinary identity along the lines of Wittgenstein's family resemblances, he introduces a list of anthropological traits as a pedagogical tool to highlight anthropology's distinct analytical sensibility in contrast to dominant organisational research frameworks. He also explores how ethnographic curiosity can be cultivated 'at home' as students conduct fieldwork in familiar work environments. Anthropology, he argues, offers critical insights into contemporary work organisations and perspectives that are valuable to people who ultimately pursue careers outside academia.

Seung-Mi Han examines how anthropology is taught in interdisciplinary programmes in South Korea, often outside dedicated departments such as area studies. With English as the medium of instruction, conducting ethnographic fieldwork in Korean society becomes challenging. Han explores how anthropology can be effectively taught in these settings, where students lack prior exposure to the field. She experiments with mini-fieldwork, virtual ethnography and structured exercises to grow an ethnographic understanding. Han demonstrates how anthropologists must continuously adapt and strategically position their discipline to remain relevant in applied contexts.

Ioannis Manos examines the teaching of ethnography in Greek higher education as a site of disciplinary formation shaped by nationalist ideologies, institutional precarity and the instrumentalisation of academic labour under neoliberal reform. Drawing on institutional histories, departmental discourses and his own teaching experience, he explores how anthropological education must continually respond to shifting sociopolitical conditions and the reconfiguration of the discipline in both national and transnational contexts. Teaching is conceptualised as a dynamic, situated process through which students develop knowledge and critical understanding of cultural diversity. Framed through a participant observer's situated involvement, the chapter argues that teaching ethnography in Greece today constitutes a political intervention, fundamental to preserving anthropology's critical orientation within constrained academic structures and a broader public discourse marked by cultural essentialism and resistance towards critical inquiry.

Kamal Feriali examines how anthropology was introduced as a semi-independent course in Morocco. The education system, shaped by political, religious and colonial legacies, offers little exposure to anthropology, and the K-12 curriculum suppresses evolutionary theory under politico-religious pretexts. To counter such limitations, Feriali advocates a four-field pedagogy to challenge ethnocentrism, nationalist ideologies

and religious biases. He integrates performative ethnography, critical discussions and fieldwork to engage students. The chapter describes how anthropology's future in Morocco is uncertain and depends on broader educational and political reforms.

This second part provides a key insight that sustaining anthropology outside its core disciplinary spaces requires pedagogical creativity and institutional awareness. The contributions demonstrate that teaching anthropology in settings beyond classical, well-defined anthropology departments goes beyond simply introducing the subject. Instead, it requires ongoing adjustment, justification and strategic positioning. Despite different institutional and ideological challenges, the chapters in this part highlight anthropology's greatest strength, flexibility, and its capacity to engage with diverse contexts critically. Whether responding to labour market pressures, interdisciplinary competition or ideological resistance, these anthropologists develop inventive, context-specific strategies that allow anthropology to remain relevant and transformative.

While these chapters reflect anthropology's responsiveness across institutional boundaries, the final part turns inward, to the educational process that takes place inside and outside the classroom, to explore how teaching is being reimagined through experimental practices in response to recent global and technological shifts. The last part, 'Multimodal Engagements: Expanding Anthropological Pedagogies', brings together four contributions that consider unconventional, experimental and innovative ways of teaching. Each chapter responds to shifting political, epistemological, pedagogical or technological contexts that demand rethinking how anthropology is taught, learned and practised. Some challenge enduring conventions, questioning the dominance of written texts over drawings and the preference for collectivities over individual-centered approaches in anthropology. Others engage with real-time disruptions, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the rise of generative AI. What unites these diverse contributions is a shared concern for how anthropology can remain flexible in methods, be pedagogically inclusive and foster intellectual curiosity. They expand the range of anthropological education by engaging students through multiple approaches: drawing, existential inquiry, digital tools and critical ethnography. These methods emphasise critical reflexivity, embodiment and emotion as fundamental elements of the learning process.

Aina Azevedo et al. examine the role of drawing as a sensorial, reflexive and epistemological practice in anthropological education. Based on Brazilian higher education, the chapter addresses the discipline's textual bias and builds on Latin American traditions of graphic expression.

