



Peer-Reviewed, International,
Academic Research Journal



Citation

Jelani, A. (2021). Interpreting Human Societies and Social Dynamics through Multifaceted Exploration of Anthropological Frameworks. *Social Science Chronicle*, Vol. 1, Issue - 1, pp. 1-17.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

<https://doi.org/10.56106/ssc.2021.001>

Received - November 11, 2020

Accepted - January 22, 2021

Published - January 29, 2021

Web-Link

All the contents of this peer reviewed article as well as author details are available at <http://socialsciencechronicle.com/article-ssc-2021-001>

Copyright

The copyright of this article is reserved with the author/s.
© 2021, Anansi Jelani.

This publication is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution, Non-Commercial, Share Alike 4.0 International License. It permits unrestricted copying and redistribution of this publication in any medium or format.



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Interpreting Human Societies and Social Dynamics through Multifaceted Exploration of Anthropological Frameworks

Anansi Jelani^{1*}

¹ Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, United States.

* Corresponding Author

Abstract

The exploration of diverse theoretical frameworks within anthropology presents a comprehensive analysis of influential perspectives that illuminate the complexities of human societies, cultural dynamics, and behaviours. Examining foundational theories such as Cultural Materialism, Structural Functionalism, Symbolic Anthropology, Cultural Ecology, Post-structuralism, Evolutionary Anthropology, Feminist Anthropology, and Actor-Network Theory (ANT), this research paper dives deep into the multifaceted lenses through which social life is understood. Each theoretical framework contributes distinct insights and challenges conventional paradigms. Cultural Materialism, rooted in the material conditions of societies, offers a lens to understand the influence of ecological and economic factors on cultural practices. Symbolic Anthropology, focusing on the interpretation of symbols, underscores the role of symbols in shaping human behaviour. Structural Functionalism emphasizes societal functions and interrelated parts that sustain equilibrium. Cultural Ecology examines the relationship between culture and environment, illuminating how societies adapt to their surroundings. Post-structuralism questions fixed meanings and the influence of power structures on knowledge. Evolutionary Anthropology studies human biological adaptations and societal development, while Feminist Anthropology critically examines gender roles and power dynamics. ANT, a unique perspective, focuses on human and non-human actors within networks and their influence on social structures. The critical analysis and synthesis of these frameworks offer a nuanced understanding of societal complexities and behaviours. The implications of these frameworks extend beyond academia, influencing societal discourses, interdisciplinary studies, and policy-making. The inclusivity and diverse methodologies presented foster a more comprehensive understanding of societal dynamics, encouraging cultural sensitivity and informed interventions. This exploration also signifies the continual evolution of anthropological thought and contributes to a more inclusive and diverse academic environment. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the multifaceted nature of human societies, cultural practices, and societal structures, offering valuable insights for diverse fields and broader societal discourses.

Keywords

Actor-Network Theory, Anthropological Theory, Cultural Dynamics, Cultural Materialism, Evolutionary Anthropology, Feminist Anthropology, Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Post-structuralism, Social Structures, Symbolic Anthropology.

1. Introduction

Anthropology stands as a multifaceted field of study that endeavours to comprehend the complexities of human societies, cultures, and behaviours. With a rich amalgamation of

theoretical frameworks, it offers diverse lenses through which to unravel the intricacies of social life and human interactions (Dobres & Robb, 2014; Graham, 2014; Kertzner, 2005; Murphy, 2002; Venkatesan, Edwards, Willerslev, Povinelli, & Mody, 2011). This paper embarks on a comprehensive exploration of prominent theoretical frameworks within anthropology, delving into their foundational principles, impacts, and implications for understanding human societies. Each theoretical framework examined contributes unique perspectives, enriching the understanding of social structures, behaviours, and cultural dynamics. The theories covered in this research paper encompass a wide array of approaches, each offering a distinct perspective on the study of human societies. Cultural Materialism, originating from the works of Marvin Harris, underscores the significance of material conditions in shaping cultural and social structures. Structural Functionalism, associated with scholars like Bronislaw Malinowski and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, focuses on the interrelated parts of society that work together to maintain its functions. Symbolic Anthropology, championed by Victor Turner and Clifford Geertz, concentrates on the interpretation of symbols and meanings in cultures and societies. Moreover, Cultural Ecology, which examines the intricate relationship between a culture and its environment, emphasizes how societies adapt to and modify their surroundings.

Post-structuralism, emerging from the works of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, questions fixed meanings and explores the influence of power structures on knowledge and discourse. Evolutionary Anthropology, a multidisciplinary approach, studies human biological adaptations, evolution, and the development of human societies over time. Feminist Anthropology, a critical lens, examines gender roles, power dynamics, and inequalities within societies, challenging traditional anthropological approaches that overlook or marginalize women's experiences. Additionally, Actor-Network Theory (ANT) offers a unique perspective by focusing on the relationships between actors, both human and non-human, within networks and how these interactions influence social structures and behaviours. Each of these theoretical frameworks enriches the understanding of social life, cultural dynamics, and human behaviour by providing diverse lenses through which to view the intricate amalgamation of societies. The exploration of these theoretical frameworks aims to unveil the diversity and complexity of anthropological inquiries and the rich array of perspectives that contribute to the understanding of human societies. These frameworks do not exist in isolation; rather, they complement and challenge one another, offering nuanced insights into the multifaceted nature of social life.

They embody the evolution of anthropological thought, reflecting the discipline's ongoing quest to comprehend the intricate web of human interactions, cultural practices, and societal structures. This paper embarks on an extensive exploration of each theoretical framework, delving into their core principles, impacts, criticisms, and contemporary relevance. It seeks to elucidate the significance of these frameworks in shaping anthropological research and their ongoing implications for understanding diverse societies across the globe. The critical analysis and synthesis of these theoretical perspectives aim to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the complexities inherent in human societies, offering a rich amalgamation of perspectives to navigate the intricate dynamics of cultural, social, and behavioural aspects within diverse

human communities. Throughout this exploration, we endeavour to shed light on the interplay between these frameworks, recognizing their coexistence, interactions, and the potential for their integration in the study of human societies. Moreover, this paper seeks to underscore the evolving nature of anthropology as a field, marked by its continual re-evaluation of theories, methodologies, and approaches in response to the dynamic and diverse societies it seeks to understand. In this comprehensive exploration of theoretical frameworks within anthropology, we aim to contribute to the ongoing scholarly discourse and understanding of the complexities and nuances within human societies, cultures, and behaviours. Each theoretical framework examined offers a unique lens through which to apprehend the multifaceted nature of human interactions, contributing to the continual refinement and evolution of anthropological knowledge and methodologies. This research paper embarks on a detailed and critical examination of these frameworks, seeking to elucidate their foundational principles, impacts, criticisms, and contemporary relevance. The synthesis of these diverse perspectives aims to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the intricate dynamics inherent in human societies, shedding light on the complexities of cultural, social, and behavioural aspects across diverse human communities.

2. Cultural Materialism: Marvin Harris's Paradigmatic Shift in Anthropological Analysis

Cultural Materialism, a theoretical framework within the field of anthropology, spearheaded by Marvin Harris, represents a paradigmatic shift in the analysis of culture and social structure. Rooted in a materialistic perspective, this theory advocates an examination of the tangible and practical aspects of society as primary determinants of cultural and social phenomena (Donovan & Anderson III, 2003; Fischer, 2009; Gilkeson, 2010; Kuper, 2014; Suchman, 2011). Harris's framework distinctly departs from earlier anthropological approaches that primarily focused on the subjective, ideational elements of culture, asserting that the material conditions and ecological factors significantly influence the cultural and social fabric of human societies. At the core of Cultural Materialism lies the fundamental premise that the ecological and material realities of a society form the foundation upon which cultural practices and social structures evolve. Harris emphasizes the relationship between a society and its environment, contending that the ecosystem, resource availability, and modes of production profoundly shape the cultural norms, behaviours, and social organization within that society.

This perspective resonates with a deterministic understanding, suggesting that environmental factors act as a primary driver in the establishment and evolution of cultural patterns (Bubandt & Otto, 2010; G. E. Marcus & Fischer, 2014; B. Morris, 2014; Ortner, 2006). Harris' framework underscores the interplay between the environment's constraints and the adaptive cultural practices developed by societies in response to these constraints, framing culture as a means of adaptation to environmental conditions. Within the framework of Cultural Materialism, the concept of "cultural infrastructure" emerges as a pivotal construct. This infrastructure encapsulates the tangible elements of society, including technology, subsistence patterns, and the economic system. These components are per-

ceived as crucial determinants in shaping the superstructure of culture, encompassing ideologies, belief systems, and social institutions (Benezra, DeStefano, & Gordon, 2012; Bille, Hastrup, & Soerensen, 2010; Buchli, 2020; Hasse, 2016; Knauft, 2006). The theory posits that the subsistence strategies adopted by a society, whether agricultural, pastoral, or hunter-gatherer, significantly influence social norms, values, and structures. Harris contends that these strategies directly impact the social organization, division of labour, and distribution of resources within a community, thereby moulding its cultural and social fabric. Moreover, Cultural Materialism accentuates the concept of “cultural adaptation.” It proposes that cultural practices and norms develop in response to environmental constraints and challenges. According to Harris, societies tend to develop cultural systems that maximize their efficiency in utilizing available resources to sustain and improve their livelihoods. Consequently, cultural practices are seen as adaptive mechanisms, intricately linked to the ecological conditions and technological advancements of a society.

For instance, dietary taboos, rituals, and social norms are analyzed not solely from a symbolic or traditional standpoint but are contextualized within the material conditions that necessitated their development. Harris’ theory further advances the concept of “cultural evolution,” positing that cultural changes and adaptations occur in response to changes in the environment or shifts in material conditions. This perspective challenges the perception of culture as static or solely driven by ideas and beliefs, emphasizing the dynamism and adaptability of cultural systems in the face of changing ecological circumstances. The theory is illustrative in explaining cultural changes observed in societies across different historical periods and geographical locations, attributing these transformations to alterations in environmental and material conditions. Critiques of Cultural Materialism have emerged, challenging the deterministic view of culture and society advocated by Harris. Critics argue that while material conditions are influential, they might not serve as the sole determinant in shaping cultural phenomena. The theory’s emphasis on environmental factors is seen as overlooking the significance of human agency, ideological frameworks, and the complex interplay of social, political, and historical factors in the formation of culture (Chodorkoff, 2014; Hackett, 2005; Kaufman & Morgan, 2005; Kohn, 2015; Lewis, 2017).

