



Why We Post: Digital methods for public anthropology

Laura Haapio-Kirk
University College London

Abstract:

In an uncertain world, fear of 'the other' and anxiety around technological development permeates public discourse, from which anthropology is often absent. But anthropology offers perhaps the best way to foster an appreciation of cultural diversity by presenting people with the culturally-constructed nature of very familiar topics, such as social media. Based on ethnographic research on digital learning and extensive public dissemination from the Why We Post project at UCL Anthropology, this paper outlines how networked learning can benefit pedagogy and enable anthropological teaching to reach beyond the University. The paper demonstrates how a spectrum of digital dissemination, ranging from the academic (such as journal papers) to the public (such as open access books, a website, and a MOOC), can transform anthropological research into global education whilst maintaining intellectual integrity. While digital tools can help to spread anthropological ideas, greater support for public engagement is required within the discipline and academia in general for anthropology to be elevated in the public consciousness.

Introduction

The theme of this special issue, 'teaching anthropology in uncertain times', raises the question: what markers of uncertainty are we talking about? Uncertainty and risk are central features of social life and political discourse in western societies, argues Lupton (2013). One of the more topical and global manifestations of uncertainty today is increasing migration and an often politically-motivated cultivation of fear of 'the other'. Lupton argues that the presence of marginalised individuals who cannot be readily categorised within a society can elicit a sense of uncertainty among a dominant group, associated with fears of risk or danger. This argument builds on Douglas's (2013) idea that an individual's assessment of risk is influenced by their position in a stratified sociocultural system and by notions of group solidarity. Recent work on uncertainty (Samimian-Darash 2013) moves beyond the conceptual conflation with risk, seeking to understand different types of uncertainty, such as 'potential' and 'possible' uncertainty which gives rise to questions about how the future is governed through 'preparedness technologies', such as vaccine stockpiles. This paper argues that when considering how to best prepare for uncertain futures, we should include anthropological education as central to the task. If 'the other' embodies uncertainty, then it is the responsibility of anthropologists who customarily dwell in a space of uncertainty between their own social norms and those of the people they study, to shift the perspective through education from a reactionary 'us versus them' to an appreciation of diversity.

This paper proposes that digital pedagogical tools offer anthropologists a means to teach a critical engagement with uncertainty, reaching especially beyond academia where intervention appears to be most urgent. These same tools also offer an opportunity to make anthropology more participatory, by presenting findings to the populations studied in a manner that is both accessible and invites critique and continuing dialogue. The paper outlines the motivation behind a spectrum of research dissemination created for the Why We Post (WWP) project at the Department of Anthropology, University College London. It goes on to discuss the reception of these materials which include open access books¹, an online course², and a public-facing website³. It suggests that this broad dissemination spectrum offers a means to attract public attention to anthropological insights whilst maintaining a commitment to academic integrity, thus addressing the uncertainty with which public

anthropology has historically been regarded within the discipline (Borofsky 2010). The dissemination strategy described builds on ethnographic observations from the project's nine field sites of the use of digital media for education, and draws on ideas of active (Piaget 1976) and social (Vygotsky 1978) learning, Situated Learning Theory (Lave 1991, Wenger 1998), and connected learning (Ito et. al. 2012).

