



Peer-Reviewed, International,
Academic Research Journal



Citation

Osío, J.B. (2023). Unveiling the Intersection: Anthropological Insights into Health Disparities and Well-Being. *Social Science Chronicle*, Vol. 3, Issue - 1, pp. 1-20.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

<https://doi.org/10.56106/ssc.2023.008>

Received - April 11, 2023

Accepted - August 18, 2023

Published - August 25, 2023

Web-Link

All the contents of this peer reviewed article as well as author details are available at <http://socialsciencechronicle.com/article-ssc-2023-008>

Copyright

The copyright of this article is reserved with the author/s.
© 2023, José Briceño Osío.

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

Unveiling the Intersection: Anthropological Insights into Health Disparities and Well-Being

José Briceño Osío^{1*}

¹ Universidad de los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela.

* Corresponding Author

Abstract

This research paper delves into the multifaceted realm where anthropology intersects with health, culture, and society. It unravels the profound contributions of various sub-disciplines within anthropology to our understanding of health disparities, cultural dimensions of education, the complexities of emotions, rituals of pregnancy and childbirth, the dynamics of public health emergencies, and the cultural underpinnings of illness and sickness. Our exploration begins with medical anthropology, illuminating the intricate interplay between health inequalities and societal constructs, with a specific focus on the influence of income disparity, racial prejudice, and cultural beliefs. This knowledge empowers medical anthropologists to devise more equitable public health interventions by recognizing the socio-cultural determinants of health disparities. The branch of psychological anthropology unveils cultural models of learning, intelligence, motivation, and assessment, shedding light on how cultural norms shape educational outcomes and learning approaches. Furthermore, the anthropology of emotions deciphers how different cultures uniquely perceive and respond to emotions, emphasizing the need for culturally sensitive interventions in diverse domains. Pre and perinatal anthropology explores the rituals, customs, and beliefs surrounding pregnancy, childbirth, and infancy in diverse cultures, highlighting the significant impact of tradition and modern medical practices on maternal and infant well-being. Amid public health emergencies, anthropological insights into social, cultural, and political dimensions offer valuable guidance for public health strategies, as exemplified by the Ebola and COVID-19 outbreaks. The anthropology of illness and sickness reveals how culture shapes illness perceptions, diagnostic frameworks, and health-seeking behaviours. This variety in cultural interpretations, from attributing illnesses to spiritual disharmony to understanding them as part of the human experience, underscores the importance of cultural sensitivity in healthcare delivery. Anthropology serves as a vital ally in the quest for holistic healthcare and public health strategies. Its diverse contributions enrich and complement conventional medical and public health paradigms, emphasizing the imperativeness of acknowledging cultural diversity, social context, and historical perspectives. Anthropology, as the multifaceted field that it is, demonstrates its unyielding relevance in contemporary health, culture, and societal contexts, advocating for a more inclusive and culturally sensitive approach to healthcare and public health.

Keywords

Anthropology, Cultural Models, Cultural Norms, Educational Practices, Emotional Intelligence, Health Disparities, Illness Perception, Maternal Health, Public Health Emergencies.

1. Introduction

This comprehensive discourse delves into the intricate relationship between social and cultural determinants and human well-being, elucidating the distinct perspectives of psychological anthropology and medical anthropology. While both disciplines share the overarching

objective of understanding how societal and cultural influences impact individual health, they approach this quest from unique vantage points. In the realm of psychological anthropology, a multifaceted investigation of emotions, cognition, and mental health is undertaken, with a central focus on the reciprocal dynamics between cultural and psychological factors. Medical anthropology delves into the ways cultural norms and customs shape health and medical practice, with a keen eye on identifying and addressing health inequalities through culturally responsive healthcare methodologies (McElroy, 1990; Singer, 1989). This treatise unfolds in three core sections. The initial segment provides an introductory overview of psychological anthropology, encompassing its historical foundations and methodological underpinnings. It further explores diverse approaches to the study of human emotions, cognition, and mental health, emphasizing their pertinence to the field of psychological anthropology.

The subsequent section dissects the field of medical anthropology, tracing its evolutionary trajectory and essential theoretical tenets. This section dissects the contributions of medical anthropology in illuminating health disparities, cultural conceptions of illness and recovery, and the influence of healthcare systems on individual well-being. The third part of this discourse elucidates the confluence between psychological and medical anthropology (Farmer & Good, 1991; Singer, 1990), demonstrating how cultural beliefs and practices mold psychological well-being while elucidating how psychological processes influence health outcomes and healthcare practices. The treatise culminates by contemplating the advances made by both psychological and medical anthropology in unraveling the intricate nexus between social context and individual health. Moreover, it contemplates the future trajectories of these disciplines and underscores the potential for synergistic collaborations to advance culturally sensitive healthcare policies and practices. Psychological anthropology and medical anthropology (Gordon, 1991; Konner, 1991) constitute two distinct yet intrinsically interconnected domains within the vast landscape of anthropological research. These fields collectively endeavor to explore the profound influence of social and cultural factors on human well-being. By examining the intricate interplay between cultural norms, practices, and individual mental and physical health, they contribute to a holistic understanding of the human experience. While their overarching objectives may converge, the lenses through which these fields view the complex tapestry of human existence are inherently unique.

This article seeks to elucidate the historical underpinnings, methodological approaches, and central theoretical constructs of psychological anthropology and medical anthropology (B. J. Good, 1992; Landrine & Klonoff, 1992), with a particular focus on their shared endeavors to fathom the multifaceted interrelationship between social context and individual health. Psychological anthropology, as a subfield of anthropology, traces its roots to early 20th century pioneers such as Alfred Kroeber and Robert Lowie. Its inception was marked by a profound interest in understanding the cognitive, emotional, and psychological dimensions of human behavior in diverse cultural contexts. Over the ensuing decades, the field evolved in response to the dynamic theoretical paradigms of anthropology, psychology, and sociology. Notably, Julian Steward's cultural ecology framework emphasized the reciprocal relationship between culture and environment, laying a foundation for understanding how cultural factors influence psychological well-being

(Pelto, 1967; Scotch, 1963). Psychological anthropology burgeoned in the mid-20th century as a distinct discipline, with pioneers like Anthony Wallace pioneering the cultural-ecological approach that explored the interplay between cultural patterns and personality (Colson & Selby, 1974; Fabrega, 1971).

In the pursuit of comprehending the psychological facets of human behaviour within various sociocultural milieus, psychological anthropologists employ an array of methodological strategies. Ethnographic fieldwork, often extended over extended durations, serves as the primary instrument for data collection. Participant observation, open-ended interviews, and the immersion of researchers within the communities they study enable the in-depth examination of emotions, thought processes, and mental health in their cultural context (Foster, 1974; Hasan, 1975). Central to the discourse of psychological anthropology is the exploration of the reciprocal interaction between cultural and psychological factors. The paradigm of cultural relativism, positing that human behaviour must be understood within the cultural framework in which it occurs, underpins the field's endeavours. Key constructs, such as cultural schemas and cultural models, elucidate how cultural norms shape individuals' emotions, cognition, and mental health (Foster, 1976; Pffifferling, 1976).

Moreover, the field delves into the concept of emotional scripts, which are culturally influenced patterns governing the expression and interpretation of emotions (Foster, 1977; Kiefer, 1977). Psychological anthropologists also explore the notion of cultural syndromes, encompassing culturally specific patterns of emotional distress and healing (Foster, 1978; Kleinman, 1977). These constructs collectively offer a framework for comprehending the intricate relationship between culture and the human psyche. The field of medical anthropology, as a distinct subdiscipline, emerged in the latter half of the 20th century. Its foundations are rooted in a rich tapestry of influences from social medicine, public health, and cultural anthropology. Medical anthropologists sought to unravel the sociocultural determinants of health, illness, and healing practices. The works of scholars such as Margaret Mead, who explored cultural influences on child-rearing and mental health, laid a foundation for this burgeoning discipline (Kaufert & Kaufert, 1978; Morsy, 1979). Over time, medical anthropology matured, embracing a critical perspective that questioned the ethnocentrism inherent in Western biomedicine and exposed the diversity of healing practices worldwide. Medical anthropology employs an interdisciplinary approach to unravel the complex dynamics between culture and health.

Researchers engage in ethnographic fieldwork to immerse themselves in the communities they study. This approach allows for a nuanced understanding of cultural norms and customs that influence health and medical practices. Furthermore, medical anthropologists analyze various aspects of health systems, health inequalities, and healing rituals through the lens of sociocultural context. At the core of medical anthropology lies an exploration of how culture molds health and illness. Key theoretical constructs include the cultural construction of illness, where conditions are understood and experienced differently in various cultural contexts (Frankenberg, 1980; Kleinman, 1980). Moreover, the field investigates cultural syndromes, which encompass culturally specific patterns of illness and treatment (N. J. Chrisman & Marezki, 1982; Marezki,

1980). Medical anthropologists also delve into the concept of medical pluralism, which acknowledges the coexistence of diverse medical systems, both traditional and biomedicine, within societies (Kleinman, 1982; Ness, 1982). These constructs form the scaffold for the analysis of how cultural norms and customs shape health and medical practices. The realms of psychological and medical anthropology, although distinct, interweave and complement each other in their quest to unravel the complex nexus between social context and individual well-being.

These disciplines converge in several domains, each shedding light on unique facets of the interplay between culture and human health. Psychological anthropology investigates how cultural norms, beliefs, and practices influence emotions, thought processes, and mental health. Cultural schemas, for instance, are fundamental in shaping individual perceptions of the self and others (Eisenbruch, 1983; Kane, 1984). These schemas are, in essence, cognitive templates that encompass cultural information and guide emotional responses. The cultural script of emotions influences not only how emotions are experienced but also how they are expressed and interpreted within a specific cultural context (Dunn & Janes, 1986; B. Good & Del Vecchio Good, 1986). These cultural constructs provide a profound insight into how culture molds the landscape of psychological well-being. Medical anthropology sheds light on the influence of psychological processes on health outcomes. Stress, for instance, is a psychological construct that has profound implications for health. The concept of “cultural syndromes” within medical anthropology encompasses culturally specific patterns of emotional distress, which have a direct bearing on health (Janes, Stall, & Gifford, 1986; Johnson, 1987).

Chronic stressors related to cultural experiences and expectations can manifest as specific cultural syndromes that impact health outcomes. Understanding these intricate interplays is crucial in developing healthcare strategies that account for the cultural dimensions of psychological well-being. The intersection between psychological and medical anthropology becomes particularly pronounced in the realm of healthcare practices. Cultural beliefs and practices significantly influence health-seeking behaviors and adherence to medical regimens. The concept of “medical pluralism,” a central construct in medical anthropology, underscores how individuals often seek healthcare from multiple sources, including traditional healers and biomedical practitioners (Lock & Schepher-Hughes, 1987; Schepher-Hughes & Lock, 1987). This phenomenon is driven by cultural norms and beliefs, and it highlights the complex decision-making processes individuals engage in when managing their health. By understanding these cultural dimensions, healthcare practitioners can develop more culturally responsive and effective treatment strategies. Both psychological and medical anthropology have made significant strides in advancing our comprehension of the intricate relationship between social context and individual health.

However, the journey is far from complete, and future directions for these disciplines offer promising avenues for further exploration and collaboration. The continued collaboration between psychological and medical anthropology holds great potential for enhancing the development of culturally sensitive healthcare policies and practices. As societies become increasingly diverse, healthcare systems must adapt to accommodate a myriad of cultural beliefs and practices. Medical an-

thropology’s insights into medical pluralism and cultural syndromes, coupled with psychological anthropology’s understanding of cultural schemas and scripts, can guide the development of healthcare strategies that resonate with diverse populations (Schepher-Hughes, 1992; Schwartz, White, & Lutz, 1992). By recognizing the cultural dimensions of health and well-being, healthcare providers can offer more personalized and effective care. Interdisciplinary research that bridges the domains of psychological and medical anthropology can lead to a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between social context and individual health. For example, studying the impact of cultural schemas on individuals’ perception of illness and their health-seeking behaviours can draw on insights from both fields. Such research endeavours can provide a comprehensive perspective on the multifaceted nature of human well-being. Both psychological and medical anthropology have a crucial role to play in addressing health inequalities (Fabrega Jr & Miller, 1995; Stein, 1992).