Additionally, the theory’s deterministic approach has been critiqued for oversimplifying the multifaceted nature of cultural practices and the intricate web of influences that shape human behavior and societal structures. Cultural Materialism, as conceptualized by Marvin Harris, remains a significant theoretical framework within the discipline of anthropology, offering a unique lens through which to examine the relationship between material conditions and the development of culture and social structures. Its emphasis on the ecological and material determinants in shaping cultural phenomena has provided invaluable insights into the adaptive nature of human societies in response to environmental constraints (Gingrich & Fox, 2002; Ingold, 2018; B. Morris, 2015; Nguyen & Peschard, 2003; Watts, 2016). Nonetheless, the theory’s deterministic perspective and exclusive focus on material factors have also drawn criticism, prompting ongoing discussions within the field regarding the multifaceted and complex nature of cultural dynamics. As the discipline of anthropology continues to evolve, Cultural Mate-

rialism stands as both a foundational theory and a subject of ongoing debate and refinement within the field.

3. Societal Coherence: The Fundamentals and Critiques of Structural Functionalism in Anthropology

Structural Functionalism, a foundational theory within the realm of anthropology, represents a fundamental paradigm that delves into the interplay between social structures and the functional contributions of these structures to the coherence and stability of a society. This theoretical framework, developed by eminent scholars such as Bronislaw Malinowski and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, perceives society as a complex system composed of interrelated parts that serve specific functions contributing to the overall stability and balance of the social order. At its core, Structural Functionalism elucidates the interconnectedness and interdependence of various social elements, emphasizing the roles these elements play in maintaining social equilibrium (García, 2005; Gillespie & Nichols, 2003; Harper, 2005; Leacock, 2014; Salomon, 2018). Central to Structural Functionalism is the notion that social institutions and structures are interconnected and serve essential functions that contribute to the stability and continuation of a society. This perspective views society as an organic entity where various social institutions, such as family, religion, economy, and government, are analogous to the organs of a living organism, each serving specific functions vital for the overall health and sustenance of the societal body.

The theory focuses on the functional significance of these institutions, highlighting how they operate in tandem to maintain social harmony and equilibrium. For instance, the family institution is seen as responsible for socializing individuals, maintaining kinship ties, and ensuring the continuity of cultural practices, all crucial for the well-being of the society. Malinowski, one of the pioneers of Structural Functionalism, particularly emphasized the concept of “functional prerequisites” or the essential requirements that must be met for the smooth functioning of a society. He highlighted the functional importance of societal elements by investigating how cultural practices and social structures fulfill specific needs essential for the survival and perpetuation of a community (Chagnon, 2007; Clair, 2003; Emberley, 2001; Macdonald, 2001; Thelen, 2015). His work, notably in the study of the Trobriand Islanders, demonstrated how cultural institutions, rituals, and practices served indispensable functions in addressing fundamental human needs, such as food, shelter, reproduction, and social order.

Furthermore, A.R. Radcliffe-Brown contributed significantly to the development of Structural Functionalism, elaborating on the functional interdependence of various social elements and their contributions to the stability of a society. Radcliffe-Brown’s focus lay in understanding how social structures, norms, and institutions create a stable social order by fulfilling necessary functions and maintaining balance. He underscored the interconnectedness of social institutions, elucidating that a change in one institution could lead to adjustments in other societal elements to restore equilibrium, emphasizing the adaptability and resilience of the social system. Structural Functionalism’s emphasis on the integration and functional contribution of social elements to the coherence of a society has led to in-depth analyses of how various institutions and practices maintain social order (Lewis, 2009; McGuigan & Moran, 2014;

Milner, 2002; Rivkin-Fish, 2010; Singh, 2002). This perspective has been instrumental in deciphering the significance of social rituals, norms, and customs, elucidating their roles in preserving social cohesion and order within a community.

For instance, rituals and ceremonies are not only viewed from their symbolic or religious aspects but are also analyzed for their functional contributions in reinforcing social solidarity, regulating behaviour, and maintaining social equilibrium. Critiques of Structural Functionalism have emerged, challenging its overemphasis on social stability and cohesion while neglecting social conflicts, power dynamics, and societal changes. Critics argue that the theory's focus on societal equilibrium overlooks the presence of power struggles, inequalities, and conflicts within a society. Additionally, its static view of society has been criticized for neglecting the dynamism and evolution of social systems over time, undermining the theory's applicability to explain societal transformations and disruptions. In contemporary anthropology, while Structural Functionalism remains a significant theoretical framework, the field has evolved to integrate other perspectives that address the limitations of this theory (Hage, 2012; Mead, 2017; Milner & Browitt, 2013; M. Morris, 2012; Susser, 2016).

The advent of new paradigms such as conflict theory, post-structuralism, and critical anthropology has widened the scope of anthropological inquiry, encompassing a broader array of social dynamics and power structures within societies, thereby providing a more nuanced understanding of the complexities inherent in social systems. Structural Functionalism, as articulated by Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, serves as a foundational framework that emphasizes the interdependence of various social elements and their functional contributions to the stability and equilibrium of a society. Its focus on the cohesive nature of social structures and their roles in maintaining social order has been instrumental in unravelling the functions of diverse social institutions. However, the theory's emphasis on social stability and its limited scope in addressing social conflicts and change has prompted ongoing debates and advancements within the field of anthropology, leading to the integration of multiple perspectives for a more comprehensive understanding of human societies.

4. Decoding Culture: Significance of Symbols in Symbolic Anthropology

Symbolic Anthropology, championed by luminaries like Victor Turner and Clifford Geertz, stands as a seminal paradigm within anthropology, focusing on the interpretation of symbols and their significance in shaping cultures and societies. At its core, this theoretical framework endeavours to unearth the deeper layers of meaning within cultural practices, beliefs, rituals, and symbols, emphasizing their symbolic significance in the construction and interpretation of social life (Eller, 2015, 2020; Leatherman & Goodman, 2011; Nugent, 2016; York & Mancus, 2009). Symbolic Anthropology contends that these symbols are not mere arbitrary signs but carry profound cultural meanings, serving as a language that conveys the values, norms, and worldviews of a society. Victor Turner, a central figure in this theoretical framework, introduced the concept of "symbols" and "symbolic action" as crucial elements for understanding social and cultural phenomena. Turner accentuated the performative nature of symbols, elucidating that symbolic actions, rituals, and performances are not merely representa-

tional but are actively engaged in creating and shaping social reality (Bodley, 2011; Ervin, 2016; Gremillion, 2005; Guenther, 2007; Rankin, 2004). These symbols, according to Turner, are imbued with meanings that go beyond their superficial appearances, serving as a lens through which individuals perceive and interpret the world around them. Turner's concept of "liminality" and "communitas" in rites of passage further explores the transformative power of symbols in altering social statuses and fostering a sense of communal belonging and shared identity among individuals. Clifford Geertz, another eminent figure in Symbolic Anthropology, introduced the notion of "thick description" to underscore the depth and complexity of cultural symbols and meanings. Geertz emphasized the necessity of delving deep into the layers of cultural symbols to understand their significance within a specific cultural context. He argued that cultural symbols are not explicit in their meanings and must be deciphered through meticulous observation and interpretation, akin to reading a text.

Geertz's approach necessitates an in-depth analysis of cultural symbols within their contextual frameworks to grasp their implications and the values embedded in them. Symbolic Anthropology's approach to symbols and meanings involves interpreting cultural practices and rituals as expressive systems, highlighting the symbolic dimensions embedded within these acts. From religious rituals to everyday actions, Symbolic Anthropology unravels the layers of meaning present in these symbolic activities. For instance, rituals such as a wedding ceremony or a funeral are not merely events; they are laden with symbolic meanings that reflect and reinforce societal values, norms, and beliefs. These symbolic actions and rituals serve as mechanisms for individuals to communicate and reinforce shared cultural meanings and values, contributing to the construction and maintenance of a shared cultural reality (Bland, Harrison, Mort, & Weedon, 2013; Droogan, 2012; Kearney, 2018; B. Morris, 2006; Ruyle, 2019). Moreover, Symbolic Anthropology accentuates the importance of understanding the subjective experiences and interpretations of individuals within their cultural context. It recognizes the diversity in interpretations of symbols among individuals and groups within a society, acknowledging that these symbols can hold multiple, sometimes contradictory, meanings.

The interpretive nature of symbols allows for varying understandings and reinterpretations, influenced by personal experiences, social positions, and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, Symbolic Anthropology acknowledges the fluidity and complexity of cultural symbols, recognizing that meanings are not fixed but are subject to interpretation and re-interpretation based on social and cultural contexts (Buchanan, 2018; J. Jackson & Depew, 2017; C. Miller, 2017; Ortner, 2016; Stocking, 2001). However, Symbolic Anthropology has faced criticism for its emphasis on interpretation and its potential to be overly interpretive, leading to subjective and sometimes overly speculative analyses. Critics argue that the emphasis on meanings and symbols may neglect the material conditions and power dynamics that shape cultures and societies. Additionally, the theory's reliance on symbolic interpretation has been questioned for potentially overlooking the structural constraints and inequalities within societies, focusing more on the subjective interpretations of symbols and meanings. In contemporary anthropology, while Symbolic Anthropology remains influential, the field has evolved to incorporate multiple perspectives, integrating

the insights of Symbolic Anthropology with other theoretical frameworks.

The integration of structuralist approaches, post-structuralist perspectives, and critical theories has enriched anthropological analyses, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of cultural phenomena (Erickson, 2011; Keane, 2003; Kromidas, 2014; Parvini, 2012; Redclift, 2012). This integration enables anthropologists to examine cultural symbols and meanings while also considering the broader socio-political and economic factors that influence the production and interpretation of these symbols. Symbolic Anthropology, as advocated by Turner and Geertz, remains a significant theoretical framework in anthropology, emphasizing the interpretation of symbols and meanings in shaping cultures and societies. Its focus on understanding the symbolic dimensions of cultural practices and rituals has been instrumental in unravelling the layers of meaning within various cultural expressions. However, the theory's emphasis on interpretation and meanings, while essential, has also prompted ongoing debates within the field about the balance between symbolic interpretation and the consideration of broader social, political, and economic factors in shaping cultural symbols and meanings. As anthropology continues to evolve, the integration of multiple perspectives allows for a more nuanced understanding of cultural symbols within the broader context of societal structures and power dynamics.

