

The WCAA Global Survey of Anthropological Practice (2014-2018): Reported Findings

*Pam McGrath*¹

*Greg Acciaioli*²

*Adele Millard*²

*Emily Metzner*³

*Vesna Vučinić Nešković*⁴

*Chandana Mathur*⁵

¹Australian National University, Australia

²The University of Western Australia, Australia

³University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

⁴University of Belgrade, Beograd, Sérvia

⁵National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland

Abstract

The *Global Survey of Anthropological Practice (GSAP)*, the first of its kind, was undertaken by the *World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA)* to provide insights about anthropology as a transnational profession, the ongoing relevance of the discipline in addressing global problems, issues in employment and gender equity, and the range of anthropological practice and expertise. Respondents to the survey were living in 113 different countries. This article summarizes some of the GSAP's most general global findings. The GSAP data suggest that within the discipline of anthropology, woman-identified practitioners predominate, except in archaeology and linguistics; yet, women were more likely to report being under-employed and/or not fairly compensated for their work. Universities were the largest employers of anthropologists, but public policy work and public engagement featured centrally in many respondents' work. The social and cultural anthropology subdisciplines appear to be the most widely practiced the world over, but many respondents also engaged in applied anthropology. However, social media platforms, which might allow anthropologists to reach broader publics, were under-utilized by respondents, who were more likely to publish in closed, internal, and disciplinary specific forums. The GSAP illustrated the global mobility of respondents, including for higher education (and the data on this reflected the hegemony of North Atlantic centers of higher education); yet, many anthropologists around the world have expertise and undertake research in their home countries. Finally, the GSAP found that respondents published their work predominantly in English, although not exclusively, and documented a diversity of languages in which anthropologists publish.

Keywords: World anthropologies, anthropological practice, gender disparity, labor, employment, academic precarity, language hegemony, education.

A Pesquisa Global de Práticas Antropológicas da WCAA (2014-2018): Resultados Encontrados

Resumo

O *Global Survey of Anthropological Practice* (GSAP), o primeiro de seu tipo, foi realizado pelo Conselho Mundial de Associações Antropológicas (WCAA) para fornecer insights sobre a antropologia como uma profissão transnacional, a relevância da disciplina na abordagem de problemas globais, questões sobre emprego e equidade de gênero, e a gama de práticas e conhecimentos antropológicos. Os participantes da pesquisa viviam em 113 países diferentes. Este artigo resume algumas das descobertas globais mais gerais do GSAP. Os dados do GSAP sugerem que, dentro da disciplina de antropologia, predominam profissionais identificados como mulheres, exceto em arqueologia e linguística; no entanto, as mulheres foram mais propensas a relatar estarem subempregadas e/ou não remuneradas de forma justa por seu trabalho. As universidades foram as maiores empregadoras de antropólogos, mas o trabalho de políticas públicas e o engajamento público tiveram um papel central no trabalho de muitos participantes. As subdisciplinas de antropologia social e cultural parecem ser as mais praticadas em todo o mundo, mas muitos pesquisados também se dedicam à antropologia aplicada. As plataformas de mídia social, que podem permitir que os antropólogos alcancem públicos mais amplos, foram subutilizadas pelos entrevistados, que eram mais propensos a publicar em fóruns específicos fechados, internos e disciplinares. O GSAP mostrou a mobilidade global dos pesquisados, inclusive para o ensino superior (e os dados sobre isso refletiram a hegemonia dos centros de ensino superior do Atlântico Norte); ainda assim, muitos antropólogos ao redor do mundo têm experiência e realizam pesquisas em seus países de origem. Finalmente, o GSAP descobriu que os pesquisadores publicaram seus trabalhos predominantemente em inglês, embora não exclusivamente, e documentaram uma diversidade de idiomas nos quais os antropólogos publicam.

Palavras-chave: Antropologias mundiais, prática antropológica, disparidade de gênero, trabalho, emprego, precariedade acadêmica, hegemonia linguística, educação.