By illuminating how cultural norms and practices shape health disparities and health outcomes, these fields can contribute to the development of targeted interventions to reduce health disparities. Psychological anthropology’s focus on cultural scripts of emotions and mental health can shed light on the psychosocial factors contributing to health inequalities, while medical anthropology’s exploration of cultural constructions of illness can inform strategies to address disparities in healthcare access and outcomes. Psychological and medical anthropology, while distinct in their foci and methods, are interconnected disciplines that offer valuable insights into the complex interplay between social and cultural factors and human well-being. Psychological anthropology delves into the cognitive, emotional, and psychological dimensions of human behaviour, exploring the reciprocal relationship between culture and individual psychology. Medical anthropology, on the other hand, examines how cultural norms and customs shape health and medical practices, shedding light on health inequalities and the impact of healthcare systems (Luborsky, 1995; Ory, 1995).

The confluence between these disciplines is evident in their shared exploration of how cultural ideas shape psychological well-being, how psychological processes influence health outcomes, and the influence of cultural practices on healthcare. The advancements made in both fields offer a promising outlook for the development of culturally sensitive healthcare policies and practices, as well as the potential for cross-disciplinary research that deepens our understanding of the intricate relationship between social context and individual health. These fields have a crucial role to play in addressing health inequalities and promoting health and well-being in an increasingly diverse and complex world. As we move forward, the collaboration between psychological and medical anthropology holds the promise of enriching our understanding of the human experience and contributing to the development of more equitable and effective healthcare systems.

2. Culture’s Impact on Human Psychology

This section delves into the intricate realm of psychological anthropology, an interdisciplinary field that focuses on the interplay between cultural norms and individual human psychology. It seeks to elucidate how cultural values and societal contexts influence human cognition, emotions, and behaviour.

Pioneered by eminent scholars such as Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead in the early 20th century, psychological anthropology employs ethnographic fieldwork to explore the profound impact of cultural settings on the human psyche. This treatise unveils the foundational principles, methodological approaches, and key theoretical constructs that define the realm of psychological anthropology. It delves into the multifaceted applications of this discipline, from the analysis of emotions to the examination of parenting styles, highlighting the transformative impact of culture on the human experience. Furthermore, it outlines the evolving landscape of psychological anthropology, with a focus on contemporary research trends and future prospects, emphasizing its perpetual role as a crucible of innovation and understanding in the domain of human psychology.

The realm of psychological anthropology represents a captivating crossroads of anthropology, psychology, and neurology, where the profound influence of culture on human psychology comes under the spotlight (Khare, 1996; Stein, 1995). This multifaceted discipline is committed to unraveling the intricate nexus between cultural norms and individual cognitive processes, emotions, and behaviors. Beyond the purview of anthropologists, it embraces a multidisciplinary approach, welcoming scholars from psychology and neuroscience who engage in cross-cultural investigations. Pioneers like Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead laid the groundwork for this interdisciplinary field in the early 20th century, ushering in an era of profound exploration into the impact of cultural settings on the human psyche. This treatise embarks on a comprehensive journey through the world of psychological anthropology, elucidating its historical underpinnings, methodological intricacies, and central theoretical constructs. Moreover, it unveils the myriad dimensions of human psychology to which psychological anthropology lends its insights, from the analysis of emotions to the exploration of parenting styles. As we delve into the nuances of this dynamic field, we underscore its evolving nature and its continued status as a breeding ground for innovation and enlightenment in the realm of human psychology.

The origins of psychological anthropology can be traced to the early 20th century when eminent scholars such as Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead embarked on groundbreaking explorations of the interplay between culture and the human psyche. These luminaries ushered in an era of cross-cultural research that challenged prevailing notions of universality in human psychology. By conducting extensive fieldwork, they sought to understand how cultural norms and settings shaped the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of individuals from diverse backgrounds. At the heart of psychological anthropology lies the meticulous art of ethnographic fieldwork (Momin, 1996; Trostle & Sommerfeld, 1996). Researchers immerse themselves within the communities they study, often for extended periods, engaging in participant observation and open-ended interviews to gain an in-depth understanding of the cultural context and its impact on human psychology. This methodological approach allows for the exploration of diverse aspects of the human psyche within the intricate tapestry of cultural norms and practices.

Psychological anthropology relies on a rich framework of central theoretical constructs that illuminate the interplay between culture and human psychology. Cultural schemas and

models, for instance, elucidate how cultural norms influence perceptions of self and others, providing a cognitive framework for emotional responses. The study of emotional scripts, another key construct, dissects how cultural norms dictate the expression and interpretation of emotions within specific cultural contexts. The examination of cultural syndromes, encompassing culturally specific patterns of emotional distress and healing, further underscores the dynamic relationship between culture and the human psyche. Psychological anthropology finds its application in the intricate realm of emotion analysis (Baer, 1997; McCLEMENT* & WOODGATE*, 1997).

Emotions, universal as they are, manifest differently across cultures, both in their expression and interpretation. This field seeks to unravel the influence of cultural norms and expectations on emotional experiences, acknowledging that what is considered an emotional response varies from one culture to the next. An illustrative example can be found in the Ifaluk of Micronesia, who employ different emotional categories like “hot” or “cold” due to the absence of specific terms for emotions such as wrath or melancholy. This exemplifies the role of cultural variables alongside biological ones in shaping human emotional experiences. Cross-cultural investigations have illuminated the profound impact of cultural differences on parenting styles and, consequently, child development. The Gusii people of Kenya, for instance, place a strong emphasis on suppressing intense emotions, such as anger, in children. In contrast, the Kung people of southern Africa encourage children to express their feelings openly. These cultural values and perspectives on child growth and development significantly shape variations in parenting styles, underscoring the transformative role of culture in the early stages of human development. As the landscape of psychological anthropology continues to evolve, contemporary research trends reveal a dynamic and continually innovating field.

Psychological anthropologists are increasingly focused on addressing the global relevance of their research, examining how cultural norms impact not only individual psychology but also broader societal phenomena. Furthermore, the subfield has extended its scope to contribute to discussions on global challenges, such as mental health disparities and intercultural interactions. One notable contemporary trend in psychological anthropology is its exploration of the social determinants of health. This concept revolves around the study of how social and economic factors influence health outcomes. Medical anthropologists, in particular, have begun to investigate this dynamic relationship in greater depth, emphasizing the impact of culture on health disparities and outcomes (Pelto & Pelto, 1997; Van Dongen, 1997). This expanded focus recognizes the pivotal role of cultural norms in shaping not only psychological well-being but also the broader domain of physical and mental health. The ever-evolving nature of psychological anthropology is underscored by its increasing openness to interdisciplinary collaborations.

The subfield welcomes not only anthropologists but also psychologists and neuroscientists who engage in cross-cultural research. This interdisciplinary approach offers a holistic perspective on the interplay between culture and human psychology, contributing to a deeper understanding of the complexities that shape the human experience. Psychological anthropology remains poised to address global challenges in the realms of mental health, intercultural communication, and the impact of

globalization on individual psychology. Its continued exploration of how cultural norms and values influence human cognition, emotions, and behavior provides valuable insights into the intricacies of the human experience in an increasingly interconnected world. Psychological anthropology serves as a crucible of knowledge and innovation, where the complex interplay between cultural norms and individual human psychology is meticulously examined. Pioneered by luminaries such as Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead, this interdisciplinary field continues to evolve, embracing contemporary research trends and interdisciplinary collaborations. Its applications are as diverse as the human experience itself, ranging from the analysis of emotions to the exploration of parenting styles. As we delve into the nuances of psychological anthropology, we acknowledge its pivotal role in unravelling the transformative impact of culture on the human psyche. Moreover, it remains poised to address global challenges and contribute to our understanding of the complexities that define the human experience in an ever-changing world.

This comprehensive discourse embarks on a journey through the realm of psychological anthropology, investigating the intricate connection between cultural backgrounds and psychological well-being. The complex interplay of mental health, cultural norms, and societal contexts has been the subject of scrutiny by psychological anthropologists (Jenkins, 1998; Yoder, 1997). Diverse dimensions of human psychological experiences, including emotions, child-rearing practices, and mental health, are explored within this interdisciplinary field. Furthermore, the expanding scope of psychological anthropology is highlighted, with a focus on the inclusion of experts from various disciplines, including psychology and neuroscience. This inclusive approach opens doors for cross-disciplinary research, such as the burgeoning field of cultural neuroscience. The evolution of psychological anthropology from the late 19th century to the early 20th century is also elucidated, with the emergence of new theoretical paradigms, such as cultural relativism, marking a pivotal shift from biological determinism.

Pioneering figures like Franz Boas and Edward Tylor played instrumental roles in challenging long-held beliefs about race, culture, and human nature, leading to a more culturally focused perspective within anthropology. Psychological anthropology delves into the intricate connection between cultural backgrounds and the well-being of individuals (Alter, 1999; Van Dongen & Fainzang, 1998). This interdisciplinary field investigates the multifaceted ways in which mental health issues are experienced and addressed, depending on cultural norms and societal contexts. Cultural factors can profoundly influence how mental health challenges manifest and are perceived. For instance, the experience of hearing voices or having visions might be considered a sign of mental illness in some cultures while being perceived as a typical aspect of religious or spiritual experiences in others. The way mental health issues are framed, understood, and addressed is deeply intertwined with cultural norms and practices. Psychological anthropology is not confined to anthropologists alone. Anyone with a solid grasp of psychological concepts and practices can contribute to this subfield.

This inclusivity means that psychologists, neuroscientists, and researchers from other disciplines can engage in psychological anthropology (W. W. Dressler, 2001; Levine, 1999). A burgeoning subfield, known as cultural neuroscience, exempli-

fies this interdisciplinary collaboration. Cultural neuroscientists employ neuroimaging techniques to explore how culture impacts cognitive processes and behaviour, shedding light on the intricate connection between mind and society. Psychological anthropology encompasses diverse domains of human psychology, from emotions and child-rearing practices to mental health. This expansive definition creates opportunities for cross-disciplinary research and collaboration with fields like psychology and neuroscience, further enriching our understanding of how cultural norms and societal contexts shape human psychology. The transition between 1870 and 1901 represents a critical juncture in the evolution of anthropology, with profound shifts in theoretical paradigms and research methodologies.

This era witnessed a significant move away from the earlier emphasis on biological and moral aspects as determinants of human behaviour. Instead, the focus shifted towards recognizing the psychological unity of humankind as a central tenet, marking a pivotal transformation. The emergence of new theories and concepts, including evolution and cultural relativism, challenged established beliefs regarding race, culture, and human nature, setting the stage for this transformative shift. The release of Charles Darwin's seminal work, "On the Origin of Species," in 1859 was a seminal moment in the field of anthropology. This work ushered in a paradigm shift in understanding human nature and behaviour. The prevailing view that humans were somehow exempt from the universal rules of natural selection and adaptability was dismantled. Instead, it was proposed that humans, like all other species, were subject to the principles of natural selection and adaptation. This concept laid the foundation for examining how one's environment plays a crucial role in shaping behaviour and human nature.

As a result, the study of cultural differences, rather than biological determinants, became increasingly paramount by the end of the 19th century. The emergence of cultural relativism as a theoretical framework played a pivotal role in the transformation of anthropology. Cultural relativist theories posited that cultural practices could only be comprehended within their own context and should be evaluated according to internal standards, not external ones. Prominent figures, such as Franz Boas, championed this shift in perspective. Boas contended that cultural forces, rather than biological ones, were the primary influencers of human behaviour. He cast doubt on the previously dominant doctrine of biological determinism and stressed the malleability of cultural influences. Boas conducted extensive fieldwork among the Arctic Inuit, proposing that their unique environment, rather than their genetics, moulded their behaviour and customs. Additionally, he advocated for anthropologists to maintain a neutral and unbiased stance when studying the cultures of others.