Extensive public dissemination, as in the case of WWP, requires large amounts of effort and coordination, on top of which researchers must also satisfy the demands associated with being part of the academic job market. So, why should anthropological dissemination aim to reach beyond academia? Anthropological research can have profound social impact when combined with advocacy, especially when exposing previously hidden worlds, as demonstrated, for example, by the work of Scheper-Hughes (1995) on organ trafficking. However, from a more general perspective, public anthropological dissemination can aim to directly challenge limiting cultural assumptions and provoke a deeper engagement with topical issues. Since anthropological research is largely publicly funded, is there not a duty to return anthropological insights to the public domain, especially if doing so might lead to increased understanding and tolerance in today's uncertain world? For anthropological ideas to reach beyond academia, the value of anthropological engagement and education outside of the University setting must be institutionally recognised. As argued by Eriksen (2006, 2008), a widespread public awareness of anthropology in Norway, and the involvement of anthropologists in policy and public discourse there, can be linked to the discipline's presence in the country's school curriculum. The planned withdrawal in 2018 of the only Anthropology A-level (the highest secondary school qualification) offered by a UK exam board, indicates a lack of appreciation of the discipline's value by those making such decisions. The AQA exam board cited new government accreditation requirements, low student numbers, and a lack of experienced examiners as reasoning (Bennett and Mills 2016), yet the A level had been given little time to mature since it launched in 2010. The withdrawal was met with an outcry from Anthropology teachers and students, in the UK and internationally, who petitioned to have the decision revoked, sadly to no effect. In anthropology's defence, teachers argued for the discipline's transformative potential: they reported that students became less judgmental and more respectful of other cultures during their anthropological studies (Gadsby, Latham, Maric 2016). This effect is pertinent in places such as London schools, where cultural diversity is the norm, but is essential where a lack of diversity may result in the dominance of certain groups and the rise of sectarianism (Douglas 2007). As Ford (2016) notes, the A-level was beginning to be taught at state schools and colleges as well as private institutions, not only widening access to anthropology but causing a ripple effect in awareness of the discipline in the UK. For this ripple of awareness to continue to expand, we must create new ways to reach beyond the University.

The first half of the twentieth century and the era of colonialism afforded social anthropology a stronger public profile than is the case today (Bennett 2015). In the 1950s, leading anthropologists presented their ideas in *A Series of Broadcast Talks* for the BBC. These talks were subsequently published (Evans-Pritchard 1956) in an effort towards public anthropology, with Evans Prichard stating in the introduction:

It is the duty of anthropologists themselves to present to the reading public from time to time, and in a more popular form, the conclusions they have reached and the problems they are seeking to solve. (Evans-Pritchard 1956)

However, in the second half of the twentieth century, the anthropological establishment was intellectually defensive and withdrew from public engagement (Leach 1974). Today anthropologists are largely absent from public discourse on the major issues of our times, with other disciplinary perspectives, notably from psychology and economics, often taking centre stage (Ingold 2016). Comaroff (2010) argues that anthropology has always been characterised by a sense of uncertainty with regard to its disciplinary boundaries and uniqueness and that 'the end of anthropology' has been predicted at various stages in the discipline's history. Yet Comaroff asserts that perhaps it is precisely this deep-rooted uncertainty, and a resulting urgency to prove anthropology's worth, which continues to revitalise the discipline. The methods of ethnography may be appropriated by other disciplines, and indeed there may be internal disagreement over the terms 'ethnography' and even 'anthropology' (see debates contained in *Hau's* 'Two or three things I love or hate about ethnography' [da Col 2017]), but anthropology remains one of the best ways to gain a holistic and sometimes comparative perspective on highly dynamic global phenomena. As this paper will outline, digital modes of dissemination make it possible to link layers of analysis, from stories about individuals through to theoretical propositions, in ways that draw out the holistic and comparative potential of anthropology. With digital tools we can also deeply engage a broad spectrum of audiences, and extend our dialogue with the communities we study beyond fieldwork. This paper proposes that uncertain times call for a creative response from anthropologists. With digital technologies we have an opportunity to try new ways of engaging wider audiences, and perhaps even new ways of practicing the discipline.

Why We Post and Ethnographically-Nuanced Education

Led by Daniel Miller, the WWP project involved nine anthropologists investigating the uses and consequences of social media in fieldsites around the world. The resulting comparative evidence challenges broad assumptions which dominate public discourse⁴, such as that social media is making us more individualistic⁵, which often stem from survey or experiment-based fields like psychology. The WWP series of eleven books show, by contrast, that social media consists largely of content that expresses local social and cultural values and concerns. For this reason, the project's comparative book is called 'How the World Changed Social Media' (Miller et. al. 2016), not 'how social media changed the world'. One of the topics under scrutiny was how the internet, which participants typically accessed via smartphones and mostly using social media, impacts education. The cross-cultural comparative findings suggest that attitudes towards formal learning in classrooms and informal learning represented by digital technologies are locally derived, based on wider attitudes towards education and the value of computer literacy (Miller et. al. 2016). Social media can be viewed by students' parents and teachers as a distraction from education, as in the English and Turkish fieldsites. However, in low-income areas with poor educational facilities, such as our Brazilian fieldsite, infographics and short YouTube videos tended to be viewed as a valuable source of education. The Indian fieldsite presented both perspectives, with parents and teachers of students from affluent backgrounds regarding social media as a distraction to be monitored and curtailed, while poorer families encouraged social media use among their children. The latter saw social media as a means to achieve social mobility and develop technological competencies required to succeed in the emerging knowledge economy (Venkatraman 2017).