5. Culture and the Environment: Reciprocal Relationship in Cultural Ecology

Cultural Ecology represents a profound theoretical framework within anthropology that scrutinizes the intricate relationship between human cultures and their environments. Emphasizing the dynamic interaction between societies and their ecological surroundings, this theory posits that cultures are deeply entwined with their natural environments and that human societies adapt to, modify, and are influenced by their ecological contexts. Cultural Ecology, as a theoretical perspective, explores the reciprocal relationship between culture and the environment, acknowledging the impact of environmental conditions on shaping cultural practices and, conversely, the human influence on their surroundings. At its core, Cultural Ecology underscores the adaptive strategies and behaviours of human societies in response to varying environmental conditions. The theory highlights that environmental factors, such as climate, topography, availability of resources, and biodiversity, significantly influence the cultural practices and lifestyles of societies (Borsos, 2017; Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 2016; Hann, 2018; Trigger, 2019; Vivanco, 2018).

For instance, nomadic pastoralist cultures develop mobility and herding practices as adaptive strategies to cope with environmental changes and the seasonal availability of forage. Similarly, agricultural societies have evolved specific farming techniques and irrigation systems that are suited to their environmental landscapes. This theory's central premise is the recognition that human cultures are not static entities but are constantly adapting and evolving in response to the environmental challenges and opportunities presented to them. Cultural Ecology investigates how human societies modify their environments to sustain their livelihoods and meet their needs. This aspect of the theory focuses on the reciprocal relationship between hu-

mans and their environment, emphasizing the impact of human activities on the natural world (Hedican, 2012; Joy & Li, 2012; Ruttan, 2003; Sinfield, 2006; Steedly, 1999). For instance, through practices such as agriculture, deforestation, or urbanization, societies alter their ecosystems, affecting soil fertility, biodiversity, and water sources. In turn, these modifications influence the sustainability and resilience of cultural practices. Cultural Ecology thus acknowledges the human impact on the environment and the subsequent feedback loops that shape cultural adaptations and ecological dynamics. Moreover, this theoretical framework highlights the role of technology and knowledge systems in mediating the relationship between culture and the environment.

Human societies develop technologies and knowledge that enable them to exploit resources and adapt to environmental conditions. For example, indigenous communities often possess intricate ecological knowledge and sustainable practices that allow them to coexist harmoniously with their surroundings. This specialized knowledge influences their social organization, belief systems, and cultural values. Conversely, technological advancements in industrial societies have significantly altered the relationship between culture and the environment, resulting in environmental changes and challenges (Laidlaw, 2013; H. L. Moore, 2007; Ortner, 2005; Taylor, 2005; Womack, 2005). Cultural Ecology's emphasis on the relationship between culture and the environment has implications for understanding global environmental challenges and conservation efforts. By recognizing the intricate connections between cultural practices and ecological systems, this theory offers insights into sustainable resource management and conservation strategies. It underscores the importance of acknowledging and integrating traditional ecological knowledge and practices into modern conservation efforts, recognizing the value of indigenous approaches in preserving biodiversity and maintaining ecological balance.

However, Cultural Ecology has faced criticism for oversimplifying the relationship between culture and the environment and potentially neglecting other social, economic, and political factors that influence human-environment interactions. Critics argue that the theory's focus on adaptation to the environment might overlook the impact of power structures, globalization, and economic systems in shaping environmental practices and policies (Faye V Harrison, 2016; McGee & Warms, 2013; D. Miller, 2012; Trotter, Schensul, & Kostick, 2015; Weisberg, 2017). Additionally, the deterministic view that culture is solely shaped by environmental conditions has been contested, as cultural practices are shaped by a complex interplay of various factors beyond the environment. In contemporary anthropology, while Cultural Ecology remains a significant theoretical framework, the field has evolved to incorporate multiple perspectives, acknowledging the complexities of human-environment interactions. The integration of political ecology, post-colonial theory, and critical approaches has broadened the understanding of environmental issues within the cultural context.

These integrated perspectives consider not only the environmental factors but also the power dynamics, social inequalities, and global economic systems that influence human-environment interactions (Bix, 2005; Hann, 2018; W. A. Jackson, 2009; Kirksey & Helmreich, 2010; McCoid, 2008). Cultural Ecology stands as a fundamental theoretical framework with-

in anthropology, examining the dynamic relationship between human cultures and their environments. Its emphasis on the adaptive strategies and modifications of societies in response to environmental conditions has provided invaluable insights into the reciprocal interactions between culture and the environment. However, ongoing debates within the field continue to refine the understanding of human-environment interactions by incorporating multiple perspectives that acknowledge the multidimensional influences on cultural practices and environmental dynamics. As anthropology continues to evolve, Cultural Ecology remains a pivotal lens through which to explore the intricate and dynamic relationship between human cultures and their ecological contexts.

6. Power Dynamics and Fluidity of Discourse in Post-Structuralism

Post-structuralism, originating from the works of prominent figures such as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, stands as a significant theoretical framework within the realm of anthropology, challenging the conventional notions of fixed meanings and the stability of language and knowledge. Central to this perspective is a critical examination of language, knowledge production, and power structures, highlighting the dynamic and often unstable nature of meaning and discourse. Post-structuralism fundamentally questions the traditional belief in stable, objective meanings and instead posits that meanings are fluid, contingent, and subject to power dynamics and societal influences (Boyer, 2014; Eriksen, 2020; Little, 1999; Milton, 2002; Moberg, 2018). At the core of Post-structuralism lies the critique of structuralist approaches, particularly the idea that language and knowledge are stable and possess fixed meanings. Figures like Michel Foucault introduced a critical lens through which to understand power dynamics, knowledge production, and how these elements shape discourses and influence societal norms.

Foucault's concept of "genealogy" emphasizes the examination of historical processes, power relations, and the construction of knowledge. He elucidated how power operates through various institutions and practices, shaping what is deemed as knowledge, truth, and acceptable discourse within societies. Furthermore, Jacques Derrida, another influential figure in Post-structuralism, introduced the concept of "deconstruction," challenging the stability and coherence of language and meaning. Derrida emphasized the inherent contradictions and ambiguities within language, highlighting that words and concepts do not possess fixed meanings but are rather constituted by multiple interpretations and contexts. He argued that language is characterized by "difference," suggesting that meanings are deferred and differ across contexts and interpretations. This challenges the notion of language as a stable and transparent medium for communication, highlighting its complexities and ambiguities. Post-structuralism challenges the idea of a single, authoritative narrative or truth, emphasizing the plurality of interpretations and the existence of multiple, often conflicting, perspectives.

This perspective destabilizes the notion of an objective reality and acknowledges that meanings and truths are shaped by multiple factors, including power structures, historical contexts, and societal norms. This theoretical framework invites a critical examination of how knowledge is constructed, who has the

power to define truth, and how different perspectives are marginalized or privileged within a society. Moreover, Post-structuralism has implications for the analysis of power structures within societies and the influence of these structures on the production of knowledge and discourse. The theory contends that power operates through discourse, influencing what is considered acceptable knowledge and shaping societal norms. Foucault's concept of "power-knowledge" elucidates how power is not merely repressive but is intricately connected with the production of knowledge and the establishment of truth. Power influences what is deemed as 'truth' or 'normal,' shaping the boundaries of what can be said or thought within a society (Haines, 2007; Ingold, 2016; Joralemon, 2017; Sander-son, 2001; Walle, 2001). Thus, this theoretical framework offers a critical lens to explore the ways in which power operates through language, discourse, and knowledge production, shaping societal norms and values.

However, Post-structuralism has faced criticism for its potential to lead to relativism, where all perspectives are considered equally valid, thereby undermining the notion of objective truth and reality. Critics argue that the emphasis on the instability of meaning and the multiplicity of interpretations might undermine the pursuit of knowledge and the existence of shared truths. Additionally, the complexity and abstract nature of Post-structuralist concepts have led to challenges in their application within concrete empirical research and analysis. In contemporary anthropology, Post-structuralist perspectives have significantly influenced the field, offering a critical approach to understanding knowledge production, power structures, and the complexities of meaning and discourse within cultures and societies (Cini, Chironi, Drapalova, & Tomasello, 2017; Fuentes, 2018; Graeber, 2001; Lettow, 2017; Low, 2009).

The integration of Post-structuralist ideas with other theoretical frameworks has led to a more nuanced understanding of societal dynamics, enabling anthropologists to critically examine the influence of power on knowledge, language, and the construction of societal norms. Post-structuralism, stemming from the works of Foucault and Derrida, offers a critical and insightful perspective within anthropology, challenging the stability of meanings and the influence of power structures on knowledge and discourse. Its emphasis on the fluidity of meanings and the examination of power dynamics in shaping knowledge production and societal norms has been influential in redefining the understanding of language, truth, and societal realities. Despite criticisms, the impact of Post-structuralist ideas on anthropology remains substantial, leading to ongoing debates and the integration of multiple perspectives for a more comprehensive understanding of cultural and societal dynamics.

7. Human Agency and Societal Structures: Dynamics in Anthropological Frameworks

The dialectical relationship between agency and structure, a foundational concept within anthropology, encapsulates the dynamic interplay between human agency—individual capacity to act—and social structures, the encompassing framework that shapes and guides human behavior within a society. This theoretical framework delves into the intricate interaction between the autonomous actions of individuals and the constraints or facilitations imposed by the overarching social struc-

tures. At its essence, agency emphasizes the capacity of individuals to act independently, while structure refers to the patterns of social organization, norms, and institutions that guide and influence these actions. This relationship between agency and structure forms the cornerstone of understanding human behaviour within societal contexts, unravelling the ways in which individuals both shape and are shaped by the cultural norms and structures that surround them. The concept of agency highlights the notion that individuals possess the capacity to make choices and act independently, exercising their will within the social context (Aitchison, 2005; Koskoff, 2014; Lamphere, 2016; Ortner, 1999; Reysoo, 2014). It underscores the idea that humans are not merely passive recipients of social norms and structures but actively engage in decision-making, influencing and shaping their immediate social environments. Agency acknowledges individual autonomy, intentions, and the ability to challenge, negotiate, or adapt to prevailing societal norms and structures. For instance, an individual's decision to challenge traditional gender roles or cultural norms within their community represents an expression of agency, a conscious deviation from the established social structure.

Conversely, social structures refer to the established norms, institutions, and hierarchies that organize and guide social behaviour within a society. These structures encompass the cultural, political, economic, and institutional frameworks that shape the opportunities and constraints individuals encounter in their lives (Bray, 2007; Brownell & Besnier, 2020; Hird, 2004; Mascia-Lees & Black, 2016; Nielsen, 2019). Social structures set the parameters within which individuals exercise their agency. For instance, economic structures, such as class divisions, influence the opportunities available to individuals, shaping their decisions and actions. Similarly, cultural norms and values establish behavioural expectations, steering individual actions and choices within a society. The dialectical relationship between agency and structure is integral to understanding human behaviour within societal contexts. It acknowledges that while individuals possess agency and the capacity for independent action, their choices and behaviours are shaped and influenced by the prevailing social structures. This relationship is reciprocal, as individuals both conform to and challenge societal norms, contributing to the constant evolution and negotiation of these structures.