Edward Tylor, another influential figure of this era, introduced the concept of culture to anthropology. Tylor's notion of culture encompassed a wide array of factors that influenced human actions. He contended that a comprehensive understanding of the customs of other cultures was essential for appreciating the distinctiveness of one's own culture. Thus, Tylor played a significant role in broadening the intellectual landscape of anthropology and promoting cultural understanding. Psychological anthropology represents an interdisciplinary realm where the profound connection between cultural backgrounds and psychological well-being is meticulously explored. The dynamic interplay between mental health, cultural norms,

and societal contexts is a central focus within this field. Moreover, the inclusive nature of psychological anthropology allows for collaboration with experts from various disciplines, opening the door to cross-disciplinary research and enriching our understanding of the cultural dimensions of human psychology. The evolution of psychological anthropology from the late 19th century to the early 20th century marked a significant shift in theoretical paradigms and research methodologies. The emergence of cultural relativism, challenged long-held beliefs about race, culture, and human nature, emphasizing the role of culture in shaping human behaviour. Pioneering figures like Franz Boas and Edward Tylor played instrumental roles in promoting cultural understanding and fostering a more culturally focused perspective within anthropology. As we reflect on this journey through the evolution of psychological anthropology, we recognize the transformative power of shifting paradigms and the enduring importance of cultural context in understanding human behaviour. This field remains a dynamic and inclusive space for exploring the complexities of human psychology and continues to offer opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration and cross-disciplinary research, further enriching our understanding of the interplay between culture and human well-being.

3. Transformative Phases: From Psychic Unity to Psychoanalytic Influence (1870-1927)

This section delves into the transformative phases in the field of anthropology between 1870 and 1927, marked by the emergence of groundbreaking theories and influential figures. The concept of psychic unity, rooted in the belief that all humans share a common set of mental and emotional characteristics, challenged long-held notions of racial and cultural distinctions. The era witnessed a shift in focus from biological and moral determinants of human behaviour to cultural and environmental influences, with pioneers like Franz Boas and Edward Tylor leading the charge. Between 1901 and 1927, a new wave of theoretical perspectives and techniques emerged, prominently shaped by Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theories. Freud's concept of the Oedipus complex had a profound impact on anthropological thought, highlighting the role of unconscious processes in shaping human actions. Figures like Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead took center stage, questioning traditional understandings of human nature and emphasizing the influence of culture on individual and societal behaviour. Despite debates and critiques surrounding the application of psychoanalytic theory in anthropology, this period set the stage for new theoretical viewpoints and methodologies, ultimately revolutionizing the field. The journey through the evolution of anthropology between 1870 and 1927 unfolds as a captivating narrative of transformative ideas, influential figures, and paradigm shifts.

During this period, the field underwent a series of profound changes that challenged established beliefs about human nature, cultural diversity, and the drivers of human behaviour. This exposition unravels the intellectual voyage that marked this era, from the concept of psychic unity to the profound influence of Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theories. Pioneering anthropologists like Franz Boas and Edward Tylor paved the way for a more culturally oriented perspective in anthropology, while figures such as Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead redefined the boundaries of anthropological inquiry

by integrating psychoanalytic insights. Although debates ensued about the application of psychoanalytic theory in anthropology, the period between 1901 and 1927 set the stage for new theoretical viewpoints and methodologies that would leave an indelible mark on the discipline. The concept of psychic unity, which emerged around the same period, posited that regardless of their cultural background or upbringing, all humans share a common set of mental and emotional characteristics. This notion challenged established beliefs about racial and cultural distinctions, highlighting the commonalities that unite humanity. At its core, the theory of psychic unity was founded on the assumption that all humans share a common evolutionary history and biological inheritance (Dein, 2003; Kleinman, 2001).

It contested the prevailing notions of diversity and division among human populations, emphasizing the power of shared mental and emotional attributes. The theory of psychic unity represented a pivotal departure from earlier conceptions of anthropology, marking a shift towards a more universal perspective on human nature. Between 1870 and 1901, anthropology witnessed a period of profound transformation. New ideas and concepts, such as evolution and cultural relativism, catalyzed a shift away from biological and moral determinants of human behaviour. Instead, the field increasingly turned its focus to the role of culture and environmental factors in shaping human conduct. This shift challenged long-held beliefs about race, culture, and human nature, setting the stage for an era of exploration and redefinition. Visionaries like Franz Boas and Edward Tylor played instrumental roles in advocating for this transition. The emergence of cultural relativism as a guiding principle in anthropology had a profound impact during this era. Cultural relativist theories contended that cultural practices and beliefs could only be understood within their specific contexts and should be evaluated without external standards.

Franz Boas, often regarded as the father of American anthropology, championed this shift in perspective. He emphasized that cultural forces, rather than biological ones, were the primary drivers of human behaviour. Boas conducted extensive fieldwork among the Arctic Inuit, proposing that their environment, rather than genetics, moulded their customs and conduct. He advocated for a neutral and unbiased approach in anthropological research, emphasizing the need to respect and understand the cultures studied. Edward Tylor, another influential figure, introduced the concept of culture to anthropology, expanding the intellectual horizons of the field. Tylor's idea that culture encompassed various factors influencing human actions challenged prevailing notions and underscored the need to appreciate the uniqueness of each culture. The period between 1901 and 1927 marked a critical phase in the development of anthropology. During this time, Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theories, especially the concept of the Oedipus complex, exerted a profound influence on anthropological thought. According to Freud's psychoanalytic theory, human actions are shaped by unconscious thoughts and memories from one's formative years. The Oedipus complex, a central component of Freud's theory, posits that young boys universally experience sexual yearning for their mothers and hostility towards their fathers.

This concept challenged traditional understandings of human nature by emphasizing the role of subconscious thought processes in molding actions. The influence of psychoanalytic thinking in the early 20th century deeply resonated with anthro-

pologists who recognized the profound influence of cultural practices and beliefs on individual and social behavior. Bronislaw Malinowski's research with the Trobriand Islanders in the Western Pacific revealed the intricate interplay between individual and group behavior, highlighting the importance of understanding cultural traditions in their specific context. Margaret Mead's research with the Samoans in the South Pacific challenged conventional notions about gender and sexuality, underlining the power of culture in shaping personal and social behaviour. While the influence of psychoanalytic theory on anthropology during this period was undeniable, it was not without its share of debates and critiques. Some critics argued that Freud's theories were overly simplistic and failed to account for the rich diversity of human behaviour

Others maintained that psychoanalytic theory did not effectively address the manner in which social and environmental factors influenced collective behaviour. Nonetheless, this period set the stage for new theoretical viewpoints and methodologies that would continue to revolutionize anthropology. The period spanning 1870 to 1927 represented a transformative era in the field of anthropology. The concept of psychic unity challenged established beliefs about racial and cultural distinctions, emphasizing the common mental and emotional characteristics shared by all humans. This marked a significant departure from earlier conceptions of anthropology and laid the foundation for a more universal perspective on human nature. The period between 1901 and 1927 witnessed the profound influence of Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theories on anthropological thought. Freud's emphasis on unconscious mental processes and the

Oedipus complex pushed back against traditional understandings of human behavior, highlighting the power of subconscious thought in shaping actions. Anthropologists like Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead integrated psychoanalytic insights into their research, questioning long-held assumptions about gender roles, sexuality, and the role of culture in individual and social behaviour. Debates and critiques surrounding the application of psychoanalytic theory in anthropology underscored the complexity of these ideas. However, this period of influence set the stage for new theoretical viewpoints and methodologies that would continue to revolutionize the field in the decades to come. The evolving landscape of anthropology was marked by a shift from deterministic biological and moral causes to the recognition of the powerful role of culture and environment in shaping human behaviour, leaving an indelible mark on the discipline and its future evolution.

4. National Character: The Culture-and-Personality School's Exploration

The Culture-and-Personality School, originating in American anthropology in the late 1920s, represented a pivotal movement that sought to explore the intricate connection between upbringing and character. This intellectual current underscored the significance of understanding cultural variations in comprehending human conduct. Advocating that cultural norms and values profoundly influenced individual personality and behaviour, this school of thought has left an enduring impact on the field of anthropology. Notably, the concept of "national character" emerged during the heyday of the Culture-and-Personality School, aiming to unravel the distinct personality traits and cultural values of different nations. Seminal works

by Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, including "Coming of Age in Samoa" and "Patterns of Culture," reshaped the way anthropologists approached the relationship between culture and individual psychology. As a result, questions related to cultural diversity and the influence of cultural values on individual behavior assumed central positions in anthropological discourse. The Culture-and-Personality School, a significant movement within American anthropology that emerged in the late 1920s, represented a transformative intellectual current deeply rooted in the exploration of the intricate connection between upbringing and character.

This paradigm illuminated the critical importance of understanding cultural variations as a fundamental aspect of comprehending human behavior. Central to the ethos of this school of thought was the notion that cultural norms and values exerted profound and discernible influences on individual personality and conduct. The legacy of this movement has left an indelible mark on the field of anthropology, with the concept of "national character" emerging as a notable product of this intellectual climate. This concept sought to unveil the distinctive personality traits and cultural values that characterized different nations and peoples, contributing to a richer understanding of the interplay between culture and individual psychology. The period encompassing 1927 to 1970 witnessed a proliferation of literature and research dedicated to the concept of "national character." This conceptual framework aimed to unravel the unique personality qualities and cultural values that distinguished one nation from another.

The Culture-and-Personality School embraced the challenge of examining and discerning the multifaceted facets of national character. At the forefront of this movement were influential figures such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, whose seminal works forever transformed the landscape of anthropological discourse. Margaret Mead's "Coming of Age in Samoa" stands as a landmark work of the Culture-and-Personality School. In this study, American anthropologist Mead conducted research in Samoa, presenting a culture that contrasted sharply with Western perceptions of adolescence. Mead's findings unveiled a society in which sexual freedom, nonviolence, and the absence of adolescent conflict were the norm. Her research vividly demonstrated that cultural variables played a substantial role in shaping adolescent behaviour, challenging Western assumptions that adolescence universally constituted a time of turmoil and stress. Mead's pioneering work revealed the significant influence of cultural norms on the formation of character and behaviour

Ruth Benedict, another luminary within the Culture-and-Personality School, made substantial contributions to the understanding of cultural diversity and its impact on individual behaviour. Her seminal work, "Patterns of Culture," proposed the concept of "configurations" of personality traits, contending that these configurations varied between countries due to the reflection of diverse cultural norms. Benedict's work heralded a shift in anthropological focus towards questions of cultural variety and the ways in which cultural values profoundly impacted individual behaviour. This concept brought forth a profound appreciation for the interplay between culture and personality, revolutionizing anthropological discourse. Anthropologist Franz Boas, a significant figure within the Culture-and-Personality School, contributed to the understanding of national character by examining the German national character. In his book "The German People," published in 1944, Boas

elucidated that the German national character was defined by characteristics such as authoritarianism, an “obsessive preoccupation with detail,” and a profound fondness for music and the arts. This comprehensive analysis underscored the significance of cultural values and societal norms in shaping the personality traits of a nation. Boas’ work exemplified the interdisciplinary nature of the Culture-and-Personality School, bridging the realms of anthropology, sociology, and psychology.

Similar to Boas, anthropologist Edwin Reischauer offered insights into the concept of national character, particularly with respect to the Japanese. In his work “The Japanese and the West,” Reischauer portrayed the Japanese national character as defined by a strong sense of collective loyalty, a propensity for harmony and consensus, and a profound veneration for tradition. This analysis highlighted the multifaceted ways in which cultural values and societal norms shape the character of a nation. The study of national character, as exemplified by Reischauer’s work, revealed the intricate interplay between cultural values and individual psychology, adding depth to anthropological investigations. The Culture-and-Personality School, which originated in American anthropology in the late 1920s, represents a pivotal movement that delved into the intricate connection between upbringing and character. This intellectual current illuminated the fundamental importance of understanding cultural variations in comprehending human behaviour, asserting that cultural norms and values exerted profound influences on individual personality and conduct.

During its heyday, the concept of “national character” emerged as a prominent focus, seeking to unveil the distinctive personality traits and cultural values that characterized different nations. Seminal works by influential figures such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, including “Coming of Age in Samoa” and “Patterns of Culture,” reshaped the way anthropologists approached the relationship between culture and individual psychology. As a result, questions related to cultural diversity and the influence of cultural values on individual behaviour assumed central positions in anthropological discourse. The contributions of anthropologists like Franz Boas and Edwin Reischauer, who examined the German and Japanese national characters, underscored the significance of cultural values in shaping the character of a nation. The Culture-and-Personality School’s lasting legacy resides in its profound impact on the understanding of human behaviour, emphasizing the integral role of culture in shaping personality and character.