The WCAA Global Survey of Anthropological Practice (2014-2018): Reported Findings

Pam McGrath; Greg Acciaioli; Adele Millard; Emily Metzner; Vesna Vučinić Nešković; Chandana Mathur

Introduction

The Global Survey of Anthropological Practice (GSAP), the first of its kind, was undertaken by the World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA) to provide insights about anthropology as a transnational profession, the ongoing relevance of the discipline in addressing global problems, issues in employment and gender equity, and the range of anthropological practice and expertise. Although it was not possible to make the GSAP a census of anthropologists practicing worldwide, the overall data are indicative of certain trends and aspects of the profession globally.

Among its most general findings at the global level, the GSAP suggests that within the discipline of anthropology, women predominate; yet, data on employment from the GSAP also suggest that women are more likely to report being under-employed and not being fairly compensated for their work. Overall, around three-quarters of respondents reported paid employment; however, almost one-third of all respondents reported they were under-employed. The GSAP found that universities were the largest employers of anthropologists, but also that public policy work and public engagement feature centrally in many respondents' work. However, social media platforms, which might allow anthropologists to reach broader publics, were under-utilized by respondents. The social and cultural anthropology subdisciplines appear to be the most widely practiced the world over, but many respondents also engaged in applied anthropology. The GSAP illustrated the global mobility of respondents, including for higher education; yet, the data also suggested that many anthropologists have expertise in their home countries. Finally, the GSAP found that respondents published their work predominantly in English, although not exclusively, and documented a range of other languages of publication.

As the brief history of the GSAP project, also included in this issue, evaluates some strengths and limitations of this survey, including biases in statistical representation among respondents, as well as analyzing the opportunities and constraints in the process of carrying out the GSAP, this article explores in further detail the salient findings introduced above and suggests some future avenues of possible analysis based on GSAP data. This article is meant to provide a global baseline of results that can also be used together with other writings on the practice of anthropology in specific countries, such as those in this issue, to highlight both the uniqueness and generality of some specific trends in those countries and regions.¹

¹ For more on the development and implementation of the GSAP, see "A Brief History of the First Global Survey of Anthropological Practice and Lessons Learned" in this issue.

Salient Findings

“Feminization” of Anthropology

The GSAP suggests that there is a disproportionate representation of women participating in the profession of anthropology around the world, especially among younger cohorts.² It is estimated that, overall, there are slightly more men than women in the world, with the number of men rising gradually each year since 1960,³ but 61% of the respondents to the GSAP were women. Among the GSAP respondents, men outnumbered women only in the oldest age brackets (70+ years). The predominance of women is most apparent among the youngest respondents, with more than twice as many women as men in the 21-29 and 30-39 age brackets. As noted in context below, women outnumbered men in all subdisciplines, except archaeology and linguistics. Notably, the survey’s options for respondents to report their gender were woefully limited (an issue complicated by the global variability of terms for gender, discussed in the article on the history of GSAP conceptualization and implementation and lessons learned elsewhere in this issue), leading 27 respondents to select “Other” as their gender.

The Global Movement of Anthropologists

The geographic distribution for responses to “country of residence” (n=3777)⁴ was very similar to the geographic profile of responses to “country of birth” (n=3811), but it is worth looking at the divergences between them. Collectively, the Americas were significantly represented, with well over one third of respondents born in countries located in either North or South America. Just over a quarter (1011) of respondents (n=3811) indicated they were born in the USA. Fewer respondents (985) were residing in the USA at the time, and fewer than that (940) held citizenship there. Just about 10% (377) of respondents were born in Brazil; more respondents (390) were residing there, and fewer (368) held citizenship there. Germany was the birthplace of 5.04% (192) of respondents (and an equal number of respondents held citizenship there), and the country of residence for 4.47% (169). Australia was the birthplace of 4.4% (166) of respondents, but the residence of 6% (227), and an even greater number of respondents held citizenship there (233). Spain and Canada shared the place of the fifth most reported country of residence, with 147 respondents each (or roughly 3.89%), albeit the eighth and ninth most reported countries of birth, respectively. Italy was the birthplace of 3.78% (144) of respondents, but the residence of just 3.07% (116). As in Australia, a greater number of respondents (156) held citizenship in Italy than resided or were born there. The United Kingdom slid from the sixth most reported place of birth to the eighth most reported country of residence. Portugal was the seventh most common place of birth and residence. Following the United Kingdom, in descending order, Italy, Mexico, South Africa, Argentina, Sweden, Serbia, and France rounded out the list of 15 countries of residence most reported by GSAP respondents. The most reported 15 countries of birth made up a similar list (yet in a different order), except that the Philippines

² It is worth noting that studies have found that women are more likely to respond to surveys than are men, and that survey participation tends to skew toward younger people (Smith, 2008).