This theoretical framework enables anthropologists to explore how individuals navigate and negotiate their agency within the constraints and opportunities offered by social structures. It provides insights into the complexities inherent in individual decision-making within diverse cultural, political, and economic landscapes. Additionally, it illuminates the mechanisms through which societal changes occur, whether through individual actions challenging existing structures or the gradual evolution of societal norms and institutions (Bieler & Niewöhner, 2018; Clifford & Lederman, 2005; Kan, 2018; Salzman, 2001; Trigger, 2003). However, the dialectical relationship between agency and structure is not without challenges. Critics argue that this conceptualization might oversimplify the complexities of human behaviour within societal contexts, as it may not fully account for the multifaceted influences that shape individual choices. The concept's emphasis on the binary relationship between agency and structure might overlook the nuanced and varied ways in which individuals engage with, resist, or conform to social norms. In contemporary anthropology, the interplay between agency and structure remains a

critical theoretical lens, but the field has evolved to incorporate more nuanced and multifaceted perspectives.

Anthropologists integrate multiple theoretical frameworks, acknowledging the complex and diverse factors influencing human behaviour within societies. The integration of feminist theory, post-colonial perspectives, and critical approaches has broadened the understanding of agency and structure within diverse cultural, political, and economic contexts. The interrelationship between agency and structure stands as a fundamental theoretical framework within anthropology, exploring the dynamic and reciprocal interaction between individual autonomy and the overarching societal norms and structures. It offers insights into the complex ways individuals navigate and negotiate their agency within societal constraints, shaping and being shaped by the cultural, political, and economic landscapes (Brondizio, Adams, & Fiorini, 2016; Dissanayake, 2001; Eriksen & Nielsen, 2013; Kimmel, 2000; Nelson, 2004). Despite the ongoing debates and critiques, this theoretical perspective remains pivotal in understanding the complexities inherent in human behaviour within diverse societal contexts. As anthropology continues to evolve, the integration of multiple perspectives enables a more comprehensive understanding of the intricate interplay between individual agency and societal structures.

8. Evolutionary Anthropology and the Amalgamation of Biological & Cultural Change

Evolutionary Anthropology stands as a multidisciplinary approach within anthropology, delving into the study of human biological adaptations, evolution, and the development of human societies over time. It intertwines the principles of biological anthropology, archaeology, and primatology to understand the evolutionary processes that have shaped humans as a species (Buss, 2001; Henry III & Smith, 2012; Leaf & Read, 2012; Lyle & Smith, 2012; Poirot, 2007). This framework explores the biological, behavioural, and cultural aspects of human evolution, drawing from fields such as genetics, palaeontology, and ecology to unravel the story of humanity's origins and the mechanisms driving biological and behavioural changes in our species. At its core, Evolutionary Anthropology endeavours to trace the trajectory of human evolution and the mechanisms that have led to the biological and behavioural adaptations of our species. It delves into the fossil record, genetic analyses, and comparative studies with non-human primates to elucidate the evolutionary changes that have sculpted the human lineage.

By examining hominin fossils, genetic evidence, and comparative anatomy, evolutionary anthropologists unravel the complex evolutionary history of our species, seeking to understand the processes that have shaped human physical and behavioural characteristics. One fundamental aspect of Evolutionary Anthropology involves the study of human biological adaptations. This includes investigating how humans have evolved physically and biologically over time in response to environmental pressures and changes. For instance, examining skeletal remains and tools from ancient human populations offers insights into the ways in which early humans adapted to different environments, such as adapting to varying climatic conditions or dietary shifts. Moreover, the study of genetic adaptations, such as lactase persistence or disease resistance, offers valuable information about how human populations

have evolved in response to selective pressures. Additionally, Evolutionary Anthropology explores the development of human societies over time, integrating the study of culture, behavior, and social organization within an evolutionary framework.

This involves investigating the cultural practices, social structures, and technological advancements that have emerged in human societies and how these have shaped our species' adaptive success. The discipline considers the role of culture in human evolution, acknowledging that cultural behaviours and practices also influence the selective pressures acting upon human populations (Barrett, Stokholm, & Burke, 2001; Bloch, 2015; Conklin, 2013; Lewis, 2013; Maurer, 2006). Evolutionary Anthropology plays a crucial role in understanding the evolutionary origins of human behaviours and social structures. By examining the behaviours of our closest primate relatives and reconstructing the social behaviours of early human populations, researchers gain insights into the development of social complexities, cooperation, language, and other uniquely human attributes. Exploring the evolutionary roots of human behaviour helps to comprehend the origins and adaptive significance of social and cognitive traits that are distinctive to our species.

Furthermore, this framework has implications for understanding contemporary human diversity and health. Evolutionary Anthropology allows for insights into the genetic and environmental factors that have shaped human variation and susceptibilities to diseases. By examining the evolutionary history of different populations and their adaptations to diverse environments, researchers can better understand the genetic and biological underpinnings of human diversity and health disparities (Eriksen, 2004; Keyes, 2002; Leibowitz, Salou, Chevillard, & Leconte, 2016; J. D. Moore, 2000). Critiques of Evolutionary Anthropology often centre around its historical biases and oversights, especially in the interpretations of human diversity and evolutionary processes. Critics argue that historical frameworks have often overlooked the contributions of non-Western or non-industrialized societies, leading to biased interpretations of human evolution. Additionally, some critiques raise concerns about oversimplification or deterministic interpretations, which may overlook the complexities of human behaviour and social structures within an evolutionary context.

In contemporary anthropology, Evolutionary Anthropology remains a critical and evolving field. The integration of multidisciplinary approaches, technological advancements, and more inclusive and diverse research methodologies have broadened the scope and depth of understanding within this field (Håkansson, 2017; A. Marcus, 2008; McCoy, 2007; Niewöhner, 2015; Wilson, 2018). Evolutionary Anthropologists are continually refining their approaches, integrating cutting-edge scientific methodologies, and considering a broader spectrum of human diversity and cultural contexts in their analyses. Evolutionary Anthropology is a multidisciplinary approach that investigates the biological and cultural evolution of our species. It engages in unravelling the biological adaptations and behavioural changes that have shaped humans as a species over time. This field offers valuable insights into the evolutionary history of human populations, providing a deeper understanding of our origins, genetic diversity, and the complex interplay between biology, culture, and environment. Despite criticisms and ongoing debates, Evolutionary Anthropology continues to be a fundamental framework within the discipline, driving a

comprehensive understanding of the origins and development of our species.

9. Feminist Anthropology and the Redefining of Gender Dynamics

Feminist Anthropology stands as a critical and transformative approach within the discipline, focusing on the examination of gender roles, power dynamics, and inequalities within societies. This theoretical framework seeks to challenge and reconfigure traditional anthropological approaches that historically have overlooked, marginalized, or subordinated women's experiences, contributions, and perspectives within various societies and cultures. At its core, Feminist Anthropology underscores the significance of gender as a lens through which to analyze social, cultural, and power structures, aiming to understand and rectify the historical neglect of women's voices and experiences in anthropological research and analysis. The theoretical foundation of Feminist Anthropology involves a critical analysis of how gender roles, power dynamics, and societal inequalities are constructed and perpetuated within diverse cultural contexts.

It highlights the ways in which gender shapes social identities, social relations, and access to resources within societies. Feminist anthropologists challenge the traditional androcentric bias within anthropology, which historically centred on male experiences and perspectives, often rendering women and their roles invisible or secondary in anthropological accounts. This framework critically examines the ways in which social norms, cultural practices, and power structures interact with and reinforce gender inequalities. One of the key objectives of Feminist Anthropology is to bring attention to and analyze the lived experiences and agency of women within different cultural settings. It acknowledges that women's experiences and contributions have often been overlooked or misrepresented in traditional anthropological research, leading to an incomplete understanding of societies and cultures. This approach emphasizes the necessity of incorporating women's voices, experiences, and agency in research to offer a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of social structures and cultural dynamics.

Furthermore, Feminist Anthropology challenges essentialist or universalized notions of gender, recognizing that gender is a socially constructed category that intersects with various aspects of identity, such as class, race, sexuality, and ethnicity. This perspective emphasizes the diversity and complexity of women's experiences within different cultural, social, and historical contexts. It rejects the notion that there is a singular, fixed "woman's experience" and instead explores the multiplicity of experiences among women across various social, cultural, and geographical settings. This theoretical framework also highlights the significance of power dynamics and inequalities within societies, particularly in relation to gender. It explores how power structures influence and perpetuate gender inequalities, often marginalizing or subordinating women within societal hierarchies. Feminist anthropologists critically analyze how social, economic, and political systems contribute to the perpetuation of gender-based discrimination, unequal access to resources, and limitations on women's agency and autonomy within various cultural settings.

Additionally, Feminist Anthropology underscores the importance of reflexivity within research, encouraging anthropologists to critically examine their own biases and positions within the research process (Greenhouse, 2002; Hendry, 2017; Howell & Paris, 2010; Slaby & Röttger-Rössler, 2018; Wyn-Davis, 2014). This self-reflection involves acknowledging the influence of the researcher's own social, cultural, and gendered identities on the research process and the interpretations of data. This critical self-reflection aims to enhance the quality and validity of anthropological research, ensuring that it is inclusive, sensitive, and respectful of the diverse experiences and voices within the communities being studied. Critiques of Feminist Anthropology often revolve around concerns that it might oversimplify or essentialize gender experiences, potentially overlooking the complexities and variations within women's experiences across cultures. Critics argue that while this approach has successfully drawn attention to gender inequalities and power dynamics, it might generalize or homogenize women's experiences, overlooking the diverse and multifaceted nature of gender identities within different cultural contexts. Moreover, some critics contend that Feminist Anthropology might focus excessively on gender to the exclusion of other equally important factors, potentially overshadowing other forms of inequality or intersectional dynamics.