The Culture-and-Personality School, a prominent movement in American anthropology from the late 1920s to the 1970s, focused on exploring the interplay between cultural norms and individual behaviour. However, this school faced criticism for potentially perpetuating stereotypes and neglecting cultural diversity, primarily due to its emphasis on national character and cultural distinctions. This section delves into the critiques and contributions of the Culture-and-Personality School in anthropology, examining how it highlighted the role of cultural context in shaping individual conduct and challenged Western assumptions about human nature. Although the school has faced objections, it significantly influenced the field by shifting the focus from the study of “primitive” cultures to a more nuanced exploration of cultural diversity and its impact on personality and behaviour. The Culture-and-Personality School, a dominant movement within American anthropology that emerged in the late 1920s and persisted until

the 1970s, emphasized the profound influence of cultural norms and values on individual behavior. However, this school of thought has not been without its share of criticism.

Critics have argued that its emphasis on national character and cultural distinctions may have perpetuated stereotypes and overlooked the complexities of cultural diversity. This section explores the critiques and contributions of the Culture-and-Personality School in anthropology, highlighting its pivotal role in underlining the significance of cultural context in shaping individual behaviour and challenging Western beliefs about human nature. The shift from studying “primitive” societies to a more nuanced exploration of cultural diversity owes much to the influence of the Culture-and-Personality School. One of the key criticisms directed at the Culture-and-Personality School is the concern that its focus on national character and cultural distinctions may perpetuate stereotypes. This critique suggests that by emphasizing distinct character traits associated with various nations or cultures, the school might inadvertently oversimplify and generalize the complexities of human behaviour. Anthropologist Clifford Geertz, for instance, disagreed with the premise that national character is unchanging and argued that culture is more fluid and subject to debate than the school suggested. Critics have also contended that the Culture-and-Personality School’s preoccupation with national character led to the neglect of cultural diversity.

By concentrating on the distinctive traits of different nations, the school may have overlooked the intricate variations and diversity within cultures. This critique underscores the potential oversimplification of complex cultural dynamics and individual differences in the school’s approach. Despite its critiques, the Culture-and-Personality School significantly contributed to the field of anthropology by highlighting the critical role of cultural context in shaping individual behaviour. The school’s focus on the influence of cultural norms and values on personality traits underscored the importance of understanding cultural diversity and its impact on human conduct. This emphasis broadened the field’s horizons, encouraging a more nuanced exploration of the interplay between culture and personality (Ember & Ember, 2003; Garro, 2003; Lock & Nichter, 2003).

The Culture-and-Personality School challenged Western beliefs about human nature, particularly through the work of anthropologists like Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict. Margaret Mead’s “Coming of Age in Samoa” questioned conventional Western perceptions of adolescence, revealing how cultural variables played a significant role in shaping adolescent behaviour. Similarly, Ruth Benedict’s “Patterns of Culture” contended that the configurations of personality traits vary across cultural contexts, challenging the assumption of a universal human nature. The Culture-and-Personality School’s influence in the field is evident in the shift from the study of “primitive” cultures towards a more nuanced understanding of cultural diversity. While some critics have disputed the concept of national character, it remains an integral part of the field’s heritage. Anthropologists have increasingly recognized the need to move beyond simplistic characterizations and delve into the intricate layers of cultural influences on individual behaviour.

The school’s legacy resides in its role in driving anthropology toward a more holistic and nuanced comprehension of culture and personality. The Culture-and-Personality School, a

dominant movement in American anthropology from the late 1920s to the 1970s, has faced criticism for potentially perpetuating stereotypes and overlooking cultural diversity due to its emphasis on national character and cultural distinctions. Critics have raised concerns about oversimplification and the neglect of complexities within cultures. However, this school has made substantial contributions to anthropology by highlighting the role of cultural context in shaping individual behaviour and by challenging Western assumptions about human nature. The shift from studying “primitive” cultures to a more nuanced exploration of cultural diversity can be attributed to the Culture-and-Personality School’s influence. Despite its critiques, the school’s legacy endures, reminding anthropologists of the importance of embracing cultural complexity in their studies of human behavior.

5. Anthropological Insights into the Complex Journey to Adulthood

This section delves into the rich contributions of anthropology in understanding the cultural and social influences on adolescent development. Adolescence is a transformative phase marked by profound physical, mental, and emotional changes as individuals transition from childhood to adulthood. Anthropologists have examined a wide array of cultural and social factors that shape adolescent experiences, such as family dynamics, peer interactions, education, gender roles, economic considerations, and health (Hemmings, 2005; Hruschka, Lende, & Worthman, 2005; Singer & Baer, 2004). This section highlights how the anthropological concept of a “culture of adolescence” aids in comprehending the diversity of teenage experiences worldwide. Furthermore, it discusses the cultural norms and practices affecting adolescents’ perceptions and behaviors, such as those related to gender roles, education, and health. Anthropological research has revealed the complex interplay between culture and adolescent development, offering valuable insights into this crucial period. Adolescence represents a crucial phase in human development, characterized by significant physical, mental, and emotional transformations as individuals navigate the transition from childhood to adulthood. Anthropology, as the scientific study of human cultures and societies, has played a pivotal role in shedding light on the multifaceted factors influencing adolescent development (Levin & Browner, 2005; Pool & Geissler, 2005; van der Geest & Reis, 2005).

This section explores the profound contributions of anthropology to the understanding of how cultural and social elements shape the experiences and behaviors of adolescents. The anthropological concept of a “culture of adolescence” serves as a valuable framework for comprehending the various ways in which culture influences the maturation of young people. This cultural lens recognizes that adolescent identity encompasses socially anticipated patterns of cognition, emotion, and action. Anthropological investigations have revealed that these patterns vary significantly across different cultures due to historical and cultural differences. Adolescents in various societies may grapple with increased social and economic responsibilities while simultaneously experiencing opportunities for personal growth and exploration. Anthropologists have brought to light how cultural norms significantly impact adolescent development. Cultural expectations regarding gender roles, sexuality, and the value of education vary widely, and these expectations have a profound influence on adolescents’ lives. In many cultures, adolescent girls are expected to fulfill

traditional gender roles long before reaching adulthood. Conversely, other societies prioritize education, encouraging youth to pursue higher education or vocational training after high school. Anthropological research has been instrumental in revealing the extent to which culture shapes adolescents’ beliefs and aspirations. The social environments of adolescents, particularly their interactions with peers and familial relationships, have been subjects of anthropological inquiry.

Peer relationships, especially close friendships, have been found to exert a significant impact on adolescent development. Anthropologists have shown that peer pressure can lead to behaviours such as drug use or delinquency in some societies, while in others, positive peer connections and guidance may be more prevalent. The dynamics within families have also been the focus of extensive anthropological research. Family structures, from nuclear to extended, have been examined to understand their effects on adolescents. Researchers have explored the roles of parents in moulding adolescents’ personalities and perspectives. Some cultures emphasize authoritarian parenting, while others adopt more permissive approaches. Anthropology has enriched our understanding of how family dynamics and parenting styles shape adolescents’ development. Anthropologists have made significant contributions to the analysis of adolescent health (Lyons & Chamberlain, 2006; Parker & Harper, 2006; Weisner & Lowe, 2005).

They have examined cultural and socioeconomic factors like access to healthcare, nutrition, and sanitation. Additionally, anthropologists have investigated the role of cultural beliefs and practices, particularly those related to mental health and traditional healing, in shaping health outcomes. Adolescents in cultures where seeking help for mental health issues is stigmatized may be less likely to access appropriate care. Anthropology has played an indispensable role in advancing our comprehension of adolescence as a dynamic phase influenced by culture and social factors. This formative period of life, marked by profound physical, mental, and emotional changes, is not a universal experience but varies significantly across different cultural contexts. Anthropological research has illuminated the extent to which cultural norms and practices affect the attitudes, behaviors, and overall development of adolescents. By examining the role of culture in shaping gender roles, education, health, and the dynamics of peer and family relationships during adolescence, anthropology has provided valuable insights. Anthropologists have highlighted the need for a nuanced and culturally sensitive understanding of adolescents and emphasized the importance of considering the cultural and social aspects in health and development (Bhasin, 2007; W. Dressler, 2007; Freeman, 2007). In conclusion, anthropology has deepened our knowledge of the complex interplay between culture, psychology, and social experiences during adolescence, making substantial contributions to the field of adolescent studies.

6. Health Inequalities, Global Practices, and the Anthropology of Emotions

Medical anthropology has evolved significantly over the years, and its researchers are now focusing on key areas that hold great promise for the field. This section explores several prominent themes within medical anthropology, including the investigation of health inequalities, cultural beliefs and practices in global health, and the study of emerging infectious diseases.

Additionally, the section delves into the anthropology of alcohol and drug use, shedding light on how cultural and social factors influence substance abuse. Furthermore, the role of medical anthropology in understanding public health and addressing disparities is discussed. The section concludes with an exploration of the anthropology of emotions, examining the cultural and social dimensions of human emotional experiences. By elucidating these topics, we aim to provide insight into the progress and potential future directions of medical anthropology. Medical anthropology, as a multidisciplinary field, has made significant strides in understanding the intricate interplay of culture, society, and health (Chapin, 2008; B. J. Good & Good, 2008; Hardin & Zeidler, 2008).

Researchers in this domain have been at the forefront of examining health inequalities, global health practices, emerging infectious diseases, substance abuse, public health, and the anthropology of emotions. These themes offer valuable insights into the complex factors influencing health and well-being. In this section, we will explore these topics within the context of medical anthropology and demonstrate their relevance to the broader field of anthropology. Investigating health inequalities is a central focus in contemporary medical anthropology. These inequalities manifest in various forms, including disparities in health status, access to healthcare, and individual health-related behaviors. Medical anthropologists are uniquely positioned to delve into the complex causes of health inequalities across cultural, social, and economic dimensions (Hinton, Howes, & Kirmayer, 2008; Mattingly, Lutkehaus, & Throop, 2008). For example, they may explore the influence of socioeconomic factors, such as income inequality and racial prejudice, on health outcomes. By studying cultural beliefs and practices related to healthcare delivery and disease prevention, medical anthropologists can contribute significantly to the field of global health.

This includes investigating how cultural conceptions of illness impact the acceptance and effectiveness of preventive measures like vaccinations. Medical anthropology researchers are actively exploring the complexities of emerging infectious diseases—novel illnesses that have recently appeared or are rapidly spreading. They aim to understand the cultural, social, economic, and political factors contributing to the origin and dissemination of these diseases. Anthropological insights can be invaluable in deciphering how cultural beliefs and practices influence the spread of diseases (Nichter, 2008; Winkelmann, 2008). By examining these dimensions, researchers can contribute to strategies for containment and prevention. Alcohol and drug consumption are central topics within medical anthropology. Anthropologists view substance abuse as a cultural phenomenon, emphasizing that it transcends individual choice to become deeply entrenched in cultural norms and social institutions. They explore how societies worldwide employ alcoholic beverages in various cultural practices, such as weddings, funerals, and religious rituals.

Similarly, they investigate the use of drugs in shamanic ceremonies and traditional healing methods. The social practices and meanings surrounding alcohol and drug consumption extend far beyond their physiological effects. Substance use is viewed as a social construct, leading to the recognition of cultural and temporal variations in the conceptualization and use of alcoholic beverages and drugs. For example, the consumption of alcohol may be considered as cultural genocide in cer-

tain Indigenous communities, leading to its prohibition. In contrast, Western societies often associate alcohol with individual choice and freedom. Similar variations exist in the cultural acceptance and prohibition of drugs like tobacco, coca, and cannabis. Substance use is also regarded as a locus of authority and control, with alcohol and drugs capable of reinforcing or undermining established hierarchies. Alcohol was historically used as a tool of dominance and control over Indigenous populations during colonial times, much like racism and classism have been employed to oppress marginalized groups. The concept of authority and control is also manifested in drug laws and policies.