³ For a useful online tool describing the current geographical distribution of men and women worldwide, see ‘See where women outnumber men around the world (and why)’, *The Washington Times*, August 19, 2015, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/08/19/see-where-women-outnumber-men-around-the-world-and-why/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.344841004c98.

⁴ Not every respondent answered every question. Whenever possible, we list the number of valid responses to any given question (“n”). Percentages, when possible, are figured based on the number of responses to a given question.

was the 15th most reported country of birth, and Sweden was not among the most common 15, indicating that fewer respondents (43) were residing in the Philippines than were born there (53) and more respondents were residing in Sweden (65) than were born there (43).

Overall, these data suggest that anthropologists who responded to the GSAP have moved away from the USA, Germany, Italy, Argentina, France, the UK, and the Philippines, and respondents have moved to Brazil, Australia, Spain, Canada, South Africa, and Sweden, perhaps suggesting global shifts in opportunities for anthropologically related employment. Mexico, Serbia, and Portugal's numbers suggested less movement to or away (or more parity between emigration and immigration). There was also significant migration to and from countries that were less represented on the survey. Hong Kong was reported as their place of residence by 48 respondents, while just 22 were born there. India was reported as a place of residence by just 11 respondents, while 22 were born there. Zimbabwe was the country of birth of 14 respondents, but only 4 respondents were living there.

The above data indicate some of the directions in which anthropologists move to live and work, but we also know that anthropologists sometimes migrate for education. Overall, just under two-thirds of respondents (58%) declared they hold a PhD in anthropology (n=3788). Another 24% held a master's degree as their highest qualification.⁵ The GSAP data also suggest that anthropologists tend towards multidisciplinary practice, with over a third of respondents indicating that they have post-graduate training in another discipline, 10% of which are PhDs (n=2743).

However, as for where respondents received their highest degree (and thereby training) in anthropology, the responses were concentrated among a smaller number of countries, namely the USA,⁶ Brazil, the UK, Australia, and Germany, reflecting to some degree the hegemonic pattern of global anthropological knowledge production (Lins Ribeiro, 2014), as opposed to the more distributed pattern of birth and residence. Collectively, 1821 respondents, or 59% of those who answered this question, were awarded their highest qualification in these five countries. However, the data suggest that among these countries, the UK may attract more education migration among anthropologists because it was neither in the top five for country of residence nor birth among respondents. In fact, 219 respondents received their highest qualification in the UK, while just 134 respondents were living there (and 139 were born there). France also drew more education migration, with 102 respondents having received their highest qualification there, while just 57 respondents reported living there (and 65 were born there).

Diversity of Expertise

The GSAP asked respondents about their sub-discipline, thematic foci, and countries of expertise. Social/cultural anthropology was by far the most common sub-discipline selected by respondents (1114 respondents or 44%, n=2517), followed by applied anthropology (424 respondents or 17%), then ethnology (308 or 12%), folklore (113 or 4%), and linguistics (95 or 3.8%).⁷ The "Other" option was used 350 times, with respondents listing more than 86 different sub-disciplines. Respondents wrote in "medical anthropology" as a response 77 times. "Visual anthropology" (including film) was written in 26 times. Close behind it was "ethnohistory" or

⁵ One aspect of this data that could be analyzed is the proportion in each country of PhDs relative to master's degrees, and this could be evaluated against the data on employment in each country. This might give a sense of the relative values of degrees around the world, but this is not information we can glean only from the GSAP.

⁶ Almost one third of (or 978) respondents received their master's degree or PhD in the USA, although this is fewer than the 1011 respondents who were born in the USA.