Smartphones and social media are accelerating social change in many parts of the world, bringing uncertainty and a need to redefine once taken-for-granted areas of life such as friendship (Miller 2017) and work (Venkatraman 2017). These same technologies can also be used within the context of teaching anthropology to promote a deep and nuanced understanding of such changes through public engagement. Designing the WWP spectrum of dissemination also required embracing multiple levels of uncertainty. For example, it was impossible to answer certain questions: who will use the material, how will the network of material be navigated, and how will people respond to the findings? Uncertainty extends even further when considering the longevity of such materials: will economic pressures change the business model of a chosen platform in a way that affects future accessibility? How long before our findings on social media, a rapidly changing phenomenon, become obsolete? What is clear from the *WWP* research is that digital educational media should be incorporated within local cultural models, broader pedagogies (which are also deeply cultural [Alexander 2005]), and curriculum development within schools (Warschauer, Cotton, and Ames 2011). The dissemination strategy for *WWP* combined a range of learning approaches in the hope that different formats would appeal to different learners. For example, the project produced [videos](#) in which members of the team describe elements of their fieldwork and findings in an instructional manner (Skinner 1953), such as in [this film about Chinese social media](#). But these same videos are then embedded within the online course, which invites learners to question what they have heard and compare it with their own experiences (Lave, 1991). The FutureLearn platform on which the WWP MOOC (massive open online course) is hosted encourages collaborative peer learning through the use of comments after every step of the course, following social constructivist learning theory (Siemens 2005; Piaget 1976; Vygotsky 1978).

The WWP research observed how people combine both on- and offline activities to construct their own learning networks. For example, in the rural China field site school children make use of 'QQ Groups' (instant messaging groups) comprising the entire class to help each other with homework. This was especially important in the rural Chinese context where physical proximity to other students was limited, and parents had little education so could not provide support (Miller, et. al. 2016). This is why the WWP spectrum of dissemination has multiple entry points, and learners are free to navigate by their particular interests, building on Ito et. al.'s (2012) work on connected learning. The WWP website is structured to facilitate not only interest-driven learning but cross-cultural comparison, for example a user can explore content from the nine fieldsites related to a particular 'discovery', such as the impact of social media on education, by going to that particular discovery page and viewing stories, short articles, and videos. Mohammid (2016), one of the educational advisors to the WWP team, noted the increasing centrality of short (around five minutes in length) online videos to both formal and informal learning in Trinidad. This observation was also made by Spyer (forthcoming2017) in his Brazilian WWP fieldsite. Spyer found that tutorial videos were often sought in order to learn practical skills or as in the film [here](#), hairdressing techniques. Learning via videos was important especially among the low-income and sometimes illiterate people in Spyer's fieldsite who preferred to listen to and watch instructions rather than read them or follow diagrams. These observations were one of the reasons why short videos became central to WWP's most public dissemination. On their own, these videos do not convey the richness and complexity of the project's

data, but when embedded on the website and in the online course, they are incorporated within a network of potential learning.