Rather than treating drawing as an illustration, the authors frame it as a mode of inquiry that produces embodied knowledge and enhances ethnographic sensibility. Through classroom-based experiments, they advocate for a 'drawing education' that challenges text-centred norms, supports intercultural dialogue and broadens our current understanding of what counts as valid anthropological knowledge.

John Loewenthal reflects on his experience teaching anthropology in continuing education programmes in the UK, examining how the discipline can become more participatory, inclusive and personally meaningful to students. Based on existential and psychological anthropology, he promotes a person-centred approach that emphasises lived experience, emotional depth and subjectivity. His teaching methods, interviews, storytelling and life-course reflection encourage students to develop knowledge jointly. Arguing for a more accessible and beneficial anthropology, Loewenthal challenges sociocultural abstraction and positions the discipline as a practice rooted in human connection. The chapter highlights the therapeutic potential of anthropology and its relevance to understanding the human condition through existential pedagogy.

Mark F. Hau examines the pedagogical use of AI chatbots like ChatGPT in anthropological education, drawing on his teaching experience in Denmark. He situates the chapter within broader debates about AI's impact on humanistic disciplines. Hau asks how such tools can support rather than undermine core values like critical thinking, relational learning and contextual depth. Using affordance theory, he frames chatbots as interconnected tools shaped by interaction. Hau proposes an 'AI literacy' approach, encouraging teachers and students to engage critically with these technologies as instructional resources rather than substitutes for teaching.

Leonardo Carbonieri Campoy recounts his teaching of 'Anthropology of Brazil' during the COVID-19 pandemic at a private university attended primarily by students from marginalised backgrounds. Confronted with a system that refuses to acknowledge political realities and structural inequalities, he rethinks pedagogy as a practice of resistance and care. He rejects traditional syllabi and exams and guides students in online ethnographic research on contemporary minority-led movements. In this context, anthropology becomes a tool for opposing injustice, building solidarity and empowering students to reinterpret knowledge on their own terms. The chapter frames ethnography as political pedagogy grounded in lived experience and committed to decolonial transformation.

This part addresses substantial questions about the transformations of the discipline and the readiness of anthropologists to incorporate experimental teaching modes and to create resilient and stimulating learning spaces. The chapters suggest that anthropological education must extend beyond conventional content delivery or disciplinary canons. They advocate teaching itself as a space of inquiry, experimentation and transformation. Regarding disciplinary relevance, these contributions challenge anthropology to revisit its assumptions about method, authority and what counts as knowledge by engaging with practices that may once have been considered marginal. In methodological terms, they offer alternatives to dominant paradigms, from drawing as a mode of ethnographic insight to AI as a prompt for digital reflexivity to existential pedagogy to cultivate critical self-awareness and engagement with the surrounding world. Regarding pedagogical value, they highlight how creativity, accessibility and care can encourage more meaningful learning experiences, particularly for students who might not see themselves reflected in conventional anthropological curricula. These experiments show that educating anthropologists for the contemporary world requires new tools and techniques and a more profound openness to transformation within the classroom and the discipline.

Educating Anthropologists, Reimagining Anthropology

As anthropology expands globally beyond its historical centres, it does not produce a single disciplinary identity but rather a plurality of anthropologies shaped by national histories, institutional settings, ideological pressures and locally rooted pedagogies (Restrepo and Escobar 2005; Lins Ribeiro 2006). The chapters in this volume reflect this diversity: they emerge from both authoritarian and democratic contexts, from long-established departments and newly emerging programmes, and academic environments shaped by colonial legacies, neoliberal reforms or both. Rather than viewing difference as a deviation from a standard model, the volume suggests that intellectual and pedagogical variation across contexts sparks creativity in teaching and thinking – it is a source of methodological innovation, theoretical development and academic renewal (Grosfoguel 2011). Recognising these local variations invites reflection on how more balanced and reciprocal exchanges across traditions can emerge without reproducing inherited inequalities.