In contemporary anthropology, Feminist Anthropology remains a significant and evolving framework. The field has witnessed a transformation in methodologies and approaches, integrating diverse perspectives that acknowledge the complexities of gender, power, and inequalities within societies. The integration of intersectional analyses, post-colonial perspectives, and more inclusive research methodologies has broadened the understanding of gender dynamics within diverse cultural and social contexts. Feminist Anthropology stands as a critical and transformative theoretical framework within anthropology, aiming to challenge and rectify historical biases and oversights regarding women's experiences and contributions within various societies. It highlights the complexities of gender roles, power dynamics, and inequalities, providing a more nuanced understanding of the diverse experiences and agency of women across different cultural and social landscapes. Despite ongoing debates and critiques, Feminist Anthropology continues to be a foundational lens within the discipline, fostering a more inclusive and comprehensive analysis of the intricate intersections of gender, power, and culture within diverse societies.

10. Decolonizing Anthropology: Post-Colonial Perspectives on Legacy and Agency

Post-colonial theory, stemming from the upheaval and social movements during decolonization, represents a significant and critical lens within anthropology. This theoretical framework delves into the examination of the enduring legacy of colonialism and its profound impact on shaping societies, cultures, and the biases within anthropological research (Llobera, 2003; Lyons & Casey, 2016; Shankman, 2017; Skoggard & Waterston, 2015). Arising from the historical context of colonialism and the subsequent movements that aimed to dismantle colonial structures and ideologies, post-colonial theory centres on a critical re-evaluation of the histories, power dynamics, and cultural transformations engendered by colonial rule, challenging the prevailing biases and Eurocentric perspectives within

anthropological research. At its core, post-colonial theory critically interrogates the enduring effects of colonialism on the cultural, social, and economic landscapes of formerly colonized societies. It examines the ways in which colonial powers imposed their cultural, political, and economic systems on colonized societies, reshaping indigenous cultures, social hierarchies, and power structures.

The theory delves into the disempowerment, marginalization, and exploitation of indigenous populations and their cultures through colonial policies, such as land dispossession, cultural erasure, and the imposition of Western ideologies and practices. This critical approach also emphasizes the impact of colonialism on knowledge production and the biases within anthropological research. It acknowledges that anthropological studies often reflected the perspectives and biases of the colonial powers, perpetuating a Eurocentric lens that marginalized or misrepresented the cultures and experiences of indigenous populations. Post-colonial theory highlights how colonial knowledge production often perpetuated stereotypes, essentialized cultural practices, and constructed narratives that served colonial agendas, neglecting or misrepresenting the voices and experiences of the colonized people. One of the fundamental tenets of post-colonial theory involves challenging the grand narratives constructed by colonial powers, which often depicted indigenous cultures as primitive, backward, or inferior.

This approach critically reevaluates these narratives, seeking to dismantle the dominant discourses that historically diminished the value and agency of indigenous cultures and peoples (Brewton, 2005; Ensor, 2011; Hendon, 2007; Paulson, Gezon, & Watts, 2003; Sanderson, 2007). By deconstructing these grand narratives, post-colonial theory aims to restore agency, authenticity, and validity to the experiences and histories of colonized societies, offering alternative perspectives that counter the Eurocentric biases prevalent in colonial knowledge production. Moreover, post-colonial theory highlights the notion of hybridity within cultural identities and systems, acknowledging that indigenous cultures have evolved through complex interactions between their own traditions and the influences of colonial powers. It recognizes that the cultural landscapes of post-colonial societies are often hybrid, shaped by the interplay of indigenous traditions and the legacies of colonial interventions. This perspective challenges the idea of cultural purity and instead underscores the dynamism and resilience of indigenous cultures in negotiating and adapting to the changes wrought by colonialism.

This theoretical framework has far-reaching implications for contemporary anthropology. It calls for a critical re-evaluation of research methodologies and interpretations, urging anthropologists to adopt more reflexive, inclusive, and ethical approaches in their studies. Post-colonial theory advocates for collaborative and participatory research methodologies that respect the agency and perspectives of indigenous communities, aiming to redress historical biases and power imbalances in anthropological research. However, post-colonial theory has faced critiques, including concerns that it might homogenize the diverse experiences and responses of colonized societies to colonial rule. Critics argue that while the theory sheds light on the impact of colonialism, it might oversimplify the complexities of the historical, social, and cultural dynamics within different post-colonial societies. Additionally, some critics caution against adopting a solely oppositional

stance to colonial legacies, emphasizing the need to also recognize and examine the continuities and adaptations within cultures that resulted from colonial encounters.

In contemporary anthropology, post-colonial theory remains a significant and evolving framework (Ruttan, 2003). The field has witnessed a paradigm shift, with the integration of more diverse perspectives and inclusive methodologies that acknowledge the complexities of post-colonial societies. The integration of indigenous voices, collaborative research methodologies, and a critical re-evaluation of historical biases have expanded the scope and depth of anthropological studies, offering a more nuanced understanding of the enduring impacts of colonialism on societies, cultures, and knowledge production. Post-colonial theory stands as a critical and transformative framework within anthropology, unravelling the enduring impacts of colonialism on societies and cultures. It challenges the biases within anthropological research and aims to restore agency and authenticity to the experiences and histories of colonized societies. Despite ongoing debates and critiques, post-colonial theory continues to be a foundational lens within the discipline, fostering a more inclusive and comprehensive analysis of the legacies of colonialism on diverse post-colonial societies. As anthropology continues to evolve, this critical framework remains pivotal in understanding the intricacies and dynamics of cultural, social, and historical transformations engendered by colonial encounters.

11. Actor-Network Theory: Rethinking Agency and Influence in Anthropology

Actor-Network Theory (ANT) is a theoretical framework that has significantly influenced the field of anthropology, particularly in understanding the complexities of social structures and behaviours. At its core, ANT offers a distinctive approach, focusing on the relationships and interactions between a variety of actors, encompassing both human and non-human elements, within networks. This theory proposes that these actors, whether human or non-human, hold agency and participate in shaping social structures, thus influencing human behaviour and societal dynamics. ANT challenges conventional perspectives that prioritize human agency and emphasizes the interconnectedness and agency of both human and non-human elements within social networks. The foundational premise of ANT lies in its rejection of the traditional dichotomy between human and non-human entities, positing that all elements—both living and non-living—can act as active participants within networks (Bettinger et al., 2015; Bloch, 2013; Humphrey, 2018; Sanderson, 2015; Warin, 2015).

This departure from the traditional human-centred perspective within social theory opens up new avenues to comprehend the dynamics of social life. ANT views humans and non-humans as “actants” or “actors” that contribute to the construction and maintenance of networks, exercising agency and influencing the interactions and structures within these networks. Moreover, ANT challenges the deterministic view that structures or institutions govern social behaviour, proposing instead that networks themselves are the dynamic forces that shape social behaviour. These networks consist of human and non-human elements entangled in relationships of influence, agency, and power. For instance, a network might encompass humans, technologies, institutions, discourses, and

various objects or artifacts (Baer, Singer, & Susser, 2013; Godelier, Young, & Edholm, 2013; Inhorn & Wentzell, 2012; Kluckhohn, 2017; Leroy & Praet, 2015). ANT scrutinizes how these heterogeneous elements interact, shape each other, and contribute to the formation of social structures. It suggests that these networks are not merely passive frameworks but dynamic and agential entities that shape human actions and social phenomena. ANT emphasizes the role of translation in network building.

This concept posits that actors within a network do not possess fixed meanings or attributes; rather, their influence and agency emerge through interactions with other actors. Translation involves the negotiation and reconfiguration of meanings, intentions, and agency as different actors come together within a network. For example, an object may have different meanings or effects depending on its interaction with other elements within a network. The concept of translation underscores the fluidity and complexity of interactions within networks, acknowledging the continual process of negotiation and adjustment among various actors (Bashkow, 2004; Brannigan, 2016; Palomera & Vetta, 2016; Palsson, 2018; Vásquez, 2020). The theory also emphasizes the concept of “symmetry,” which entails treating human and non-human actors equally within the network. Symmetry challenges the hierarchical distinctions between human and non-human elements that are commonly embedded in social theory. In ANT, both humans and non-humans possess agency and influence within networks, without hierarchical privileging of one over the other. This principle of symmetry allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the diverse influences and interactions within networks. One of the key contributions of ANT lies in its approach to understanding how various actors, both human and non-human, participate and contribute to the formation and maintenance of social structures.

This approach allows for a comprehensive exploration of the entanglements and interactions among diverse elements within networks, challenging traditional notions of agency, power, and influence in social theory (Barth, Gingrich, Parkin, & Silverman, 2010; Bessire & Bond, 2014; Diah, Hossain, Mustari, & Ramli, 2014; Faye Venetia Harrison, 2008; Zuckerman & Armelagos, 2011). ANT offers a distinctive lens through which to examine the complexities of societal dynamics, shedding light on the agential capacities of various actors and the intricate relationships that shape social structures and behaviours. However, ANT has faced several critiques. Critics argue that the theory’s emphasis on the equality of human and non-human actors might overlook the inherent differences in agency and influence between the two. Additionally, the concept of symmetry might lead to an oversimplification of the complex power dynamics and hierarchies present within networks. Critics also raise concerns about the potential to overlook broader societal structures and power relations in favour of a focus on localized networks. In contemporary anthropology, ANT remains a significant and evolving theoretical framework, impacting various fields, including science and technology studies, sociology, and organizational theory (Hakken, Lessinger, Nash, & Babb, 2019; Hicks & Beaudry, 2010; Schein, 1999; Shapiro, 2009; Strathern, 2005).

The application of ANT has expanded beyond traditional anthropological studies, informing analyses of technology, scientific practices, and organizational dynamics. Its approach to

understanding the agency and influence of diverse actors within networks has contributed to a deeper understanding of the complexities of social structures and behaviours, offering a rich and multifaceted lens through which to examine the intricate dynamics of contemporary societies. Actor-Network Theory stands as a distinctive and influential theoretical framework within anthropology, offering a unique approach to understanding the relationships between human and non-human actors within networks and their influence on social structures and behaviours. It challenges traditional perspectives by emphasizing the agency and participation of both human and non-human elements in shaping societal dynamics. Despite ongoing debates and critiques, ANT continues to be a pivotal framework within anthropology, offering a valuable perspective that enriches the understanding of the intricate and dynamic nature of social life (de Wolf, 2004; Gledhill, 2009; Iacovetta, 1999; Paulson, Gezon, & Watts, 2005; Rubin, 2009). Its influence extends beyond anthropology, shaping various fields and offering new insights into the complexities of contemporary societies and their structures.