⁷ We did not undertake any analysis on the geographical distribution of sub-disciplines, for example, on how they relate to country of birth, residence, or expertise, but that could be a fruitful area for future investigation.

“historical anthropology”, which 24 respondents entered under “Other.” In keeping with the predominance of women in anthropology, female respondents predominated in every sub-discipline, with the exception of archaeology and linguistics – the only sub-disciplines selected by more male than female respondents.

Selecting from among 30 thematic foci or areas of expertise listed on the GSAP, 870 respondents identified expertise in ethnicity and social identity, 848 identified social change, 784 cultural heritage, 747 indigenous peoples and colonialism, 722 political anthropology, 720 medical anthropology, and 661 urban anthropology. The list of 30 options was clearly inadequate to cover the diversity of expertise, with 466 respondents listing alternatives in the “Other” option for this question, among which “education” was the most popular, with 69 write-ins. The write-ins were very wide-ranging, with very few written-in categories of expertise attracting more than 10 individual responses.

Ambiguity about whether applied anthropology was a subdiscipline or an area of focus meant that it was, inadvertently, included on both the list of subdisciplines and as a thematic focus. Nevertheless, it is clear that applied anthropology features strongly, regardless of whether it is considered a sub-discipline or a thematic focus. Over one thousand respondents indicated expertise in applied anthropology. This significant finding is qualified only by the fact that a precise definition of applied anthropology was not provided by the survey instrument.

Other significant findings relate to the gendered nature of some areas of thematic focus: male respondents are proportionally over-represented in political anthropology (where they outnumber women), as well as in the areas of state and society, environmental anthropology, religion and ritual, and ethnohistory. Male respondents were significantly less likely to list medical anthropology or gender and sexuality as areas of expertise.

Examining the reported areas of thematic focus in the top ten countries of residence illustrates some of the apparent differences in the interests of anthropologists living in different countries around the globe and allows us to identify a few interesting trends. For instance, “cultural heritage” was particularly popular among Europe-based respondents. Furthermore, there appears to be a greater focus on themes such as “Indigenous peoples and colonialism” among respondents residing in settler states, such as Australia, Canada, and Brazil. However, “Indigenous peoples and colonialism” was a less popular thematic focus in the USA, despite also being a settler state, where “applied anthropology” and “medical anthropology” were among the most prevalent areas of expertise among respondents.

The geographic spread of respondents’ area expertise is much more diverse than that of their birth, residence, and qualification. The GSAP allowed respondents to list multiple countries in response to this question. Here, in descending order, were the countries of expertise most often listed. A substantial 981 respondents (or 26% of the total number of respondents to the survey) listed the USA as the country (or one of the countries) of their expertise, a number very similar to the 985 respondents who reported residing in the USA. Brazil was listed by 609 (16%) respondents, substantially more than the 390 respondents residing in that country. Mexico was listed by 394 (10%) respondents (also substantially more than the 111 residing there). Spain, Australia, or the United Kingdom were listed by around 7% of respondents to the survey. However, comparing the figures with the data on country of residence paints a more complex picture when we consider: there were 266 respondents with expertise in Spain, yet 147 respondents residing there; 259 with expertise in Australia with 227 residing there; and 250 with expertise in UK while 134 were residing there. Canada or France was listed by 6% (233 and 217 respondents, respectively). Argentina, Portugal, South Africa, Italy, India, or Germany were listed by 5% (between 201 and 180 respondents, listed here in descending order). Peru or Indonesia was listed by 4% (158 and 144 respondents, respectively). Guatemala, Colombia, the People’s Republic of China, Chile, Japan, Bolivia, Serbia, or Papua New Guinea were listed by 3% (between 133 and 98 respondents, listed in descending order). Ecuador, the Philippines, New Zealand, Croatia, Ghana, Sweden, Kenya, Greece, Costa Rica, Romania, Turkey, Ireland, Morocco, or the Netherlands were listed by 2% (between 95 and 58 respondents, in descending order).