Given this global diversity, reflecting on the discipline's enduring intellectual commitments and the evolving role of teaching within them becomes essential. Anthropology has long distinguished itself through

its broad scope, with cross-cultural comparison and a global perspective as defining features of its inquiry. Yet the discipline has also historically grounded its authority in research, often neglecting or under-theorising teaching as a secondary concern (Bundgaard and Rubow 2016; Coleman 2011; Mills 2011). This volume builds on anthropology's comparative traditions by placing teaching at the centre of disciplinary reflection, asking what it means to teach anthropology in meaningful, responsive and contextually grounded ways within today's shifting institutional, political and social landscapes. Through educational autoethnographies and reflexive accounts drawn from the authors' own teaching contexts, the chapters explore the creativity and innovation that arise when anthropology engages critically with the everyday realities of its transmission and transformation, offering new insights into how the discipline is taught, reshaped and reimagined across diverse settings.

By documenting how anthropology is taught across diverse institutions and regions, this volume advances a compelling argument: educating anthropologists also means rethinking what anthropology is, what it does and who it is for (Holmes and Marcus 2008). If the discipline is to remain critical and engaged in the twenty-first century, it must treat education not as an afterthought but as a generative site for epistemological, methodological and political-intellectual transformation. We contend that teaching is not merely a means of transmitting knowledge but a site of epistemological and institutional negotiation between teachers and students, between inherited intellectual legacies and current societal demands and between global paradigms and local realities.

By placing voices and institutions often under-represented in mainstream anthropological discourse at the centre, we shift attention to the settings where anthropology is most actively practised, debated and transformed. In doing so, we argue for a broader recognition of teaching practices as a vital domain of anthropological knowledge-making and disciplinary renewal. Beyond critiquing the discipline's historical prioritisation of research, we call for a more proactive rethinking and valorisation of teaching practices, a shift that resonates with calls for decolonial and transformative approaches to knowledge and education (De Lissovoy 2010; Santos 2014). Doing so requires directly confronting the persistent gap between teaching practice and theoretical reflection and committing to developing stronger conceptual frameworks that recognise teaching as a central part of anthropological inquiry.

Whether in Chiapas or Casablanca, Seoul or Tallinn, educators face specific dilemmas about what kind of anthropology to teach, to whom

and for what purpose. Across the volume, anthropology is taught in conditions shaped by neoliberal reform, technological change, institutional marginalisation and political repression. Yet responses to these pressures are far from uniform. Each context produces distinct pedagogical answers shaped by local histories, institutional arrangements and educational traditions. Anthropologists respond with creativity on a variety of levels, from developing study programmes expanding the reach of anthropology to students of other disciplines, to everyday adjustments to syllabi, engagement strategies and relationships with students. These are not mere accommodations to challenging environments, but grounded interventions that expand what anthropological teaching can do and who it can reach. In this sense, teaching becomes more than a response. Teaching becomes a site for reshaping the field itself, redefining anthropology's boundaries, commitments and publics (Seth 2009).

The chapters also underscore that teaching is never a neutral or technical activity. Struggles over power, ideology and access shape curricula. Anthropologists must contend with external pressures, from market-driven education policies to political authoritarianism, while engaging with internal debates around decolonisation, relevance and which thinkers, texts and traditions are deemed legitimate within the field. Teaching anthropology is not just about delivering content; it is a political and intellectual practice that helps students engage with cultural differences, structural injustice and their own roles in understanding and transforming the world (Lavia and Moore 2009; Prakash 1992). In other words, how are the changing universities and the expansion of the discipline, the advent of educational IT and remote learning, and urgent, pressing global concerns from decolonisation to climate change reflected in curricular and teaching practices in different parts of the world? And how can we see those changes and experiments not only as reflections but also as inspiring examples of how to expand pedagogical possibilities and means of anthropology teaching and education within and beyond the classroom? These are some of the questions the volume addresses.

Positioned at the intersection of global change and disciplinary reflection, this volume intervenes in current debates about what it means to educate anthropologists both for and in the contemporary world. The phrase is intentionally dual: we explore how anthropological education responds to rapid social and institutional change, and what kinds of anthropologists are needed in and for such a world (Haugerud 2016). Across the chapters, a shared insight emerges: anthropological education

is not a static template to be replicated globally, but a dynamic, developing practice shaped by local contexts, critical reflection and experimentation in both pedagogy and methodology. Teaching anthropology, in this sense, is not a peripheral concern. It is central to shaping the discipline's future.