12. Implications

The comprehensive exploration of diverse theoretical frameworks within anthropology holds far-reaching implications for the field and beyond, offering insights that extend to academia, society, and interdisciplinary studies. Each framework contributes unique perspectives, challenging conventional paradigms, and enriching the understanding of human societies, cultural dynamics, and behaviours. These implications span across various domains, influencing the course of anthropological research, academic discourse, and broader societal understandings. Firstly, the examination of these theoretical frameworks offers significant implications for the trajectory of anthropological research. By providing diverse lenses to analyze human societies, these frameworks challenge conventional approaches and methodologies, prompting scholars to adopt more reflexive and inclusive methodologies. The recognition of diverse perspectives fosters the integration of interdisciplinary approaches and collaborative research methodologies, leading to more comprehensive and nuanced analyses within anthropology.

This diversification of research methodologies broadens the scope of anthropological studies, enabling researchers to capture the intricacies of human societies with greater depth and inclusivity. Moreover, the critical examination of these frameworks holds implications for the evolution of anthropological thought and theory. The synthesis and juxtaposition of these diverse perspectives contribute to the ongoing re-evaluation and refinement of anthropological theories. The integration of these frameworks encourages a more dynamic and multifaceted understanding of social dynamics, urging scholars to continually reassess and modify existing paradigms. This ongoing process of re-evaluation and synthesis is integral to the progressive nature of anthropology, fostering a more nuanced and evolving discipline that better captures the complexities of human societies. Furthermore, these theoretical frameworks have implications that extend beyond the confines of academia, influencing broader societal understandings and discourses. The insights provided by these frameworks contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of societal dynamics, cultural practices, and behavioural nuances, offering

insights into the complexities of human interactions within diverse communities.

This has implications for social discourse, encouraging a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of cultural practices and social structures within diverse societies. By challenging conventional societal perceptions and biases, these frameworks promote a more inclusive and comprehensive view of human societies, fostering greater cultural sensitivity and appreciation for diverse perspectives. The implications of these frameworks extend into interdisciplinary studies, offering valuable perspectives for fields beyond anthropology. The emphasis on diverse methodologies, critical analyses, and inclusivity in understanding social dynamics has implications for disciplines such as sociology, psychology, history, and cultural studies. These diverse theoretical lenses offer valuable insights and approaches that enrich the study of human behaviours, societal structures, and cultural dynamics across various academic disciplines. The interdisciplinary nature of these frameworks fosters collaborative approaches and diverse perspectives in understanding complex societal phenomena. Moreover, these frameworks hold implications for policy-making and social interventions. By offering a nuanced understanding of societal structures, power dynamics, and cultural practices, these theoretical frameworks provide insights that can inform more sensitive and effective policy decisions.

The insights gleaned from these frameworks offer valuable tools for social scientists, policymakers, and practitioners working to address societal issues and promote inclusivity within diverse communities. Additionally, the exploration of these frameworks has implications for fostering a more inclusive and diverse academic environment. By acknowledging the multifaceted nature of human societies and the diverse perspectives offered by these frameworks, academia is encouraged to embrace a more inclusive and diverse range of voices and perspectives. This inclusivity promotes a richer and more comprehensive academic environment, fostering the exchange of diverse ideas and perspectives within the academic community. The recognition of diverse perspectives enriches the academic discourse, encouraging the integration of varied methodologies and critical analyses in anthropological research. The exploration of diverse theoretical frameworks within anthropology holds multifaceted implications that span across various domains. These frameworks challenge conventional paradigms, urging scholars to adopt more diverse and inclusive methodologies, contributing to the ongoing evolution of anthropological theory and thought. Moreover, they offer insights that extend beyond academia, influencing societal understandings and discourse, and have implications for policy-making, interdisciplinary studies, and the fostering of a more inclusive academic environment. The recognition of the multifaceted nature of human societies and the diverse perspectives offered by these frameworks has the potential to shape more inclusive and nuanced societal discourses, fostering a deeper understanding of the complexities inherent in diverse human communities.

13. Conclusion

The exploration of diverse theoretical frameworks within anthropology has offered a rich amalgamation of perspectives and lenses through which to comprehend the complexities of human societies, cultures, and behaviours. From the founda-

tional principles of Cultural Materialism to the intricate analyses of Actor-Network Theory (ANT), each theoretical framework brings its own unique approach, enriching the understanding of social structures, behaviours, and cultural dynamics. The significance of Cultural Materialism, as introduced by Marvin Harris, lies in its emphasis on the material conditions of a society as a pivotal factor in shaping cultural and social structures. It offers a lens through which to understand the interplay between material circumstances and cultural practices, providing insights into how societies adapt to their environments and allocate resources.

The framework's analysis of cultural practices in the context of ecological and economic factors contributes to a deeper understanding of societal behaviours and structures. Structural Functionalism, associated with figures like Bronislaw Malinowski and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, centres on the functionality of social structures, emphasizing the interrelated parts that work together to maintain societal equilibrium. This framework examines the functions of social institutions and cultural practices, emphasizing their contributions to the overall stability and functioning of societies. It offers insights into the coherence and interdependence of various social elements, contributing to the understanding of social systems. Symbolic Anthropology, pioneered by Victor Turner and Clifford Geertz, concentrates on the interpretation of symbols and meanings in cultures and societies. This framework delves into the symbolic meanings embedded in cultural practices and rituals, emphasizing the role of symbols in shaping human behaviour and social interactions. Symbolic Anthropology contributes to a deeper comprehension of the subjective and interpretive aspects of culture, highlighting the role of meaning-making in social life. Cultural Ecology examines the intricate relationship between a culture and its environment, emphasizing how societies adapt to and modify their surroundings.

This framework offers insights into the complex interactions between human populations and their ecological surroundings, shedding light on how environmental factors influence societal behaviours and practices. It highlights the adaptability and resilience of human societies in response to environ-

mental challenges. Post-structuralism, emerging from the works of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, questions fixed meanings and explores the influence of power structures on knowledge and discourse. This framework challenges traditional notions of knowledge, highlighting the ways in which power shapes discourse and influences the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Post-structuralism critically analyses the power dynamics inherent in social and cultural contexts, offering insights into the complexities of societal discourses and their implications. Evolutionary Anthropology, a multidisciplinary approach, studies human biological adaptations, evolution, and the development of human societies over time. This framework provides insights into the evolutionary processes that have shaped human biological and behavioural traits, offering a comprehensive understanding of human origins and the mechanisms driving biological and cultural changes.

However, these theoretical frameworks do not exist in isolation; rather, they complement and challenge each other, offering diverse and nuanced perspectives on the complexities of social life. The overarching significance of this exploration lies in its contribution to the continual evolution of anthropological knowledge and methodologies. The diverse perspectives and lenses provided by these frameworks offer a rich amalgamation of approaches to navigate the intricate dynamics of cultural, social, and behavioural aspects within diverse human communities. The synthesis and critical analysis of these theoretical perspectives contribute to the ongoing scholarly discourse and understanding of the complexities and nuances within human societies, offering a holistic understanding of the multifaceted nature of human interactions and social structures. The comprehensive exploration of these theoretical frameworks within anthropology offers a mosaic of perspectives that deepen our understanding of human societies. The rich array of lenses provided by these frameworks reflects the complexities and dynamism inherent in human interactions, cultural practices, and societal structures. As anthropology continues to evolve, these frameworks offer valuable insights into the intricate and diverse nature of human societies and their behaviours, contributing to the continual refinement and evolution of anthropological knowledge.

Funding Information:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosure Statement:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Competing Interest:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data Availability Statement:

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

References

- Aitchison, C. C. (2005). Feminist and gender perspectives in tourism studies: The social-cultural nexus of critical and cultural theories. *Tourist studies*, 5(3), 207-224.
- Baer, H. A., Singer, M., & Susser, I. (2013). *Medical anthropology and the world system: critical perspectives*: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Barrett, S. R., Stokholm, S., & Burke, J. (2001). The idea of power and the power of ideas: A review essay. *American Anthropologist*, 103(2), 468-480.
- Barth, F., Gingrich, A., Parkin, R., & Silverman, S. (2010). *One discipline, four ways: British, German, French, and American anthropology*: University of Chicago Press.
- Bashkow, I. (2004). A Neo-Boasian conception of cultural boundaries. *American Anthropologist*, 106(3), 443-458.
- Benezra, A., DeStefano, J., & Gordon, J. I. (2012). Anthropology of microbes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(17), 6378-6381.
- Bessire, L., & Bond, D. (2014). Ontological anthropology and the deferral of critique. *American ethnologist*, 41(3), 440-456.
- Bettinger, R. L., Garvey, R., Tushingham, S., Bettinger, R. L., Garvey, R., & Tushingham, S. (2015). Marxist and Structural Marxist Perspectives of Hunter-Gatherers. *Hunter-Gatherers: Archaeological and Evolutionary Theory*, 163-185.
- Bieler, P., & Niewöhner, J. (2018). Universal biology, local society? Notes from anthropology. *The Palgrave handbook of biology and society*, 641-662.
- Bille, M., Hastrup, F., & Soerensen, T. F. (2010). *An anthropology of absence: materializations of transcendence and loss*: Springer.
- Birx, H. J. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Five-Volume Set*: Sage Publications.
- Bland, L., Harrison, R., Mort, F., & Weedon, C. (2013). Relations of reproduction: approaches through anthropology. In *Women Take Issue* (pp. 155-175): Routledge.
- Bloch, M. (2013). *Marxism and anthropology: the history of a relationship*: Routledge.
- Bloch, M. (2015). *In and out of each other's bodies: Theory of mind, evolution, truth, and the nature of the social*: Routledge.
- Bodley, J. H. (2011). *Cultural anthropology: Tribes, states, and the global system*: Rowman Altamira.
- Borsos, B. (2017). Ecology+ Anthropology= Ecological Anthropology? *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica*, 62(1), 31-52.
- Boyer, D. (2014). Energopower: an introduction. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 309-333.
- Brannigan, J. (2016). *New historicism and cultural materialism*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bray, F. (2007). Gender and technology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 36, 37-53.
- Brewton, V. (2005). Literary theory. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 29.
- Brondizio, E., Adams, R. T., & Fiorini, S. (2016). History and scope of environmental anthropology. In *Routledge handbook of environmental anthropology* (pp. 10-30): Routledge.
- Brownell, S., & Besnier, N. (2020). Gender and sexuality. In *The Handbook of Sociocultural Anthropology* (pp. 239-258): Routledge.
- Bubandt, N., & Otto, T. (2010). Anthropology and the Predicaments of Holism. *Experiments in holism: theory and practice in contemporary anthropology*, 1-15.
- Buchanan, I. (2018). *A dictionary of critical theory*: Oxford University Press.
- Buchli, V. (2020). *An anthropology of architecture*: Routledge.
- Buss, D. M. (2001). Human nature and culture: An evolutionary psychological perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 69(6), 955-978.
- Chagnon, N. A. (2007). *Chronic problems in understanding tribal violence and warfare*. Paper presented at the Ciba Foundation Symposium 194-Genetics of Criminal and Antisocial Behaviour: Genetics of Criminal and Antisocial Behaviour: Ciba Foundation Symposium 194.
- Chodorkoff, D. (2014). The Anthropology of Utopia. *Essays on Social Ecology and Community Development*. Porsgrunn: New Compass.
- Cini, L., Chironi, D., Drapalova, E., & Tomasello, F. (2017). Towards a critical theory of social movements: An introduction. In (Vol. 17, pp. 429-452): SAGE Publications Sage UK: London, England.
- Clair, R. P. (2003). The changing story of ethnography. *Expressions of ethnography: Novel approaches to qualitative methods*, 3-26.
- Clifford, J., & Lederman, R. (2005). *Unwrapping the sacred bundle: reflections on the disciplining of anthropology*: Duke University Press.
- Conklin, A. L. (2013). *In the museum of man: Race, anthropology, and empire in France, 1850-1950*: Cornell University Press.
- Cornwall, A., & Lindisfarne, N. (2016). Dislocating masculinity: gender, power and anthropology. In *Dislocating masculinity* (pp. 27-61): Routledge.
- de Wolf, J. J. (2004). The predicament of writing the history of anthropology. *Social Anthropology*, 12(1), 103-111.
- Diah, N. M., Hossain, D. M., Mustari, S., & Ramli, N. S. (2014). An overview of the anthropological theories. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(1), 155-164.
- Dissanayake, E. (2001). *Homo aestheticus: Where art comes from and why*: University of Washington Press.
- Dobres, M.-A., & Robb, J. E. (2014). Agency in archaeology: paradigm or platitude? In *Agency in archaeology* (pp. 3-17): Routledge.
- Donovan, J. M., & Anderson III, H. E. (2003). *Anthropology and law* (Vol. 1): Berghahn Books.
- Droogan, J. (2012). *Religion, material culture and archaeology*: A&C Black.
- Eller, J. D. (2015). *Cultural anthropology: 101*: Routledge.
- Eller, J. D. (2020). *Cultural anthropology: Global forces, local lives*: Routledge.
- Emberley, J. V. (2001). The bourgeois family, Aboriginal women, and colonial governance in Canada: A study in feminist historical and cultural materialism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 27(1), 59-85.
- Ensor, B. E. (2011). Kinship theory in archaeology: from critiques to the study of transformations. *American antiquity*, 76(2), 203-227.
- Erickson, P. I. (2011). Sexuality, medical anthropology, and public health. *A companion to medical anthropology*, 271-287.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2004). *What is anthropology?*: Pluto Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2020). *Engaging anthropology: The case for a public presence*: Routledge.
- Eriksen, T. H., & Nielsen, F. S. (2013). *A history of anthropology*: Pluto Press.
- Ervin, A. M. (2016). *Cultural transformations and globalization: Theory, development, and social change*: Routledge.
- Fischer, M. M. (2009). *Anthropological futures*: Duke University Press.