Hong Kong, Thailand, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Israel, the Russian Federation, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Haiti, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Paraguay, Nigeria, the Republic of China (Taiwan), Honduras, Nepal, Belize, the Czech Republic, Austria, Cuba, Denmark, Malaysia, Cameroon, Egypt, Poland, or Uruguay were listed by 1% (between 56 and 39 respondents). In a list of 195 countries, only four had no experts among respondents: North Korea (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea), Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, and San Marino.

Notable is the fact that the USA and Brazil top the locations for country of expertise among respondents and are also the two countries most often identified as countries of birth, residence, and highest qualification of respondents⁸. When considered alongside responses to earlier questions about where anthropologists live and train, these findings raise some interesting questions about the extent to which anthropologists were doing anthropology “at home” even before the COVID-19 pandemic. However, these data also suggest that the USA may be proportionally less studied than other countries, as almost every other country was the subject of expertise for more GSAP respondents than it was the place of residence. Further analysis of these findings about country of expertise may shed light on the extent to which the geographical footprint of anthropological expertise globally may no longer predominantly reflect and be shaped by the political and economic relationships of Empire, as the rough correlation of countries of birth and residence with countries of expertise suggests that now the practice of anthropology in almost all nation-states is more oriented to “nation-building” than “empire-building” (Stocking Jr., 1982).⁹

Employment, Underemployment, and Fair Pay

The GSAP has considerable potential to allow us to learn more about the differences in the working conditions of anthropologists globally. The overall findings indicate that among respondents, around three quarters of respondents had one or more paid positions related to anthropology.¹⁰ A significant finding is that male and female respondents report similar levels of paid employment in positions related to their training and skills in anthropology; however, this statistic masks a more complicated picture in terms of underemployment and pay.

The survey used the term “underemployment” rather than “unemployment” in order to reflect the fact that underemployment – with the global spread of the “gig economy” (Friedman, 2014) increasing the number of professionals stuck in the precariat – is a growing challenge, particularly in university settings (Mulligan; Danaher, 2021). Findings indicate that 31% of respondents are underemployed (n=3475). Broken down by male and female gender, the data suggest that female anthropologists face underemployment at higher rates than their male counterparts. Among female respondents who answered this question, fully one third (34%) reported being underemployed, compared to one quarter (25%) of male respondents. When asked about fair pay,¹¹ fewer than half (44%) of those who responded to this question (n=3339) reported they believe they are paid a fair wage, and 39% reported they feel they are underpaid (with the remaining 17% “uncertain”).

8 The USA and Brazil are also the two countries having national anthropological associations with the first and second largest membership respectively.

9 This distribution of research expertise certainly reflects the differential funding opportunities for conducting anthropological research. However, the fact that more funding, most of it public, may be available for conducting research in one's country of residence is also a reflection of governmental priorities upon nation-building, reflecting contemporary trends in many post-welfare nation-states toward 'turning inward' (i.e. political and economic nationalism) (Garten, 2009).

10 It is difficult to know whether our survey was able to reach a representative proportion of unemployed anthropologists in the world, as some might be disconnected from anthropological associations through which most of these surveys were distributed.

11 Given the obvious issues with attempting to assess global pay conditions in terms of a single monetary scale, the question of remuneration was dealt with by allowing respondents the opportunity to self-assess whether they feel they are remunerated fairly for the work that they do.

However, among female respondents to this question, 40% reported they believe they are paid a fair wage, whereas the figure for male respondents was almost 50%. Overall, a greater proportion of female respondents than male respondents indicated they are underpaid, and the same pattern was evident in reporting they are uncertain whether they are paid enough.

Employer and Professional Activities

Universities were by far the single biggest employer of respondents, with 2299 respondents (or just about 60% of the total number of respondents to the survey) reporting a university as their employer. Domestic NGOs (employing 380, or 10% of, respondents to the survey) were the next largest employers, and almost 9% (or 333) of respondents were self-employed. When looking at the data on employer types by country of residence (using only the 12 countries with the greatest representation among respondents), some notable differences are apparent that likely relate to the particular governmental and educational structures of individual countries. For example, respondents living in Argentina reported employment by federal government agencies substantially more than anthropologists in other countries, which reflects the fact that the Argentinian government has established and funds a number of non-university research institutes where anthropologists are employed. On the other hand, a very small proportion of respondents reported employment by the federal government in South Africa. The federal governments of Canada, Italy, and the UK employed only a slightly larger proportion of respondents. The highest proportions of respondents employed by a university lived in Canada, the UK, and Germany.