Lorenzo Cañás Bottos is Professor of Social Anthropology at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). Previously he held the first Chair in Sociocultural Anthropology at Tallinn University. He has researched and published on Latin American Mennonite colonies, on the Irish–Northern Irish border, on Levantine immigrants in Argentina and on Iberian pig producers in Spain. He is the author of *Old Colony Mennonites in Argentina and Bolivia: Nation Making, Religious Conflict and Imagination of the Future* (2008) and *Christenvolk: Historia y Etnografía de una Colonia Menonita* (2005), and co-editor of 'Cosmopolitan Networks' (a special issue of *Anthropological Forum*, 2024) and *Political Transformation and National Identity Change* (2008).

Jakob Krause-Jensen is Associate Professor of Anthropology at Aarhus University. His research focuses on a long-standing interest in how to use anthropological and ethnographic methods and strategies to gain fresh perspectives on contemporary work organisations and practices. He is the author of *Flexible Firm: The Design of Culture at Bang & Olufsen* (2010) and is co-editor of Berghahn's *Anthropology of Work* series. From 2012 to 2020 he co-coordinated the EASA Teaching Anthropology Network (TAN) and currently he is interested in the Danish shipping industry and its move towards a green transition.

Ioannis Manos is a Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Macedonia in Thessaloniki, Greece. He has conducted research and published works on borders and borderlands, nationalism, performative culture, identity politics, education, migration, and research ethics in South-East Europe. He served as the guest editor for the special issue of *Teaching Anthropology* 'Teaching Anthropology in Southern Europe' (2021) and was a co-author of *Communities in Greece: Exploring Aspects of Albanian Migration in Greece* (2017, with D. Papadopoulou and V. Makrygianni). Among other works, he has co-edited (with V. Dalkavoukis and Ch. Veikou) *Innocent Anthropologists Suspicious Students: Teaching Anthropology to 'Those Who Don't Need It'* (2010).

References

Asad, Talal. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.

Biehl, João Guilherme, and Peter A. Locke. 2017. *Unfinished: The Anthropology of Becoming*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Boas, Franz. 1919. 'Report on the Academic Teaching of Anthropology', *American Anthropologist* 21(1): 41–48.

Brunner, José Joaquín, and Juan Labraña. 2020. 'The Transformation of Higher Education in Latin America: From Elite Access to Massification and Universalisation', in Simon Schwartzman (ed.), *Higher Education in Latin America and the Challenges of the 21st Century*. Cham: Springer, pp. 31–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44263-7_3.

Bundgaard, Helle, and Cecilie Rubow. 2016. 'From Rite of Passage to a Mentored Educational Activity: Fieldwork for Master's Students of Anthropology', *Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences* 9(3): 22–41. https://doi.org/10.3167/latiss.2016.090303.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coleman, Simon. 2011. 'Teaching Anthropology Today', *Teaching Anthropology* 1(1): 3–11.

Collier, Stephen J., and Aihwa Ong. 2005. 'Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems', in Stephen J. Collier and Aihwa Ong (eds), *Global Assemblages*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 3–21.

De Lissovoy, Noah. 2010. 'Decolonial Pedagogy and the Ethics of the Global', *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 31(3): 279–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596301003786886.

Dracklé, Dorle, Iain R. Edgar and Thomas K. Schippers (eds). 2003. *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Dracklé, Dorle, and Iain R. Edgar (eds). 2004. *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Ehrich, Richard W. 1954. 'Anthropology in a Liberal-Arts Curriculum', *Journal of Higher Education* 25(7): 357–400. https://doi.org/10.2307/1977325.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1959. 'The Teaching of Social Anthropology at Oxford', *Man* 59: 121–24.

Gerholm, Tomas, and Ulf Hannerz. 1982. 'Introduction: The Shaping of National Anthropologies', *Ethnos* 47(1–2): 5–35.

Gibbons, Michael, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott and Martin Trow. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2011. 'Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality', *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/T411000004.

Handler, Richard. 2017. 'Three Ways of Being Interdisciplinary in the Neoliberal University: Suggestions for the Future of Anthropology in the Undergraduate

Curriculum', *American Anthropologist* website, 24 February. Retrieved 26 September 2025 from https://www.americananthropologist.org/online-content/anthropology-in-the-classroom-handler-essay.