- Fuentes, A. (2018). Towards integrative anthropology again and again: disorderly becomings of a (biological) anthropologist. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 43(3-4), 333-347.
- García, M. D.-A. (2005). *The archaeology of identity: approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion*: Taylor & Francis.
- Gilkeson, J. S. (2010). *Anthropologists and the Rediscovery of America, 1886–1965*: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillespie, S. D., & Nichols, D. L. (2003). *Archaeology is anthropology*: American Anthropological Association Arlington, VA.
- Gingrich, A., & Fox, R. G. (2002). *Anthropology, by comparison*: Psychology Press.
- Gledhill, J. (2009). Power in political anthropology. *Journal of Power*, 2(1), 9-34.
- Godelier, M., Young, K., & Edholm, F. (2013). Modes of production, kinship, and demographic structures. In *Marxist analyses and social anthropology* (pp. 3-27): Routledge.
- Graeber, D. (2001). *Toward an anthropological theory of value: The false coin of our own dreams*: Springer.
- Graham, M. (2014). *Anthropological explorations in queer theory*: Taylor & Francis.
- Greenhouse, C. J. (2002). Introduction: Altered states, altered lives. *Ethnography in unstable places: everyday lives in contexts of dramatic political change*, 1-34.
- Gremillion, H. (2005). The cultural politics of body size. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 34, 13-32.
- Guenther, M. (2007). Current issues and future directions in hunter-gatherer studies. *Anthropos*, 102(2), 371-388.
- Hackett, R. I. (2005). Anthropology of religion. In *The Routledge companion to the study of religion* (pp. 156-175): Routledge.
- Hage, G. (2012). Critical anthropological thought and the radical political imaginary today. *critique of anthropology*, 32(3), 285-308.
- Haines, V. A. (2007). Evolutionary explanations. In *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology* (pp. 249-310): Elsevier.
- Håkansson, N. T. (2017). Inequality and the return to structure in anthropology. *Reviews in Anthropology*, 46(2-3), 106-124.
- Hakken, D. J., Lessinger, H., Nash, J., & Babb, F. (2019). *Perspectives in US Marxist anthropology*: Routledge.
- Hann, C. (2018). Economic anthropology. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-16.
- Harper, D. (2005). An argument for visual sociology. In *Image-based research* (pp. 24-41): Routledge.
- Harrison, F. V. (2008). *Outsider within: reworking anthropology in the global age*: University of Illinois Press.
- Harrison, F. V. (2016). Theorizing in ex-centric sites. *Anthropological Theory*, 16(2-3), 160-176.
- Hasse, C. (2016). *Anthropology of learning*: Springer.
- Hedican, E. (2012). *Social anthropology: Canadian perspectives on culture and society*: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Hendon, J. A. (2007). Living and working at home: The social archaeology of household production and social relations. *A companion to social archaeology*, 272-286.
- Hendry, J. (2017). *An introduction to social anthropology: sharing our worlds*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Henry III, F., & Smith, E. A. (2012). How conservative are evolutionary anthropologists? A survey of political attitudes. *Human nature*, 23(3), 306-323.
- Hicks, D., & Beaudry, M. C. (2010). *The Oxford handbook of material culture studies*: OUP Oxford.
- Hird, M. J. (2004). Feminist matters: New materialist considerations of sexual difference. *Feminist Theory*, 5(2), 223-232.
- Howell, B. M., & Paris, J. W. (2010). *Introducing cultural anthropology: A Christian perspective*: Baker Academic.
- Humphrey, C. (2018). *Marxism and neo-Marxism*. London, Routledge.
- Iacovetta, F. (1999). Post-modern ethnography, historical materialism, and decentring the (male) authorial voice: a feminist conversation. *Histoire sociale/Social History*.
- Ingold, T. (2016). *Evolution and social life*: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2018). *Anthropology: Why it matters*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Inhorn, M. C., & Wentzell, E. A. (2012). *Medical anthropology at the intersections: histories, activisms, and futures*: Duke University Press.
- Jackson, J., & Depew, D. (2017). *Darwinism, democracy, and race: American anthropology and evolutionary biology in the twentieth century*: Routledge.
- Jackson, W. A. (2009). *Economics, culture and social theory*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Joralemon, D. (2017). *Exploring medical anthropology*: Taylor & Francis.
- Joy, A., & Li, E. P. H. (2012). Studying consumption behaviour through multiple lenses: an overview of consumer culture theory. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 1(1), 141-173.
- Kan, S. (2018). United States, Anthropology in. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-30.
- Kaufman, S. R., & Morgan, L. M. (2005). The anthropology of the beginnings and ends of life. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 34, 317-341.
- Keane, W. (2003). Self-interpretation, agency, and the objects of anthropology: Reflections on a genealogy. *Comparative studies in Society and History*, 45(2), 222-248.
- Kearney, M. (2018). *Reconceptualizing the peasantry: anthropology in global perspective*: Routledge.
- Kertzer, D. I. (2005). Anthropological demography. In *Handbook of population* (pp. 525-547): Springer.
- Keyes, C. F. (2002). Weber and anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31(1), 233-255.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2000). *The gendered society*: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Kirksey, S. E., & Helmreich, S. (2010). The emergence of multispecies ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology*, 25(4), 545-576.
- Kluckhohn, C. (2017). *Mirror for man: The relation of anthropology to modern life*: Routledge.
- Knauft, B. M. (2006). Anthropology in the middle. *Anthropological Theory*, 6(4), 407-430.
- Kohn, E. (2015). Anthropology of ontologies. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44, 311-327.
- Koskoff, E. (2014). A feminist ethnomusicology. *Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press*.
- Kromidas, M. (2014). The 'savage'child and the nature of race: Posthuman interventions from New York City. *Anthropological Theory*, 14(4), 422-441.
- Kuper, A. (2014). *Anthropology and anthropologists: the modern British school*: Routledge.
- Laidlaw, J. (2013). *The subject of virtue: An anthropology of ethics and freedom*: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamphere, L. (2016). Feminist anthropology engages social movements. *Mapping Feminist Anthropology in the Twenty-First Century*, 41-64.