If we assess digital learning technologies in terms of efficiency, engagement, and effectiveness - 'the three Es' (Merrill 2009) - we see that they have the potential to cut the time and cost of teaching, foster a more of a hands-on approach for more engaged learning, and make learning more effective by enabling collaboration and dialogue (Alexander 2008). However, simply taking advantage of new digital educational tools is not a magic pill for improved learning; it can also be a distraction and lead to shallow or simplistic representation (Watson 2001). Building on Situated Learning Theory, which emphasises the embedded nature of learning in social spaces (Mohammad 2016, Lave 1991, Wenger 1998), the WWP project demonstrated how learning is dependent on a wider context involving a learner's social relationships, access to technology, and possession of skills to select and process information. In the digital age learning is not location, time, or person-dependent, but it is constrained by a learner's digital literacy and ability to identify valuable knowledge among vast amounts of information (Downs 2016, Siemens 2005). The project found that the impact of social inequality on learning is not remedied by simply putting education online. By making dissemination material available in the languages of the field sites and by anticipating potential barriers to access, WWP attempted to overcome some of the educational inequalities and uncertainties between its field sites. For example, the e-course was made available in DVD format in Tamil and Hindi for distribution in rural India to colleges and libraries where internet access was not guaranteed. However, a wider lack of appreciation of anthropological knowledge combined with a preference for forms of education revolving around professional development affected the success of the WWP course in India. Despite the provision of translated and accessible learning materials, it is clear that the success of digital education is dependent on local, and often unforeseen, circumstances.

A Spectrum of Research Dissemination

The WWP project was conceived as having a broad appeal from the outset due to its popular topic. Hoping to inspire the next generation of social anthropologists, WWP used perhaps the single most relatable topic with regard to young people - social media - to demonstrate how a seemingly global technology is actually culturally specific. A teenager in England might take for granted that the best kinds of photos to post on social media are those taken with friends, especially with members of the opposite sex. In the Turkish site the situation is very different, with teenagers preferring to post photos of food rather than images of people, as a way to avoid gossip. Rather than envisaging only an academic audience, the intention was to create a spectrum of dissemination that meets people at various levels, ranging from the more academic (for example journal articles) to the more public (the website and online course), allowing varied audiences many entry points to the research, and multiple routes to the open access books which is where the core of the evidence lies. The WWP team hoped that this way people would be drawn into an appreciation of anthropology itself, which could be followed by increasing demand for the discipline. Since the measurement of such qualitative shifts would be extremely difficult without extensive ethnographic engagement with learners, uncertainty surrounds the intangible societal impact of the WWP project, yet that does not preclude its potential for positive pedagogical outcomes.

The WWP project embraced the dual responsibility of both publishing academic results in full, with all the rich contextual details derived from nine fieldsites contained in over 2,000 pages of evidence, but also of conveying the key findings to non-academic audiences who might only engage with more succinct output. For most anthropological projects the resulting monographs would, along with journal articles, represent an engagement only within academia, but the publication of the open access book series with UCL Press was intended to break the mold. The WWP monographs are written in a way as to be appreciated by a wide audience, with jargon-free text and discussion of other academic literature kept to footnotes. The project blog⁶, running since 2012, provided a platform for the team to hone their writing skills necessary for communicating to a general public. Since the research was global and encompassing in outlook, the team considered it important that the results should be disseminated to that same global audience, specifically to the regions under study. For this reason the project translated the e-course and website (including 130 films) into the six languages of the field sites besides English. The books are currently in translation, to be published as open access by UCL Press.

In 2016 the WWP project was incorporated into the curriculum of the OCR Sociology A level, under the 'Globalisation and the Digital World' unit⁷. While this inclusion could be seen as another marker of anthropology's uncertain future, with the potential that sociology may subsume anthropology, the WWP team were pleased that anthropology would continue to have a presence in the English school system after the demise of the AQA Anthropology A level.⁸ This inclusion was met with appreciation from sociology teachers who had expressed uncertainty about how to best teach the topic and relate it to contemporary and accessible research. Some teachers reported that their entire class had taken the MOOC and they had used it for classroom

discussion. In addition, the WWP team have led workshops for teachers in association with OCR, encouraging teachers to use the material in whichever way they see fit, since all of the project's output is open access and held under a creative commons license. The project created an example worksheet which condenses material from the books and online course, available to download from resourcd.com⁹. The team have also given talks at schools, directly introducing students to the range of online dissemination. For example, on several occasions Miller has screened this [short film](#) within schools to facilitate discussion with pupils about the more negative uses of social media in relation to bullying.