The GSAP asked respondents to report their work activities on a three-tiered scale of time spent: “a lot”, “some”, or “a little”.¹² The top ten activities on which respondents reported spending a lot of time reflect the predominance of our employment at universities. These activities were academic administration, presenting at conferences and seminars, field research, meetings (internal), peer review of articles and grants, writing for peer review publications, teaching (at the undergraduate level), convening conferences and other professional development events, supervision of post-graduate students, and applying for grants and other funding. Notable here is the relative lack of external engagement – the primary focus of efforts is internal to the university system.

While the list of ten activities on which respondents were most likely to report spending no time had some overlap with the list of activities on which respondents spent the most time, the three activities that appeared only on the list of ten activities on which most respondents reported spending no time were desktop/archival research, business administration, and community service and leadership. Business administration was also the least often selected activity for any time spent. Following business administration, respondents were least likely to report spending any time on teaching in nonaccredited settings (e.g. professional development), facilitation and/or mediation, stakeholder engagement, and public advocacy. This is consistent with the finding that many respondents did not report spending any time doing community service or leadership. It is important to note, however, that 1673 respondents reported spending any time, whether a lot, some, or a little, doing public advocacy and 1685 doing policy development and/or implementation, compared with 1923 respondents who listed academic administration, suggesting that policy work and public engagement do make up significant parts of the work of anthropologists.

12 . There were 24 activities listed that aimed to capture the full range of research, management, teaching, promotional, and advocacy-related tasks that an anthropologist might conceivably undertake across the spectrum of different kinds of employment and employers. The question also included a free-text “Other” box, which attracted 238 responses, many of which provided comment on respondents’ current work activities and demands on their time. This question, along with the one that followed it about use of different communication channels, was the most problematic in terms of analysis. Among other things, many respondents did not fully complete the question, leaving the scale for some activities blank.

Communication Channels

The GSAP also asked respondents about how they share and communicate the results of their research to others. We asked respondents to indicate on a three-tiered scale how often they use 21 different kinds of communication channels to share information about their research.¹³ The top six “frequently” used channels were academic conferences and seminars, subscription only peer-reviewed journals, books (in print), open access peer-reviewed journals, published reports, and unpublished reports. The top six “sometimes” used channels were academic conferences and seminars, open access peer-reviewed journals, community events, newspaper or magazine articles, subscription only peer-reviewed journals, and books (in print). Perhaps most intriguingly, the top six “never” used channels were video blogs, Instagram, submissions to government reviews of law and policy, Twitter, public “town hall” meetings, and a personal webpage or blog.¹⁴

There are some interesting trends emerging in the data about communication channels that relate to research audience and social impact that may warrant further exploration. For example, the fact that so few respondents use social media to communicate the findings of their research, despite the platforms having over 3 billion users worldwide,¹⁵ suggests that many anthropologists at the time of the survey were missing out on significant opportunities to promote the value of their research to non-academic audiences. Conversely, academic conferences are by far the most frequently used communication channel across the board. This suggests not only that the main audiences for anthropological research are anthropologists themselves, but also that the most favored channel for communicating with this audience is also one of the most ephemeral and performative ones.

Language of Publication

The final question of the GSAP asked about the languages that respondents use to publish peer-reviewed research findings. This yielded some rich data that illustrate both the dominance of English as an academic language within anthropology, as well as the extent to which some anthropologists are utilizing other languages. The question was structured using the top twenty most frequently spoken languages around the world and allowed for multiple responses. English was by far the most frequently used publication language, with 2847 (or 74% of total) respondents reporting publication in English. By contrast, the next most widely used language of publication was Spanish, with 703 (or 18% of total) respondents reporting its use. Portuguese was used by 537 (or 14% of total) respondents, and 415 (or 11%) had published in French. A smaller number of respondents had published in German (199 or 5% of total respondents) and Italian (169 or 4%). While at lower rates, respondents also reported publishing in Japanese, Indonesian, Russian, Chinese, Dutch, Arabic, Hindi, Korean, Bengali, Urdu, Vietnamese, and Punjabi/Lahnda. One key observation is that the languages respondents reported using for publishing are not the most frequently used languages in the world generally, of which Chinese (i.e. Mandarin) tops the list.