Haugerud, Angelique. 2016. 'Public Anthropology in 2015: Charlie Hebdo, Black Lives Matter, Migrants, and More', *American Anthropologist* 118(3): 585–601. https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.12606.

Holmes, Douglas R., and George E. Marcus. 2008. 'Collaboration Today and the Re-Imagination of the Classic Scene of Fieldwork Encounter', *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1: 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1353/cla.0.0003.

Hyatt, Susan B., Boone W. Shear and Susan Wright (eds). 2015. *Learning under Neoliberalism: Ethnographies of Governance in Higher Education*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Kawa, Nicholas C., Juan A. Clavijo Michelangeli, Jessica L. Clark, Daniel Ginsberg and Christopher McCarty. 2018. 'The Social Network of US Academic Anthropology and Its Inequalities', *American Anthropologist* 121(1): 14–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13158.

Lavia, Jennifer, and Michele Moore. 2009. 'Education, Community, and Change: Advanced Perspectives', in Jennifer Lavia and Michele Moore (eds), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Policy and Practice: Decolonizing Community Contexts*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–11.

Leach, Edmund R. 1959. 'The Organization of Graduate Teaching and Research in Social Anthropology in Great Britain', *Social Science Information* 5(4): 97–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/053901846600500405.

Lins Ribeiro, Gustavo. 2006. 'World Anthropologies: Cosmopolitics for a New Global Scenario in Anthropology', *Critique of Anthropology* 26(4): 363–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X06070121.

Lins Ribeiro, Gustavo, and Arturo Escobar (eds). 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*. Oxford: Berg.

MacCurdy, George Grant. 1902. 'The Teaching of Anthropology in the United States', *Science* 15(371): 211–16.

Marcus, George E. 1998. *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mills, David. 2008. *Difficult Folk? A Political History of Social Anthropology*. New York: Berghahn Books.

———. 2011. 'Teaching Anthropology: A Hidden History of Disciplinary Pedagogy', *Teaching Anthropology* 1(1): 12–20.

Naylor, Lawrence L. 1977. 'Anthropology Today for the Anthropologists of Tomorrow', *American Anthropologist* 79(3): 618–27.

OECD. 2007. *On the Edge: Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education*. OECD Education Working Papers, no. 7. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved 26 September 2025 from https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2007/03/on-the-edge_g17a1963/220180871707.pdf.

Pink, Sarah, and Juan Francisco Salazar. 2017. 'Anthropologies and Futures: Setting the Agenda', in Sarah Pink and Juan Francisco Salazar (eds), *Anthropologies and Futures*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 3–22.

Prakash, Gyan. 1992. 'Science "Gone Native" in Colonial India', *Representations* 40: 153–78. https://doi.org/10.2307/2928743.

Restrepo, Eduardo, and Arturo Escobar. 2005. '"Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise": Steps to a World Anthropologies Framework', *Critique of Anthropology* 25(2): 99–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X05053009.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. London: Routledge.

Schippers, Thomas K. 1999. 'Antropologia Incognita: Teaching and Learning Anthropology in Europe Today', *Anthropology Today* 15(5): 65–72.

Seth, Sanjay. 2009. 'Putting Knowledge in Its Place: Science, Colonialism, and the Postcolonial', *Postcolonial Studies* 12(4): 373–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790903350633.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

UNESCO. 2017. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2017/8: Accountability in Education – Meeting Our Commitments*. Paris. Retrieved 26 September 2025 from https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/accountability.

Urciuoli, Bonnie. 2018. *The Experience of Neoliberal Education*. New York: Berghahn Books.

———. 2022. *Neoliberalizing Diversity in Liberal Arts College Life*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Verdery, Katherine. 2007. 'Franglus Anthropology and East European Ethnography: The Prospects for Synthesis', in Christina Hahn (ed.), *Anthropology's Multiple Temporalities and Its Future in Central and Eastern Europe: A Debate*. Halle/Saale: Max Planck Gesellschaft, pp. 48–59.

Wright, Susan, and Chris Shore. 2017. *Death of the Public University*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.