Finally, the most public mode of dissemination is the project's own output on social media¹⁰. While it might be expected that WWP would foreground this mode of communication since the research is about social media, it was most effective when embedded within this wider spectrum of dissemination. For example, learners on the FutureLearn course became ambassadors for the project on social media, primarily on Twitter, where they shared insights from the course and continued their conversations outside of FutureLearn. However the team did purposefully make content that was social media friendly, such as sharing insights as infographics and turning discoveries into cat memes.

Outcomes and Evaluation

The extensive WWP public output demonstrates the extraordinary potential of digital technologies for disseminating anthropological ideas. For instance, the open access WWP book series launched with three books in February 2016 and by June 2017 the eight books published so far have almost a quarter of a million downloads¹¹. 'Social Media in Industrial China' (Wang, 2016) was published in September 2016 and has already been downloaded over 30,000 times. Prior to open access publishing, it would have been unimaginable that an ethnographic monograph about a Chinese factory could reach such an audience. Equally significant is the global range of readership of the series. In a year since the launch there were over 2,400 downloads in the Philippines, 1,400 in Ethiopia and over 1,000 in Pakistan. These figures all apply to the English versions of the books, which is encouraging for the prospects of the translated series. The hope is that the translated books will help to demonstrate the potential of the discipline in regions where the future of anthropology is uncertain.

The WWP MOOC is also geographically far-reaching; the map below indicates the global spread of learners on the first run of the course back in February 2016. Since then there have been subsequent runs, with 12,000 people taking the course on FutureLearn and 14,500 in total when considering the translated versions on UCL Extend. While these numbers are impressive, especially when compared to the numbers of students reached on a typical university course, it is uncertain how the learning experience compares with traditional offline courses. One marker of comparison is learner retention: the WWP course followed typical FutureLearn user behaviour with a majority of learners dropping-off after week one. While the design of the course mimics offline learning to enable a cohort of students to progress through the course at the same time, therefore facilitating interactivity, it seems that MOOCs still have a way to go to come fully in to their own as digital learning environments, not bounded by the same constraints that determine the structure of offline courses.



Fig. 1. Locations of learners who chose to locate themselves on a map on the first run of 'Why We Post: the Anthropology of Social Media' on FutureLearn. Source: ZeeMaps.

The post-course survey from the first run of the FutureLearn course indicated that social interactivity had enhanced learning (90% of respondents agreed). A lack of interactivity therefore may have contributed to why the translated courses, hosted on UCL's own learning platform called UCLeXtend¹², didn't have the same degree of success as the FutureLearn course. Social functionality is not as central on UCLeXtend and also it is simply not as supported in terms of having an active user base and a high number of new daily registrants. After an article on the theory of scalable sociality in the first run of the FutureLearn course there were over 1,100 comments, many of which showed deep engagement with the idea. Many comments from students, both in the post-course survey and within the course itself, expressed the value of reading about the experiences of other learners from around the world. MOOCs represent a new and powerful means of not only engaging directly with others in a dialogue about culture and difference, but for encouraging such dialogue between peers. While the team interjected with comments to offer guidance and answer questions, the community which gathered at every course run provided an essential learning element, as this learner testimonial describes:

I've really enjoyed dipping into anthropology and it's taught me a lot about what SM means to different people. And thanks to all the contributors to the discussions, too - you've added a lot to my enjoyment and my understanding. (Anonymous, FutureLearn: Why We Post 2016)

The post-course survey revealed that 40% of learners had studied the subject area (anthropology or social media) before, so perhaps the online course was not the place where the project would reach the widest audience. Perhaps that would be on YouTube where the course videos were duplicated, or on other social media channels. Encouragingly, survey responses indicated that the course increased people's interest in the field of anthropology and in digital anthropology in particular. To learn from the WWP project it is important to be honest about what went wrong in this experiment in dissemination. For example, the translated courses on UCLeXtend attracted a total of about 2,500 registrants across the six languages, however most sign-ups and social activity occurred within one month of the launch of the project in February 2016, after which activity dropped off. Whereas the first FutureLearn course run had over 4,500 active learners, and on subsequent runs this number was an average of 2,300. This indicates that the FutureLearn model of periodic course runs works well to keep a cohort of learners engaged, and to drive new sign-ups. There was a clear logic behind the WWP spectrum of dissemination, but the way that people engaged with the material was surprising. For example there were no significant spikes in book downloads when the FutureLearn courses were running. This leads to new questions regarding the success of the open access series in different places. As anthropologists we are sceptical of relying on surveys and statistics to inform our understanding of the true impact of the WWP dissemination. Uncertainty remains regarding its overall impact when contextualised in people's wider lives.