The question included a free-text “Other” option that elicited a further 54 languages that respondents use to publish peer-reviewed research outputs. When these responses are taken into consideration, they indicate that, among the GSAP respondents, Serbian was the eighth most frequently used language for publishing, after Japanese, and Catalan the eleventh most frequently used, after Indonesian and Russian.

¹³ This question was structured in a similar way to the question about professional activities, and the responses were similarly difficult to analyze.

¹⁴ It is likely that any update on the GSAP would find more emphasis upon using online channels such as an online webpage or blog due to trends in what universities have begun accepting as countable outputs (i.e. for the purposes of tenure and promotion, as well for promoting university community engagement) for publicly engaged research since the administration of the GSAP.

¹⁵ <https://wearesocial.com/blog/2018/01/global-digital-report-2018>

This obviously has much to do with the relatively high number of respondents from Serbia and may not accurately reflect language use patterns in anthropological publications worldwide.

Yet, there are a few interesting observations one can derive from the results obtained. When broken down by country of residence, the responses to this question help illustrate the extent to which certain local anthropologies are more multilingual than others. For example, respondents living in Australia and South Africa are publishing almost exclusively in English. However, for those living in Argentina, Brazil, France, Mexico, Portugal and Spain, English is less dominant. These patterns in the language of publication suggest a linguistic and geographical silo-ing of anthropological work that may be a considerable barrier to the development of a global bank of anthropological knowledge.

Conclusions

The GSAP data begin to illustrate how anthropologists move through the world in their professional lives. It is also a data set that urges us to ask what, where, and why anthropologists do what they do in their intellectual and professional endeavors. Overall, the first ever Global Survey of Anthropological Practice has yielded some interesting if not always surprising findings, which include:

- The predominance of female respondents to the survey, and perhaps the “feminization” of the discipline of anthropology, except in archaeology and linguistics;
- The predominance of the social and cultural anthropology subdisciplines, and applied anthropology as both a subdiscipline and an area of expertise;
- The large variety of thematic and geographical expertise among respondents;
- The large number of respondents doing “anthropology at home”, suggestive of the possibility that contemporary anthropology is more orientated to nation-building than empire-building;
- The global mobility of respondents for work and education, yet considerable continuity in the hegemony of Atlantic centers of learning for higher degrees;
- The concentration of respondents residing in the USA, Brazil, and Australia, but also the fact that respondents to the survey were living in 113 different countries overall;
- The fact that three quarters of respondents reported having paid employment that utilizes their anthropological skills, with universities being the largest employers of anthropologists;
- The fact that almost one-third of respondents self-reported being under-employed;
- A gender disparity disadvantaging female anthropologists in rates of underemployment and perceptions of fair pay;
- The tendency to publish, share, and communicate anthropological knowledge in relatively closed, internal, and disciplinary specific forums; and
- Both the dominance of the English language in publishing as well as the diversity of publication languages used by respondents.

Of course, we cannot vouch for the representativeness of these trends in the global population of anthropologists, given the biases generated by recruiting respondents through member associations of the WCAA. For example, the degree of underemployment and indeed unemployment in work related to anthropology for those who have received their degrees in this field is most likely greatly underreported, given that the under- and unemployed in anthropology are less likely to have participated in the survey.