To illustrate these anthropological viewpoints, this section examines alcohol consumption in Western culture and coca use by Indigenous peoples. Alcohol is often a means of socializing and celebrating in Western societies. However, its significance and functions vary across cultures and time periods. The era of Prohibition in the United States during the 1920s provides a clear example of how alcohol's prohibition led to increased crime and violence. Similarly, in some Muslim societies, alcohol consumption is forbidden by religious law, resulting in the emergence of alcohol-free social spaces such as teahouses and hookah lounges. The coca leaf has been revered in Indigenous South American civilizations for its medical and spiritual benefits. However, coca use has been stigmatized and criminalized in Western cultures due to perceived dangers. This has led to severe consequences for Indigenous communities in the Andean region, where coca farming is a source of livelihood. The United States' War on Drugs, initiated in the 1970s, has devastated these communities. Recently, efforts have been made to destigmatize coca use and acknowledge its cultural and therapeutic significance.

This highlights the complex social, cultural, and political dimensions of alcohol and drug consumption from an anthropological perspective. Medical anthropology plays a crucial role in public health by investigating how cultural factors affect people's physical and mental health. Beyond genetics and individual choices, medical anthropologists recognize the significant role of social and cultural factors in shaping health outcomes (Foster, 2010; Womack, 2009). Social and economic inequalities, such as poverty, discrimination, and limited access to healthcare, can impact disease prevalence and health conditions. Furthermore, cultural beliefs and practices, including attitudes toward illness and treatment, can influence health-related behaviours. Stigmatization and underutilization of mental health services in societies where mental illness is viewed as a personal failing rather than a medical condition are illustrative of how cultural factors impact public health. Medical anthropologists contribute to identifying and addressing these social and cultural factors to reduce health disparities and enhance health outcomes (B. J. Good, 2010; B. J. Good, Fischer, Willen, & Good, 2010). They employ qualitative research methods like ethnography and participant observation to understand the cultural context of health-related behaviours and practices. By collaborating with healthcare professionals and policymakers, they develop programs and services that are culturally responsive to the diverse perspectives on health within a given community.

The anthropology of emotions is a subfield that examines the cultural, social, and biological contexts of human emotional experiences. It delves into how emotions influence and are

influenced by social practices, cultural norms, and cross-cultural variations in emotional experiences. Anthropologists began to recognize the significance of emotions in the 1970s and 1980s, leading to the emergence of this subfield. The anthropology of emotions encompasses several foundational theories and principles, including the notion that emotions are culturally produced rather than innate. This perspective emphasizes that cultural norms and values can lead to changes in the perception and expression of emotions over time. Another key concept is “emotional labor,” which refers to the effort invested in controlling one’s emotions and the emotions of others. Emotional labor plays a significant role in fields like healthcare, education, and customer service, where individuals may need to conceal or amplify their emotions.

Additionally, the phenomenon of emotional contagion, where one person’s emotions influence others through interpersonal contact, is explored. Both verbal and nonverbal forms of communication can contribute to emotional contagion, influencing interpersonal relationships and group dynamics. The anthropology of emotions highlights the cultural diversity in the understanding and expression of emotions. For instance, love is a multifaceted emotion that takes various forms and is communicated differently around the world. Some cultures, like India and Japan, express love primarily through nonverbal acts and gestures, while others, such as the United States, openly declare their love and express affection physically. Similarly, anger’s expression varies significantly across cultures. In some societies, anger is considered negative and is either avoided or repressed, as seen in Japan and China. In contrast, anger is viewed as a genuine and necessary emotion in Western cultures like the United States and Europe.

The concept of honor and shame is central to several non-Western cultures. In these societies, individuals and families go to great lengths to protect themselves from public shame, recognizing it as a powerful social tool for maintaining order and enforcing standards. Shame is integral to social control and maintaining social norms. Medical anthropology is a dynamic and evolving field that holds immense promise in addressing the complex interplay of culture, society, and health. The exploration of health inequalities, the impact of cultural factors on global health practices, the study of emerging infectious diseases, and the anthropology of alcohol and drug use are all central themes within this discipline. Furthermore, medical anthropology plays a crucial role in understanding and addressing disparities in public health. The anthropology of emotions reveals the intricate ways in which emotions are understood and expressed across cultures. As the field continues to advance, medical anthropologists are poised to make valuable contributions to our understanding of health and well-being, guiding the development of culturally sensitive public health interventions. By elucidating these themes, we aim to highlight the multifaceted contributions of medical anthropology and its potential to influence public health practices and policies.

7. Cultural Models of Learning, Intelligence, Motivation, and Assessment

Psychological anthropology, a subfield within anthropology, is devoted to understanding the influence of an individual’s upbringing and social environment on their psychology. This section explores the relationship between psychological anthropology and education, highlighting the impact of cultural

and social contexts on the educational experience. A central focus of psychological anthropology is the concept of cultural models of learning, which examines how different cultures conceptualize and approach learning (Erickson, 2011; LeVine, 2010).

Moreover, the field addresses cultural conceptions of intelligence, motivation, and assessment, which significantly influence academic success. This section provides a comprehensive overview of these concepts and underscores their importance in developing culturally responsive teaching practices. Psychological anthropology is a distinct branch of anthropology that seeks to unravel how an individual’s upbringing and social surroundings mold their psychological makeup (Gaines, 2011; Leatherman & Goodman, 2011). The discipline delves into how cultural norms influence human emotions and actions. In recent years, psychological anthropology has provided valuable insights into the realm of education. This section delves into the interplay between psychological anthropology and education, focusing on how cultural and social contexts shape the educational journey. A pivotal concept in this regard is that of cultural models of learning, which examines the diverse ways cultures conceptualize and approach the learning process. Additionally, the section highlights the significance of cultural conceptions of intelligence, motivation, and assessment, all of which play a critical role in determining academic success.

Cultural models of learning represent a central pillar of psychological anthropology’s contribution to the field of education (McMahan & Nichter, 2011; Quesada, Hart, & Bourgois, 2011). These models encompass the shared beliefs, attitudes, and practices that communities use to comprehend and respond to their surroundings. Cultural models of learning specifically pertain to the various ways individuals from different cultures perceive and engage with the process of learning. Understanding the contrasting approaches to learning across cultures is crucial for the development of effective teaching methods. In many Western countries, individualism and self-directed learning are highly esteemed. Students are encouraged to think independently and take charge of their educational journey. However, in numerous non-Western cultures, collectivism and communal learning take precedence. Here, education is perceived as a collective responsibility, and students are expected to collaborate and support each other as they pursue knowledge. Recognizing these cultural variations in approaches to learning can help educators adapt their teaching methods to better suit the needs of diverse student populations. Cultural conceptions of intelligence are another fundamental aspect of psychological anthropology’s contribution to education.

The essence of this concept lies in the vast diversity in how intelligence is defined and consequently, how it is expected to be nurtured and cultivated across different cultures. In essence, the cultural lens through which intelligence is viewed significantly influences teaching methodologies. In many Western societies, cognitive attributes such as memory, logic, and problem-solving skills form the foundation of intelligence. However, in several non-Western cultures, intelligence encompasses a broader spectrum, incorporating not only cognitive abilities but also practical wisdom, emotional maturity, and interpersonal skills. Understanding these differences in cultural conceptions of intelligence underscores the need for a more inclusive and diverse approach to education. Psychological anthropology also sheds light on the role of cultural models of motivation in education, emphasizing how different cultures define and encour-

age motivation (N. Chrisman & Maretzki, 2012; Williams, 2011). The motivation to learn is a pivotal factor in academic success. Cultures worldwide vary in the way they understand and foster motivation, impacting student engagement and achievement. Many Western societies prioritize individual success and competitiveness, often rewarding and praising high-achievers. In contrast, numerous non-Western cultures place a higher value on community success and collective achievement, fostering a more communal form of motivation. The impact of cultural models of motivation on the educational experience is substantial, and recognizing these distinctions can enable educators to create learning environments that cater to a diverse range of students. Cultural models of assessment are essential to the field of psychological anthropology and are highly relevant to educational practices. Assessment methods used in education often reflect cultural values and societal expectations.

Understanding these differences is crucial in ensuring equitable evaluation processes for students from diverse backgrounds. Many Western countries emphasize academic success and standardized testing as essential elements of assessment. However, several non-Western cultures favor a more holistic evaluation approach. This method considers a broader range of skills and knowledge, with a greater emphasis on practical application and real-life experience. Recognizing these disparities is pivotal in developing fair and culturally sensitive assessment practices that support the success of all students. Psychological anthropology has significantly enriched the field of education by exploring the complex interplay between cultural and social factors and the learning experience (B. J. Good, 2012; Heusser, Scheffer, Neumann, Tauschel, & Edelhäuser, 2012). The concepts of cultural models of learning, intelligence, motivation, and assessment provide valuable insights into the diverse educational needs and expectations of various cultures. By acknowledging and accommodating these cultural variations, educators can develop more effective and inclusive teaching methods. Psychological anthropology continues to be instrumental in shaping pedagogical practices that are responsive to the cultural and social diversity of students, thus fostering an equitable and enriching educational experience.

8. Cultural Influence on Cognition: Intersection of Anthropology and Cognitive Science

This section delves into the dynamic relationship between anthropology and cognitive science, two distinct yet interconnected fields that share a common goal: understanding the intricacies of the human mind and behavior. Cognitive science, an interdisciplinary field, focuses on investigating mental processes related to perception, learning, memory, and decision-making. In contrast, anthropology, a social science, delves into the cultural and social elements that shape human behavior. We explore how anthropology contributes to cognitive research by emphasizing the role of cultural awareness, language, and cultural models in shaping cognition. Anthropological insights shed light on the profound influence of cultural norms and assumptions on human thoughts, feelings, and actions (Hsu, 2012; Inhorn & Wentzell, 2012). Moreover, the impact of language on cognitive processes, as well as the significance of cultural models in shaping cognition, is discussed. Understanding these intersections between anthropology and cognitive science can lead to the development of more nuanced and culturally sensitive models of human cognition. The realms of

anthropology and cognitive science are both dedicated to unravelling the enigmatic workings of the human mind and behaviour

While cognitive science explores mental processes like perception, learning, memory, and decision-making, anthropology investigates the cultural and social elements that influence human behaviour. Recently, there has been an increased focus on the intersection of these two fields, as anthropology offers valuable insights into the study of cognition. This section delves into some specific examples of how anthropology enriches cognitive research by emphasizing the pivotal role of cultural awareness, language, and cultural models in shaping human cognition. One of the significant contributions of anthropology to cognitive research is the recognition of cultural awareness as a substantial factor in the formation of cognition. Cultural norms and assumptions about the world have the power to influence people's thoughts, feelings, and actions significantly.

This influence becomes evident when examining cultural conceptions of time, which vary across different societies. In many non-Western cultures, time is perceived holistically and closely linked to social interactions and events. In contrast, Western societies often view time as a commodity that can be measured and managed. This cultural distinction can impact an individual's perspective on work, daily routines, and their tolerance for time constraints. Similarly, the concept of the "self" takes on different connotations in diverse societies. Individualistic cultures tend to emphasize concepts like "autonomy" and "independence" in self-definition. In contrast, collectivistic cultures often frame the "self" in terms of "others" and "obligations." These cultural variations have the potential to influence how people perceive themselves, interact with others, and navigate their daily lives. Anthropology has significantly contributed to the understanding of how language affects thought, shedding light on the intricate relationship between linguistic patterns and cognitive processes.

Language serves as a vital tool for communication and sharing ideas among individuals. It is not merely a means of expression but also a shaper of cognition. Anthropologists have demonstrated that linguistic patterns in different languages can influence the way individuals perceive their surroundings. Some languages possess grammatical structures that enable the communication of nuanced meanings that may not be as easily conveyed in others. This linguistic variation has the potential to impact how people perceive their environment, categorize it, and make decisions. Language also has an impact on memory and cognition. In certain languages, speakers must use spatial metaphors to convey the passage of time, such as referring to the past as "behind" and the future as "ahead." This linguistic framing can affect individuals' ability to recall specific details about past events and plan for the future, including considerations of time. Another key contribution of anthropology to cognitive research is the concept of cultural models. Cultural models encompass shared beliefs, attitudes, and practices that people use to understand and respond to their environment.