- Leacock, E. (2014). *Behavior, Biology and 9 Anthropological Theory*. Paper presented at the Behavioral Evolution and Integrative Levels: The Te Schmeirla Conferences Series, Volume 1.
- Leaf, M. J., & Read, D. (2012). *Human thought and social organization: Anthropology on a new plane*: Lexington Books.
- Leatherman, T., & Goodman, A. H. (2011). Critical biocultural approaches in medical anthropology. *A companion to medical anthropology*, 29-48.
- Leibowitz, L., Saliou, M., Chevillard, N., & Leconte, S. (2016). *Women's work, men's property: The origins of gender and class*: Verso Books.
- Leroy, F., & Praet, I. (2015). Meat traditions. The co-evolution of humans and meat. *Appetite*, 90, 200-211.
- Lettow, S. (2017). Turning the turn: New materialism, historical materialism and critical theory. *Thesis Eleven*, 140(1), 106-121.
- Lewis, H. S. (2009). The radical transformation of anthropology: history seen through the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, 1955–2005. *Histories of anthropology annual*, 5(1), 200-228.
- Lewis, H. S. (2013). *In Defense of Anthropology: An Investigation of the Critique of Anthropology*: Transaction Publishers.
- Lewis, H. S. (2017). Anthropology or Cultural and Critical Theory? 1. In *In Defense of Anthropology* (pp. 199-206): Routledge.
- Little, P. E. (1999). Environments and environmentalisms in anthropological research: facing a new millennium. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 28(1), 253-284.
- Llobera, J. R. (2003). *An invitation to anthropology: the structure, evolution and cultural identity of human societies*: Berghahn Books.
- Low, S. M. (2009). Towards an anthropological theory of space and place.
- Lyle, H. F., & Smith, E. A. (2012). How conservative are evolutionary anthropologists? A survey of political attitudes. *Human nature*, 23, 306-322.
- Lyons, D., & Casey, J. (2016). It's a material world: the critical and on-going value of ethnoarchaeology in understanding variation, change and materiality. *World archaeology*, 48(5), 609-627.
- Macdonald, S. (2001). British social anthropology. *Handbook of ethnography*, 60-79.
- Marcus, A. (2008). Interrogating the neo-pluralist orthodoxy in American anthropology. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 32, 59-86.
- Marcus, G. E., & Fischer, M. M. (2014). *Anthropology as cultural critique: An experimental moment in the human sciences*: University of Chicago press.
- Mascia-Lees, F. E., & Black, N. J. (2016). *Gender and anthropology*: Waveland Press.
- Maurer, B. (2006). In the matter of Marxism. *Handbook of material culture*, 13-28.
- McCoid, C. H. (2008). Eleanor Burke Leacock and intersectionality: Materialism, dialectics, and transformation. *Race, Gender & Class*, 24-41.
- McCoy, S. B. (2007). *Interpreting the organization of culture: A historical provisional approach to organizational culture*: California State University, Fullerton.
- McGee, R. J., & Warms, R. L. (2013). *Theory in social and cultural anthropology: An encyclopedia*: Sage Publications.
- McGuigan, J., & Moran, M. (2014). Raymond Williams and sociology. *The Sociological Review*, 62(1), 167-188.
- Mead, M. (2017). *Continuities in cultural evolution*: Routledge.
- Miller, C. (2017). *Design+ anthropology: Converging pathways in anthropology and design*: Routledge.
- Miller, D. (2012). Things ain't what they used to be. In *Interpreting objects and collections* (pp. 13-18): Routledge.
- Milner, A. (2002). *Re-imagining cultural studies: The promise of cultural materialism*: Sage.
- Milner, A., & Browitt, J. (2013). *Contemporary cultural theory: An introduction*: Routledge.
- Milton, K. (2002). *Environmentalism and cultural theory: exploring the role of anthropology in environmental discourse*: Routledge.
- Moberg, M. (2018). *Engaging anthropological theory: a social and political history*: Routledge.
- Moore, H. L. (2007). *The subject of anthropology: gender, symbolism and psychoanalysis*: Polity.
- Moore, J. D. (2000). *Visions of culture: An introduction to anthropological theories and theorists*: Rowman Altamira.
- Morris, B. (2006). *Religion and anthropology: A critical introduction*: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, B. (2014). *Anthropology and the human subject*: Trafford Publishing.
- Morris, B. (2015). *Anthropology, ecology, and anarchism: A Brian Morris reader*: PM Press.
- Morris, M. (2012). *Concise dictionary of social and cultural anthropology*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Murphy, R. F. (2002). *American Anthropology, 1946-1970: Papers from the American Anthropologist* (Vol. 3): U of Nebraska Press.
- Nelson, S. M. (2004). *Gender in archaeology: analyzing power and prestige*: Rowman Altamira.
- Nguyen, V.-K., & Peschard, K. (2003). Anthropology, inequality, and disease: a review. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 32(1), 447-474.
- Nielsen, J. M. (2019). *Feminist research methods: Exemplary readings in the social sciences*: Routledge.
- Niewöhner, J. (2015). *Infrastructures of society, anthropology of*: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
- Nugent, S. (2016). *Critical anthropology: Foundational works*: Routledge.
- Ortner, S. B. (1999). *The fate of "culture": Geertz and beyond* (Vol. 8): Univ of California Press.
- Ortner, S. B. (2005). Subjectivity and cultural critique. *Anthropological Theory*, 5(1), 31-52.
- Ortner, S. B. (2006). *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*: Duke University Press.
- Ortner, S. B. (2016). Dark anthropology and its others: Theory since the eighties. *HAAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 6(1), 47-73.
- Palomera, J., & Vetta, T. (2016). Moral economy: Rethinking a radical concept. *Anthropological Theory*, 16(4), 413-432.
- Palsson, G. (2018). Nature, concepts of. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-8.
- Parvini, N. (2012). *Shakespeare and Contemporary Theory: New historicism and cultural materialism*: A&C Black.
- Paulson, S., Gezon, L. L., & Watts, M. (2003). Locating the political in political ecology: An introduction. *Human organization*, 62(3), 205-217.
- Paulson, S., Gezon, L. L., & Watts, M. (2005). Politics, ecologies, genealogies. *Political ecology across spaces, scales, and social groups*, 17-37.
- Poirot, C. (2007). How can institutional economics be an evolutionary science? *Journal of Economic Issues*, 41(1), 155-179.
- Rankin, K. N. (2004). *The cultural politics of markets: Economic liberalization and social change in Nepal* (Vol. 27): University of Toronto Press.
- Redclift, N. (2012). Rights in women: Kinship, culture, and materialism. In *Engels Revisited (Routledge Revivals)* (pp. 113-144): Routledge.

- Reysoo, F. (2014). Feminist anthropology meets development. In *Under Development: Gender* (pp. 42-60): Springer.
- Rivkin-Fish, M. (2010). Pronatalism, gender politics, and the renewal of family support in Russia: Toward a feminist anthropology of "maternity capital". *Slavic review*, 69(3), 701-724.
- Rubin, G. (2009). The "political economy" of sex. *Feminist Anthropology: a reader*, 87.
- Ruttan, V. W. (2003). *Social science knowledge and economic development: An institutional design perspective*: University of Michigan Press.
- Ruyle, E. E. (2019). Rethinking Marxist anthropology. In *Perspectives in US Marxist Anthropology* (pp. 24-56): Routledge.
- Salomon, F. (2018). *At the mountains' Altar: anthropology of religion in an Andean community*: Routledge.
- Salzman, P. C. (2001). *Understanding culture: An introduction to anthropological theory*: Waveland Press.
- Sanderson, S. K. (2001). *The evolution of human sociality: A Darwinian conflict perspective*: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sanderson, S. K. (2007). Marvín Harris, Meet Charles Darwin. *Boulder, CO: Paradigm*.
- Sanderson, S. K. (2015). Marvín Harris, meet Charles Darwin: A critical evaluation and theoretical extension of cultural materialism. In *Studying Societies and Cultures* (pp. 194-228): Routledge.
- Schein, L. (1999). Performing modernity. *Cultural Anthropology*, 14(3), 361-395.
- Shankman, P. (2017). It seemed like a good Idea at the Time. *These" Thin Partitions": Bridging the Growing Divide Between Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology*, 45.
- Shapiro, W. (2009). *Partible paternity and anthropological theory: the construction of an ethnographic fantasy*: University Press of America.
- Sinfield, A. (2006). *Shakespeare, authority, sexuality: unfinished business in cultural materialism*: Routledge.
- Singh, P. K. (2002). Recent Trends in Anthropological Theories (A Brief Outline of Developments since 1950). *The Oriental Anthropologist*, 2(1), 1-17.
- Skoggard, I., & Waterston, A. (2015). Introduction: toward an anthropology of affect and evocative ethnography. *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 26(2), 109-120.
- Slaby, J., & Röttger-Rössler, B. (2018). Introduction: Affect in relation. In *Affect in Relation* (pp. 1-28): Routledge.
- Steedly, M. M. (1999). The state of culture theory in the anthropology of Southeast Asia. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 28(1), 431-454.
- Stocking, G. W. (2001). *Delimiting anthropology: Occasional essays and reflections*: Univ of Wisconsin Press.
- Strathern, M. (2005). *Partial connections*: Rowman Altamira.
- Suchman, L. (2011). Anthropological relocations and the limits of design. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40, 1-18.
- Sussler, I. (2016). Considering the urban commons: Anthropological approaches to social movements. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 40(3), 183-198.
- Taylor, J. S. (2005). Surfacing the body interior. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 34, 741-756.
- Thelen, T. (2015). Care as social organization: Creating, maintaining and dissolving significant relations. *Anthropological Theory*, 15(4), 497-515.
- Trigger, B. G. (2003). *Understanding early civilizations: a comparative study*: Cambridge University Press.
- Trigger, B. G. (2019). Early Native North American responses to European contact: romantic versus rationalistic interpretations. In *European and Non-European Societies, 1450–1800* (pp. 191-211): Routledge.
- Trotter, R. T., Schensul, J. J., & Kostick, K. M. (2015). Theories and methods in applied anthropology. *Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*, 661-694.
- Vásquez, M. A. (2020). *More than belief: A materialist theory of religion*: Oxford University Press.
- Venkatesan, S., Edwards, J., Willerslev, R., Povinelli, E., & Mody, P. (2011). The anthropological fixation with reciprocity leaves no room for love: 2009 meeting of the Group for Debates in Anthropological Theory. *critique of anthropology*, 31(3), 210-250.
- Vivanco, L. (2018). *A dictionary of cultural anthropology*: Oxford University Press.
- Walle, A. H. (2001). *Exotic visions in marketing theory and practice*: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Warin, M. (2015). Material feminism, obesity science and the limits of discursive critique. *Body & society*, 21(4), 48-76.
- Watts, M. J. (2016). anthropology, geography and the environment. *The Routledge Companion to Contemporary Anthropology*, 323.
- Weisberg, D. (2017). Theories about the origins of culture have never been very kind to women. In nineteenth-century, social-evolutionist accounts of the emergence of the civilizing institutions of family, clan, and property in works like JM McLennans Primitive Marriage (1865) or Lewis H. Morgans Ancient Society (1877) women appear, when they are lucky enough to escape female infanticide, as captured and. *Indigenous Religions*.
- Wilson, D. J. (2018). *Indigenous South Americans of the past and present: an ecological perspective*: Routledge.
- Womack, M. (2005). *Symbols and meaning: A concise introduction*: Rowman Altamira.
- Wyn-Davis, M. (2014). *Introducing Anthropology: A Graphic Guide*: Icon Books Ltd.
- York, R., & Mancus, P. (2009). Critical human ecology: Historical materialism and natural laws. *Sociological Theory*, 27(2), 122-149.
- Zuckerman, M. K., & Armelagos, G. J. (2011). The origins of biocultural dimensions in bioarchaeology. *Social bioarchaeology*, 13-43.

© 2021, Author(s).

This open access publication is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License.



You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material.

However,

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

Non-Commercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Share Alike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license.

You shall not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

There are no additional restrictions.