Another of the important lessons learned from the GSAP is the amount of time, expertise, and resources required to undertake a survey of this scale. This was, in the end, a project that was extremely difficult for a few volunteers to undertake in their spare time and achieve globally representative and significant results. There are some significant issues in the design, distribution, and analysis of the survey, as well as in resourcing, that limit its immediate utility. Most significantly, the low participation rate of anthropologists from countries across Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and in some parts of Europe is particularly problematic in terms of establishing a global picture of anthropological practice. In addition, a detailed communications and promotions plan was not developed prior to the launch of the GSAP, and we now believe that such a plan would have helped increase participation. While the WCAA provided the best possible platform for achieving some measure of global representation in the survey, there are also national anthropological associations that are not members of the WCAA and that therefore may not have known about or circulated information about the survey, and, of course, not all practicing anthropologist belong to these associations.

Nevertheless, despite all the caveats regarding representativeness and other shortcomings of this survey, the GSAP dataset has the potential, especially with further analysis of the data, to yield many more interesting findings about geographical distinctions and global trends in the present-day practice of anthropology by anthropologists in all parts of the world. More complex analysis of the dataset will require a team with the requisite skills in advanced quantitative analysis and the time to devote to the endeavor. The GSAP data set will, the authors suggest, yield the greatest insights in the hands of knowledgeable individuals who can interpret the findings alongside contextual information about the specific political, intellectual and economic frameworks that are shaping how anthropology is practiced in particular countries or regions around the world. The GSAP dataset can also be used as a baseline with which the results of future surveys of comparable scope might be compared. It would be interesting to see how the GSAP results might compare with future trends with regard to the emergence of such relatively new subdisciplines as design anthropology, the use of blogs and other social media to publicize results of anthropological research as universities move to prioritizing wider social impact rather than just academic citations of academic research articles and monographs as criteria for job retention and promotion, and possible shifts to new forms of external engagement and employment as universities shift their academic structures and priorities away from traditional disciplines, as opposed to prevalence of university employment and participation in closed, internal, and disciplinary specific academic forums evident in the GSAP results. Assembling the articles of this special issue represents one step towards this wider contextualization and analysis of the data that the GSAP provides and will hopefully also stimulate subsequent surveys that can redress the methodological and analytical deficiencies of this pioneer endeavor.

Received: September 23, 2021

Approved: November 06, 2021

References

- FRIEDMAN, Gerald. 2014. "Workers without employers: shadow corporations and the rise of the gig economy". *Review of Keynesian Economics*, 2(2): 171-188.
- GARTEN, Jeffrey E. 2009. "The dangers of turning inward". *The Wall Street Journal*, March 1 2009. <<http://spinup-oodia-wp-offload-media.s3.amazonaws.com/faculty/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2019/06/2009-03-01-WSJ-The-Dangers-of-Turning-Inward.pdf>> (Accessed on: 25 02 2022)
- LINS RIBEIRO, Gustavo. 2014. "World Anthropologies: Anthropological Cosmopolitanisms and Cosmopolitics". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 43: 483-498.
- MULLIGAN, Deborah L.; DANAHER, Patrick Alan (eds.). 2021. *Researchers at Risk: Precarity, Jeopardy, and Uncertainty in Academia*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53857-6_8
- SMITH, William G. 2008. "Does Gender Influence Online Survey Participation?: A Record-linkage Analysis of University Faculty Online Survey Response Behavior." Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED501717.pdf>
- STOCKING JR., George W. 1982. "Afterword: A view from the center." *Ethnos*, 47: 172-186. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00141844.1982.9981237>
- THE WASHINGTON TIMES. 2015 'See where women outnumber men around the world (and why)', *The Washington Times*, August 19, 2015. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/08/19/see-where-women-outnumber-men-around-the-world-and-why/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.344841004c98>.

Pam McGrath

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3964-4845>

Author's corresponding address: pammcgrath@bigpond.com

Greg Acciaioli

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4070-5545>

Author's corresponding address: gregory.acciaioli@uwa.edu.au

Adele Millard

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1991-8260>

Author's corresponding address: adele.millard@uwa.edu.au

Emily Metzner

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6009-4913>

Author's corresponding address: Metzner2@illinois.edu

Vesna Vučinić Nešković

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2954-0399>

Author's corresponding address: vvucinic4@gmail.com

Chandana Mathur

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8259-0432>

Author's corresponding address: Chandana.Mathur@mu.ie