Anthropologists have revealed that these cultural models significantly impact cognition by shaping how individuals perceive information and make decisions. For example, in some cultures, illness is attributed less to physical causes and more to

spiritual or moral shortcomings. Such cultural interpretations influence individuals' understanding of their symptoms and their motivation to seek medical care. Additionally, cultural norms in various societies often revolve around established social orders and power structures. These norms have the potential to influence individuals' judgment and actions in social settings. Anthropology's convergence with cognitive science presents a captivating area of study, where the interplay between cultural elements and cognitive processes is illuminated (Aggarwal, 2013; Kleinman, 2012; Willen & Mulligan, 2012). By focusing on cultural awareness, the influence of language on thought, and the impact of cultural models on cognition, anthropology offers invaluable insights into the complexity of human cognition. These insights have the potential to foster the development of more sophisticated and culturally sensitive models of human behavior. Understanding the intersection of anthropology and cognitive science ultimately enriches our understanding of how cognition is influenced by social and cultural factors.

9. Cultural Dimensions and Identity Formation

This section explores the intersection of anthropology and the study of adolescence, highlighting the invaluable contributions made by anthropology to our understanding of this crucial transitional phase of human life. Anthropology, as a branch of the social sciences, delves into human behavior and cultural traditions across different temporal and spatial dimensions (Baer, Singer, & Susser, 2013; Banerjee, Chakrabarti, & Arnab, 2013; Napier et al., 2014). Through an examination of adolescent cultural variation, gender influences, acknowledgment of the formation of adolescent identity, and the facilitation of comparative research across diverse contexts, anthropology has significantly enriched the study of adolescence. Adolescence, the transitional phase between childhood and adulthood, represents a complex and multifaceted period in the human life course. Anthropology, a discipline that focuses on human behavior and cultural practices across diverse contexts, has made substantial contributions to the understanding of adolescence. This section aims to provide an overview of the history of adolescence research, emphasizing the key role played by anthropology in shedding light on the distinctive cultural dimensions of this pivotal life stage.

One of anthropology's primary contributions to the study of adolescence is the recognition of cultural heterogeneity in the adolescent experience. Anthropologists assert that while adolescence is a universal life period, the experiences of adolescents can vary significantly across different cultures (Rashed & Galal, 2015; Van der Geest, 2014; Whitley, 2014). For instance, some societies employ initiation rites to mark the transition to adulthood, bestowing new responsibilities and roles upon adolescents. In contrast, other cultures consider adolescence as a time for formal schooling or apprenticeships, during which young individuals acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for their future roles as adults. The anthropological literature on adolescence vividly illustrates how cultural beliefs and practices can profoundly influence adolescents' sense of identity and their place in the world. While some cultures perceive adolescence as a period of responsibility and maturation into adulthood, others view it as a time of rebellion and exploration. Anthropology has made significant contributions to the field of adolescent research by examining the effects of gender on adolescents. Anthropologists argue that gender roles and expecta-

tions have a profound impact on how young people perceive themselves and their prospects. These roles are culturally constructed, leading to different interpretations and opportunities for young people.

In some cultures, gendered pursuits may limit the choices of adolescents, while in others, they are encouraged to explore their interests freely. Anthropologists further highlight the influence of gender on adolescents by emphasizing that puberty experiences can differ substantially across cultures. For example, in some societies, menstruation may be considered a secret and embarrassing occurrence, while in others, it is celebrated as a symbol of strength and fertility. Another pivotal contribution of anthropology to our understanding of adolescence lies in its examination of adolescents' socialization and identity formation. Anthropologists have revealed that adolescence is a crucial period during which an individual's sense of self and social identity takes shape (Singer, 2016; Ventevogel, 2016; Zlatanović, 2016). How children and adolescents are socialized can have profound and lasting effects on their developing identities and worldviews. Across different cultures, the socialization of youth takes on various forms. In some societies, young people are taught to prioritize the needs of the group and value conformity, while in others, they are encouraged to be independent and pursue their individual interests. The process of forming one's identity is intricate and multi-dimensional. In specific cultures, young individuals may prioritize their individuality over their membership in a family or society, reflecting the complexity of identity formation during adolescence. Anthropology has been instrumental in laying the groundwork for comparative research in adolescence. Anthropologists have employed comparative methodologies to examine the similarities and differences in the experiences of young people across various cultures and historical periods (Charlier et al., 2017; Joralemon, 2017; Lemelson & Tucker, 2017).

By adopting a multi-cultural perspective, researchers have identified both universal themes and unique patterns that cut across different studies. Anthropology has played a pivotal role in advancing our understanding of adolescence by emphasizing cultural variation, gender influences, identity formation, and facilitating comparative research. Adolescence, a crucial transitional phase in human life, is subject to diverse cultural interpretations and experiences. The insights garnered through anthropological research have enriched the discourse on adolescence, highlighting the significance of cultural contexts and providing a nuanced perspective on this dynamic life stage. Understanding adolescence within the framework of anthropology broadens our comprehension of the human experience across different cultural landscapes and temporal dimensions.

10. Public Health Emergency Response: Understanding Cultural and Social Aspects

This section elucidates the indispensable role of anthropology in understanding, responding to, and mitigating public health emergencies. By examining cultural and social elements influencing disease transmission, documenting the societal impacts of health crises, and designing culturally sensitive interventions, anthropology enriches the response to public health crises (McElroy, 2018; Panter-Brick & Eggerman, 2018; Roch, 2017). The section addresses challenges such as resource constraints and limited integration of anthropology into emergency response teams and underscores the urgent need for

recognizing the discipline's relevance and allocating funding for anthropological research in the context of public health crises. Public health emergencies pose significant challenges to societies and healthcare systems worldwide. These crises demand multifaceted responses that extend beyond biomedical interventions. The social, cultural, and political aspects of health must be thoroughly considered for a holistic response. Anthropology, as the study of human culture and behavior, is uniquely positioned to provide valuable insights into public health emergency response (Kaiser & Jo Weaver, 2019; Singer & Baer, 2018; Weisner, 2018). This section examines the pivotal role of anthropology in such scenarios and underscores the importance of addressing cultural and societal aspects to enhance the effectiveness of public health interventions.

Understanding how social and cultural elements influence disease transmission is a critical aspect of public health emergency response. Anthropologists have played a crucial role in elucidating the role of cultural practices and beliefs in the spread of diseases such as the Ebola virus in West Africa and COVID-19. Traditional burial practices were found to be a significant factor in the spread of Ebola. Anthropologists worked closely with communities to develop culturally appropriate burial rituals that reduced disease transmission while respecting local traditions. Similarly, anthropologists have examined how factors like poverty, overcrowding, and cultural practices contribute to the spread of COVID-19. Collaboration between anthropologists and local communities has led to the development of public health programs that consider local customs and practices. Public health emergencies can have profound societal and cultural impacts, and anthropology has been instrumental in documenting and analyzing these effects (Apud & Romani, 2020; Kleinman, 2020; Singer, Baer, Long, & Pavlotski, 2019).

During the Ebola pandemic, anthropologists documented the sociological and economic consequences, including the closure of businesses, the disruption of social and cultural events, and community fragmentation. By collaborating with affected communities, anthropologists have been able to develop strategies to address these impacts and support the recovery process. The COVID-19 pandemic has presented similar challenges, with social isolation and economic repercussions being among the most significant. Anthropologists have worked with communities to develop interventions such as funding for mental health services and financial aid for affected individuals and businesses. Anthropology is instrumental in designing public health programs that are culturally sensitive and respectful of local customs (Mason et al., 2020; Pillay, 2021; Wentzell & Labuski, 2020).

The experience of the Ebola outbreak highlighted the importance of crafting public health messages that resonate with local communities. Messages emphasizing the need to protect vulnerable populations, such as the elderly and those with underlying health conditions, have proven more effective than messages focusing solely on individual behaviour change. Anthropologists have also worked to reduce the stigma associated with diseases like COVID-19, especially for survivors. These initiatives underline the importance of recognizing local beliefs and traditions in shaping intervention strategies. Despite the significant contributions of anthropology to public health emergency response, there are several challenges that must be addressed. Limited resources for anthropological research dur-

ing public health crises pose a considerable obstacle. Funding options for anthropologists are often scarce and competitive, hindering their ability to conduct vital research. Additionally, the integration of anthropology into public health emergency response teams remains limited (Alexander, Lyne, Cannon, & Roch, 2022; Sheehan, 2022; Trotter, 2022). Anthropologists are seldom consulted in the planning and execution of emergency responses, limiting the use of their insights and recommendations.

To address these challenges, it is imperative to recognize the relevance of anthropology in public health emergency response and allocate funding accordingly. The insights and recommendations of anthropologists should be integrated into disaster response strategies. Furthermore, anthropologists should be actively sought out and included as integral members of response teams. By doing so, the understanding of the cultural and social determinants of health can be enhanced, resulting in more effective public health interventions. Anthropology is a vital discipline in the response to public health emergencies. The contributions of anthropologists in understanding the cultural and social aspects of disease transmission, documenting societal and cultural impacts, and designing culturally sensitive interventions are invaluable. To address resource constraints and limited integration into emergency response teams, it is essential to recognize the discipline's relevance and prioritize funding for anthropological research in the context of public health crises. By doing so, public health professionals and communities can harness the unique insights of anthropology to develop more effective strategies for mitigating the impact of public health emergencies.

11. The Tapestry of Anthropology of Illness and Sickness

This section delves into the anthropology of illness and sickness, a field that explores the cultural, social, and historical aspects of health and illness. Drawing upon examples from various cultures and time periods, it elucidates the multifaceted dimensions of how different societies perceive and respond to sickness. Key aspects addressed include diverse cultural interpretations of illness, the influence of society and culture on health, and the dissemination and construction of medical knowledge. By emphasizing the impact of cultural and social factors on healthcare, this section underscores the imperative of incorporating anthropological insights into medical and public health practices. The anthropology of illness and sickness is a specialized field that delves into the cultural, social, and historical dimensions of health and disease. Anthropologists in this domain explore how different societies interpret and respond to sickness, shedding light on the multifaceted relationship between culture and health (Black, 2023; Helman, 2023; Patel, 2023).

This section seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of this discipline, illustrating its significance through examples from diverse cultures and historical contexts. One of the fundamental aspects of the anthropology of illness and sickness is the examination of how various societies perceive and interpret illness. Cultural beliefs and norms significantly influence the understanding of sickness, as well as the decisions made by individuals regarding where and how to seek treatment. In some cultures, illness is viewed through a lens of sin or spiritual disharmony, considering it a consequence of moral transgres-

sions. These societies may attribute illness to factors such as divine punishment or malevolent forces, impacting the way individuals approach treatment and healing. Conversely, in several cultures, illness is acknowledged as an intrinsic part of the human experience, and suffering is seen as a natural aspect of life. Anthropologists have documented these varying perspectives, highlighting their profound influence on healthcare decisions. For instance, in traditional systems like Ayurveda and traditional Chinese medicine, health problems are often attributed to energy blockages or imbalances within the body. Practices such as acupuncture, herbal medicine, and massage aim to restore this balance and promote health. In Western medicine, illness is frequently perceived as a result of identifiable causes, and the primary objective is to cure or alleviate the underlying disease or condition.

The anthropology of illness and sickness delves beyond cultural interpretations to examine how illness is shaped and influenced by societal and cultural factors. Illness is not solely a product of biological processes; it is intricately intertwined with social and cultural norms and expectations. For example, mental disorders are perceived differently across various cultural contexts. Some societies attribute these conditions to demonic possession or supernatural causes, while others recognize them as medical conditions amenable to treatment and therapy. Anthropologists have documented how social and cultural factors impact the experience and management of illness. Consider the influence of factors such as gender, race, and socioeconomic status on how individuals cope with sickness. Certain diseases are more prevalent among specific racial or ethnic groups, and gender can significantly affect the manifestation of symptoms or the diagnosis of illnesses.

Moreover, individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds may encounter varying degrees of stigma and discrimination when seeking medical care. These social and cultural dimensions play a crucial role in the overall experience of illness and the pursuit of healthcare. In addition to the cultural and social aspects of illness, the anthropology of illness and sickness also examines the creation and dissemination of medical knowledge. Medical knowledge is neither universal nor objective; it is influenced by historical, cultural, and political contexts. For instance, the development of Western medical knowledge has been influenced by colonialism, imperialism, and capitalism. Historically, the West used its advanced medical knowledge as a justification for colonial rule and the oppression of non-Western nations. Anthropologists have also documented diverse practices of knowledge production and transmission in different cultural settings. Some traditional medical systems rely on apprenticeships and oral traditions for knowledge transfer, whereas Western medicine predominantly employs formal education, certification, and standardized examinations.

By highlighting these disparities in medical knowledge systems, anthropologists contribute to a more nuanced understanding of healthcare practices and emphasize the need for culturally sensitive approaches in medical and public health interventions. The anthropology of illness and sickness provides invaluable insights into the multifaceted nature of health and disease. It underscores the significance of cultural, social, and historical contexts in shaping the perception, experience, and management of illness. By exploring how different societies interpret sickness, the impact of social and cultural factors on healthcare, and the construction of medical knowledge, this

discipline offers a holistic perspective that complements the biomedical model. It emphasizes the imperative of considering cultural and social variables when addressing medical and public health concerns. The anthropology of illness and sickness is a vital field that enriches our understanding of health and healthcare practices across cultures and serves as a foundation for more culturally sensitive and effective healthcare interventions.

12. Conclusion

In this comprehensive exploration of the diverse facets of anthropology's intersections with health, culture, and society, we have traversed a spectrum of anthropological sub-disciplines. From medical anthropology's investigations into health inequalities and global health to the anthropology of adolescence and pregnancy, it is evident that anthropology provides a profound understanding of the intricate interplay between human behaviours, societal norms, and healthcare. Medical anthropology, with its substantial theoretical underpinnings and empirical research, has made significant contributions to our comprehension of the manifold factors that contribute to health disparities across cultural, social, and economic dimensions. By delving into the intricate web of factors such as income inequality, racial prejudice, and cultural beliefs, medical anthropologists unveil the underlying causes of health inequalities.

These professionals, poised at the intersection of healthcare and cultural contexts, aid in the development of more equitable public health interventions. The seamless partnership between medical anthropology and global health research facilitates a profound grasp of the impact of cultural beliefs on healthcare and disease prevention, thereby catalyzing the development of culturally-sensitive strategies for enhancing global health. Equally enlightening is the branch of psychological anthropology, which probes the role of cultural norms in shaping cognitive processes, learning strategies, and academic success. The notion of cultural models of learning underscores the significance of cultural perspectives in pedagogical methods. The intriguing juxtaposition of individualism and collectivism highlights how cultures perceive the autonomy of learners and the societal responsibility in education. This cultural perspective also extends to conceptions of intelligence, motivation, and assessment. It is in these domains that the cultural context often redefines the boundaries of educational success, illustrating that what might be considered academic excellence in one culture could vary drastically when viewed from another.

As our exploration unfolds, we come to comprehend the importance of understanding the culture-bound aspects of human emotions, exemplified by the anthropology of emotions. The idea that emotions are socially constructed, rather than biologically innate, has opened a window into how cultural norms and values shape emotional expressions and experiences. Anthropologists have revealed how different cultures uniquely interpret and respond to emotions such as love, anger, and shame. These nuanced cultural dynamics underscore the need for context-specific interventions in various domains, including healthcare, education, and social services, to be both effective and culturally sensitive. Turning our gaze toward pre- and perinatal anthropology, we venture into the profound intricacies of pregnancy, childbirth, and infancy as perceived and practiced across different cultures. This sub-discipline reveals

that the journey from pregnancy to postpartum involves a myriad of cultural rituals, customs, and beliefs that profoundly impact the health and well-being of mothers and their infants. From the Chinese tradition of “sitting the month” to the variety of postnatal practices in diverse societies, the anthropology of pre-and perinatal phases elucidates the complex interplay of tradition and modern medical practices.

Likewise, the field of anthropology proves indispensable in the context of public health emergencies, where the social, cultural, and political dimensions of health outcomes take center stage. Anthropologists aid in decoding the intricate web of social practices, beliefs, and traditions that influence the spread of diseases, as exemplified by the Ebola and COVID-19 outbreaks. By acknowledging the role of social and cultural factors, anthropology provides insights that transcend the biomedical model, leading to the formulation of public health strategies that respect local customs and beliefs. Furthermore, anthropology illuminates the profound sociological and economic consequences of public health crises and guides the creation of culturally responsive solutions. The anthropology of illness and sickness, another crucial sub-discipline, delves into the cultural, social, and historical aspects of health and illness.

It discloses how culture shapes perceptions of illness, impacts diagnostic frameworks, and influences health-seeking behaviours. The variability in cultural interpretations of disease,

from attributing illnesses to spiritual disharmony to understanding them as part of the human condition, underscores the importance of cultural sensitivity in healthcare delivery. This insight stands as a reminder that medicine is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor, and that acknowledging cultural nuances is imperative for successful healthcare practices.

In conclusion, anthropology, with its diverse sub-disciplines and multi-dimensional approach to the understanding of human behavior, culture, and health, stands as an invaluable ally in the realm of healthcare and public health. Its contributions to the elucidation of health disparities, the cultural dimensions of education, the intricacies of emotions, the rituals of pregnancy and childbirth, and the management of public health emergencies, not to mention the cultural underpinnings of illness and sickness, form an intricate tapestry of knowledge that enriches and complements conventional medical and public health paradigms. These insights underscore the imperative of acknowledging cultural diversity, social context, and historical perspectives when addressing health-related issues and in the development of public health interventions that are not only effective but culturally sensitive and inclusive. The multifaceted field of anthropology has demonstrated its unyielding relevance in the contemporary landscape of health, culture, and society, underlining its indispensability as a collaborative partner in the quest for holistic healthcare and public health strategies.

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

- Aggarwal, N. K. (2013). Cultural psychiatry, medical anthropology, and the DSM-5 field trials. *Medical Anthropology*, 32(5), 393-398.
- Alexander, L., Lyne, J., Cannon, M., & Roch, B. (2022). The importance of anthropology in psychiatry. *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 39(2), 113-114.
- Alter, J. S. (1999). Heaps of health, metaphysical fitness: Ayurveda and the ontology of good health in medical anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 40(S1), S43-S66.
- Apud, I., & Romani, O. (2020). Medical anthropology and symbolic cure: from the placebo to cultures of meaningful healing. *Anthropology & medicine*, 27(2), 160-175.
- Baer, H. A. (1997). The misconstruction of critical medical anthropology: a response to a cultural constructivist critique. *Social Science & Medicine*, 44(10), 1565-1573.
- Baer, H. A., Singer, M., & Susser, I. (2013). *Medical anthropology and the world system: critical perspectives*. Praeger.
- Banerjee, A., Chakrabarti, G., & Arnab, D. (2013). A new beginning in medical anthropology: scope and relevance of ‘pharmaceutical anthropology’ in India. *Eurasian Journal of Anthropology*, 4(2), 51-57.

- Bhasin, V. (2007). Medical anthropology: a review. *Studies on Ethno-medicine*, 1(1), 1-20.
- Black, S. P. (2023). Language and Health. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Anthropology*.
- Chapin, B. (2008). Society for Psychological Anthropology. *Anthropology News*, 49(9), 57-57.
- Charlier, P., Coppens, Y., Malaurie, J., Brun, L., Kepanga, M., Hoang-Opermann, V., . . . Schor, X. (2017). A new definition of health? An open letter of autochthonous peoples and medical anthropologists to the WHO. *European journal of internal medicine*, 37, 33-37.
- Chrisman, N., & Maretzki, T. (2012). *Clinically applied anthropology: Anthropologists in health science settings* (Vol. 5): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Chrisman, N. J., & Maretzki, T. W. (1982). Anthropology in health science settings. In *Clinically applied anthropology: anthropologists in health science settings* (pp. 1-31): Springer.
- Colson, A. C., & Selby, K. E. (1974). Medical anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 3(1), 245-262.
- Dein, S. (2003). Against belief: The usefulness of explanatory model research in medical anthropology. *Social theory & health*, 1, 149-162.
- Dressler, W. (2007). Meaning and structure in research in medical anthropology. *Anthropology in Action*, 14(3), 30-43.
- Dressler, W. W. (2001). Medical anthropology: Toward a third moment in social science? *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 15(4), 455-465.
- Dunn, F. L., & Janes, C. R. (1986). Introduction: medical anthropology and epidemiology. In *Anthropology and epidemiology: Interdisciplinary approaches to the study of health and disease* (pp. 3-34): Springer.
- Eisenbruch, M. (1983). 'Wind Illness' or Somatic Depression?: A Case Study in Psychiatric Anthropology. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 143(4), 323-326.
- Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (2003). *Encyclopedia of medical anthropology: health and illness in the world's cultures topics-Volume 1; Cultures* (Vol. 2): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Erickson, P. I. (2011). Sexuality, medical anthropology, and public health. *A companion to medical anthropology*, 271-287.
- Fabrega, H. (1971). Medical anthropology. *Biennial review of anthropology*, 7, 167-229.
- Fabrega Jr, H., & Miller, B. D. (1995). Toward a more comprehensive medical anthropology: The case of adolescent psychopathology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 9(4), 431-461.
- Farmer, P., & Good, B. J. (1991). Illness representations in medical anthropology: A critical review and a case study of the representation of AIDS in Haiti. In *Mental representation in health and illness* (pp. 132-162): Springer.
- Foster, G. M. (1974). Medical anthropology: some contrasts with medical sociology. *Medical Anthropology Newsletter*, 6(1), 1-6.
- Foster, G. M. (1976). Medical anthropology and international health planning. *Medical Anthropology Newsletter*, 7(3), 12-18.
- Foster, G. M. (1977). Medical anthropology and international health planning. *Social Science & Medicine* (1967), 11(10), 527-534.
- Foster, G. M. (1978). The role of medical anthropology in primary health care. *Bulletin of the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)*; 12 (4), 1978.
- Foster, G. M. (2010). Medical anthropology and international health planning. *A Reader in Medical Anthropology*, 394-404.
- Frankenberg, R. (1980). Medical anthropology and development: a theoretical perspective. *Social Science & Medicine. Part B: Medical Anthropology*, 14(4), 197-207.
- Freeman, B. C. (2007). *Third-world folk beliefs and practices: Haitian medical anthropology*: [Lawrence, Kan.]: Institute of Haitian Studies, University of Kansas.
- Gaines, A. D. (2011). Millennial medical anthropology: From there to here and beyond, or the problem of global health. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 35, 83-89.
- Garro, L. C. (2003). Cognitive Medical Anthropology. *Encyclopedia of Medical Anthropology: Health and Illness in the World's Cultures*, 12-23.
- Good, B., & Del Vecchio Good, M. (1986). The cultural context of diagnosis and therapy: A view from medical anthropology. REPORT NO DHHS-ADM-86-1466 PUB DATE 86 NOTE 240p. PUB TYPE Reports-General (140) EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage., 23.
- Good, B. J. (1992). Culture and psychopathology: Directions for psychiatric anthropology. *New directions in psychological anthropology*, 181-205.
- Good, B. J. (2010). Medical anthropology and the problem of belief. *A reader in medical anthropology: Theoretical trajectories, emergent realities*, 15, 64.
- Good, B. J. (2012). Theorizing the 'subject' of medical and psychiatric anthropology. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 18(3), 515-535.
- Good, B. J., Fischer, M. M., Willen, S. S., & Good, M.-J. D. (2010). *A reader in medical anthropology: theoretical trajectories, emergent realities* (Vol. 15): John Wiley & Sons.
- Good, B. J., & Good, M.-J. D. (2008). The Cultural Context of Diagnosis and Therapy: A View from Medical Anthropology. *Cultural formulation: A reader for psychiatric diagnosis*. Juan E. Mezzich and Giovanni Caracci, eds, 27-50.
- Gordon, D. (1991). Female circumcision and genital operations in Egypt and the Sudan: A dilemma for medical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 5(1), 3-14.
- Hardin, J. A., & Zeidler, W. M. (2008). From the editor of Ethos, the journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 110(2), 176.

- Hasan, K. A. (1975). What Is Medical Anthropology? *Medical Anthropology Newsletter*, 6(3), 7-10.
- Helman, C. G. (2023). *Medical anthropology*: Taylor & Francis.
- Hemmings, C. P. (2005). Rethinking medical anthropology: How anthropology is failing medicine. *Anthropology & medicine*, 12(2), 91-103.
- Heusser, P., Scheffer, C., Neumann, M., Tauschel, D., & Edelhäuser, F. (2012). Towards non-reductionistic medical anthropology, medical education and practitioner–patient–interaction: The example of Anthroposophic Medicine. *Patient education and counseling*, 89(3), 455-460.
- Hinton, D. E., Howes, D., & Kirmayer, L. J. (2008). Toward a medical anthropology of sensations: Definitions and research agenda. *Transcultural psychiatry*, 45(2), 142-162.
- Hruschka, D. J., Lende, D. H., & Worthman, C. M. (2005). Biocultural dialogues: Biology and culture in psychological anthropology. *Ethos*, 33(1), 1-19.
- Hsu, E. (2012). Medical anthropology in Europe—quo vadis? *Anthropology & medicine*, 19(1), 51-61.
- Inhorn, M. C., & Wentzell, E. A. (2012). *Medical anthropology at the intersections: histories, activisms, and futures*: Duke University Press.
- Janes, C., Stall, R., & Gifford, S. M. (1986). *Anthropology and epidemiology: Interdisciplinary approaches to the study of health and disease* (Vol. 9): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Jenkins, J. H. (1998). The medical anthropology of political violence: A cultural and feminist agenda. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 12(1), 122-131.
- Johnson, T. M. (1987). Practicing medical anthropology: clinical strategies for work in the hospital. In *Applied Anthropology in America* (pp. 316-339): Columbia University Press.
- Joralemon, D. (2017). *Exploring medical anthropology*: Taylor & Francis.
- Kaiser, B. N., & Jo Weaver, L. (2019). Culture-bound syndromes, idioms of distress, and cultural concepts of distress: New directions for an old concept in psychological anthropology. In (Vol. 56, pp. 589-598): SAGE Publications Sage UK: London, England.
- Kane, D. (1984). Resources in Psychological Anthropology. *Collection Building*, 5(4), 23-30.
- Kaufert, P. L., & Kaufert, J. (1978). Alternate courses of development: medical anthropology in Britain and North America. *Social Science & Medicine. Part B: Medical Anthropology*, 12, 255-261.
- Khare, R. (1996). Dava, Daktar, and Dua: Anthropology of practiced medicine in India. *Social Science & Medicine*, 43(5), 837-848.
- Kiefer, C. W. (1977). Psychological anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 6(1), 103-119.
- Kleinman, A. (1977). Lessons from a clinical approach to medical anthropological research. *Medical Anthropology Newsletter*, 8(4), 11-15.
- Kleinman, A. (1980). *Patients and healers in the context of culture: An exploration of the borderland between anthropology, medicine, and psychiatry* (Vol. 3): Univ of California Press.
- Kleinman, A. (1982). The teaching of clinically applied medical anthropology on a psychiatric consultation-liaison service. In *Clinically applied anthropology: Anthropologists in health science settings* (pp. 83-115): Springer.
- Kleinman, A. (2001). Why psychiatry and cultural anthropology still need each other. *Psychiatry*, 64(1), 14-16.
- Kleinman, A. (2012). Medical anthropology and mental health: Five questions for the next fifty years. *Medical anthropology at the intersections: histories, activisms, and futures*, 116-128.
- Kleinman, A. (2020). Concepts and a model for the comparison of medical systems as cultural systems. In *Concepts of health, illness and disease* (pp. 27-47): Routledge.
- Konner, M. (1991). The promise of medical anthropology: An invited commentary. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 5(1), 78-82.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1992). Culture and health-related schemas: a review and proposal for interdisciplinary integration. *Health psychology*, 11(4), 267.
- Leatherman, T., & Goodman, A. H. (2011). Critical biocultural approaches in medical anthropology. *A companion to medical anthropology*, 29-48.
- Lemelson, R., & Tucker, A. (2017). *Afflictions: Steps toward a visual psychological anthropology*: Springer.
- Levin, B. W., & Browner, C. H. (2005). The social production of health: Critical contributions from evolutionary, biological, and cultural anthropology. *Social Science & Medicine*, 61(4), 745-750.
- Levine, R. A. (1999). An agenda for psychological anthropology. *Ethos*, 27(1), 15-24.
- LeVine, R. A. (2010). *Psychological anthropology: A reader on self in culture*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lock, M., & Nichter, M. (2003). *New horizons in medical anthropology: essays in honour of Charles Leslie* (Vol. 8): Routledge.
- Lock, M., & Schepers-Hughes, N. (1987). The mindful body: a prolegomenon to future work in medical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 1(1), 6-41.
- Luborsky, M. R. (1995). Questioning the allure of aging and health for medical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 277-281.
- Lyons, A. C., & Chamberlain, K. (2006). *Health psychology: A critical introduction*: Cambridge University Press.
- Maretzki, T. W. (1980). Reflections on clinical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Newsletter*, 12(1), 19-21.

- Mason, K. A., Willen, S. S., Holmes, S. M., Herd, D. A., Nichter, M., Castañeda, H., & Hansen, H. (2020). How do you build a “culture of health”? A critical analysis of challenges and opportunities from medical anthropology. *Population health management, 23*(6), 476-481.
- Mattingly, C., Lutkehaus, N. C., & Throop, C. J. (2008). Bruner's search for meaning: A conversation between psychology and anthropology. *Ethos, 36*(1), 1-28.
- McCLEMENT*, S. E., & WOODGATE*, R. L. (1997). Care of the terminally ill cachectic cancer patient: interface between nursing and psychological anthropology. *European Journal of Cancer Care, 6*(4), 295-303.
- McElroy, A. (1990). Biocultural models in studies of human health and adaptation. In (Vol. 4, pp. 243-265): Wiley Online Library.
- McElroy, A. (2018). *Medical anthropology in ecological perspective*: Routledge.
- McMahan, B., & Nichter, M. (2011). Medical Anthropology. *Encyclopedia of Environmental Health, 674*.
- Momin, A. (1996). Towards an Islamic medical anthropology. *Journal of the Islamic Medical Association of North America, 28*(4).
- Morsy, S. (1979). The missing link in medical anthropology: The political economy of health. *Reviews in Anthropology, 6*(3), 349-363.
- Napier, A. D., Ancarno, C., Butler, B., Calabrese, J., Chater, A., Chatterjee, H., . . . Jadhav, S. (2014). Culture and health. *The Lancet, 384*(9954), 1607-1639.
- Ness, R. C. (1982). Medical anthropology in a preclinical curriculum. In *Clinically Applied Anthropology: Anthropologists in Health Science Settings* (pp. 35-59): Springer.
- Nichter, M. (2008). Coming to our senses: Appreciating the sensorial in medical anthropology. *Transcultural psychiatry, 45*(2), 163-197.
- Ory, M. G. (1995). Aging, health, and culture: The contribution of medical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 9*(2), 281-283.
- Panter-Brick, C., & Eggerman, M. (2018). The field of medical anthropology in Social Science & Medicine. *Social Science & Medicine, 196*, 233-239.
- Parker, M., & Harper, I. (2006). The anthropology of public health. *Journal of biosocial science, 38*(1), 1-5.
- Patel, V. (2023). Cultural factors and international epidemiology. *Medical Anthropology, 75-87*.
- Pelto, P. J. (1967). Psychological anthropology. *Biennial review of anthropology, 5*, 140-208.
- Pelto, P. J., & Pelto, G. H. (1997). Studying knowledge, culture, and behavior in applied medical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 11*(2), 147-163.
- Pfifferling, J. H. (1976). Medical anthropology: Mirror for medicine.
- Pillay, I. (2021). Culture, politics and being more equal than others in COVID-19: some psychological anthropology perspectives. *South African Journal of Psychology, 51*(2), 325-335.
- Pool, R., & Geissler, W. (2005). *Medical anthropology*: McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Quesada, J., Hart, L. K., & Bourgois, P. (2011). Structural vulnerability and health: Latino migrant laborers in the United States. *Medical Anthropology, 30*(4), 339-362.
- Rashed, T. G., & Galal, M. (2015). *Culture and health: A study in Medical Anthropology in Kenya*. Paper presented at the Presented on the 30th Annual International Conference of the Institute of African Research and Studies themed Human Security in Africa in May.
- Roch, E. (2017). Anthropology and its relevance to psychiatry. *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine, 34*(2), 85-88.
- Schepher-Hughes, N. (1992). 11 Hungry Hungry bodies, medicine, and the state: toward a critical psychological anthropology. *New directions in psychological anthropology*(3), 221.
- Schepher-Hughes, N., & Lock, M. M. (1987). The mindful body: A prolegomenon to future work in medical anthropology. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 1*(1), 6-41.
- Schwartz, T., White, G. M., & Lutz, C. A. (1992). *New directions in psychological anthropology*: Cambridge University Press.
- Scotch, N. A. (1963). Medical anthropology. *Biennial review of anthropology, 3*, 30-68.
- Sheehan, C. (2022). Psychological anthropology and medical anthropology: a brief history of ideas and concepts. *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine, 39*(2), 115-120.
- Singer, M. (1989). The coming of age of critical medical anthropology. *Social Science & Medicine, 28*(11), 1193-1203.
- Singer, M. (1990). Reinventing medical anthropology: toward a critical realignment. *Social Science & Medicine, 30*(2), 179-187.
- Singer, M. (2016). *A companion to the anthropology of environmental health*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Singer, M., & Baer, H. (2004). Critical medical anthropology. *Encyclopedia of Medical Anthropology: Health and Illness in the world's of Cultures, 23-30*.
- Singer, M., & Baer, H. (2018). *Critical medical anthropology*: Routledge.
- Singer, M., Baer, H., Long, D., & Pavlotski, A. (2019). *Introducing medical anthropology: a discipline in action*: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Stein, H. F. (1992). Medical anthropology and the depths of human experience: contributions from psychoanalytic anthropology. *Medical Anthropology, 14*(1), 53-75.
- Stein, H. F. (1995). Cultural Demystification and Medical Anthropology: Some Answers in Search of Questions--A Commentary on Singer. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 9*(1), 113-117.
- Trostle, J. A., & Sommerfeld, J. (1996). Medical anthropology and epidemiology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 25*(1), 253-274.

- Trotter, R. T. (2022). Applied Medical Anthropology: Praxis, Pragmatics, Politics, and Promises. *A companion to medical anthropology*, 49-66.
- Van der Geest, S. (2014). Medical anthropology. *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of health, illness, behavior, and society*, 1313-1324.
- van der Geest, S., & Reis, R. (2005). Reflections on Medical Anthropology. In: Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis Publishers.
- Van Dongen, E. (1997). Courses in medical anthropology: The Netherlands.
- Van Dongen, E., & Fainzang, S. (1998). Medical anthropology at home: creating. *Anthropology & medicine*, 5(3), 245.
- Ventevogel, P. (2016). *Borderlands of mental health: explorations in medical anthropology, psychiatric epidemiology and health systems research in Afghanistan and Burundi*. Peter Ventevogel.
- Weisner, T. S. (2018). Psychological anthropology and the study of disability. *Autism in Translation: An Intercultural Conversation on Autism Spectrum Conditions*, 263-281.
- Weisner, T. S., & Lowe, E. D. (2005). Globalization, childhood, and psychological anthropology. *A companion to psychological anthropology: Modernity and psychocultural change*, 315-336.
- Wentzell, E., & Labuski, C. (2020). Role of medical anthropology in understanding cultural differences in sexuality. *Cultural Differences and the Practice of Sexual Medicine: A Guide for Sexual Health Practitioners*, 23-35.
- Whitley, R. (2014). Beyond critique: rethinking roles for the anthropology of mental health. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 38, 499-511.
- Willen, S. S., & Mulligan, J. (2012). Society for Medical Anthropology.
- Williams, T. R. (2011). *Psychological anthropology*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Winkelman, M. (2008). *Culture and health: Applying medical anthropology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Womack, M. (2009). *The anthropology of health and healing*. Rowman Altamira.
- Yoder, P. S. (1997). Negotiating relevance: belief, knowledge, and practice in international health projects. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 11(2), 131-146.
- Zlatanović, L. (2016). Self-efficacy and health behaviour: Some implications for medical anthropology. *Glasnik Antropološkog društva Srbije*, 51(1-2), 17-25.

© 2023, 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.