Finally, the WWP project demonstrates that using digital methods to improve public engagement in anthropology can actually have simultaneous benefits for the practice of anthropology. A combination of open access, translated content, and accessible writing facilitated engagement with, and criticism from, the people we study. Just as digital technology has allowed research to continue beyond the initial ethnographic encounter in the field, the same technology can expand how we present our results and make the discipline more participatory. The communities that form around online education, such as learners on MOOCs, offer an enthusiastic and willing cohort of potential research participants and discussants. Anthropological pedagogy can benefit from the social dynamics of MOOCs, with learning often involving a global cohort of students, bringing a sense of discovery and intimacy to cross-cultural peer-to-peer exchange. Uncertainty surrounding public anthropology appears to stem from a conflation of objectivity and professionalism with distance, common in the social sciences (Borofsky 2010). However, this paper has demonstrated how digital technology enables us to pursue engagement that is both accessible and collaborative, yet is rigorously grounded in scholarship. By linking digital forms of engagement to open access books, audiences can not only get a sense of the depth of scholarship but can also explore the connections and disparities between multiple field sites on common topics, thus allowing for truly comparative dissemination of a comparative project.

Conclusion

In an uncertain and rapidly changing world is it possible for anthropology to keep up? Our methods are slow, yet the WWP project has shown that they are well-suited to dealing with highly dynamic phenomena such as social media. The WWP spectrum of digital dissemination facilitated active and networked learning, enabling learners to access both the project's more public output and the more academic. Over-simplification is avoided since one can clearly see how general statements are nuanced by cross-cultural caveats from nine different field sites, for example in the way that discoveries are presented on the WWP website. This contextualisation is deepened as one explores more extensive discussion within the MOOC. Finally, at the level of the individual monographs, a commitment to cultural relativism is demonstrated in rich ethnographic description about the particularities of the field sites. By creating clear linkages between the different layers of dissemination, academic integrity is protected and both generalisation and specificity are conveyed.

We must respond to uncertainty not by withdrawing into conservatism, but by building on the generative capacity inherent in uncertainty, taking risks with our research and teaching, experimenting with new digital technologies, and by using our anthropological insights for practical purposes, not least to improve teaching and learning in anthropology. In the WWP case we aimed to design globally accessible educational materials that would demonstrate cultural difference by exploiting the popular topic of social media. With nearly a quarter of a million global downloads from our books less than a year and a half after launch, we believe this popularity demonstrates the public appeal of an anthropological perspective on contemporary phenomena. The WWP project benefited from generous ERC funding which allowed for the employment of a public engagement fellow to manage the implementation of the dissemination for the last 18 months of the project. As the occupant of that position I witnessed the struggle faced by the team despite such support to juggle public output at the same time as writing up research, publishing academic papers, and securing jobs in academia. For the kind of extensive dissemination employed by the WWP project to be replicable by other researchers, there needs to be greater institutional support for non-traditional modes of teaching. We were also fortunate to benefit from the expertise of UCL's Digital Education team and FutureLearn in developing a successful e-course. However, the creativity, time, and effort required to produce digital educational content such as MOOCs is not currently valued in the same way as offline education by the modes of evaluation that academics are subject to, such as processes of tenure review. If public engagement is institutionally undervalued within anthropology, there is little chance for anthropology to be valued widely outside of the discipline.

There is the danger that an emphasis on public engagement could lead to the neglect of communicating with academic audiences. However, the main academic contribution of the WWP project is not just the open access book series, but also journal articles¹³ that are specifically designed to engage in academic debate. In addition, the team felt that the skills they developed by writing content for the MOOC and website were valuable, not only for communicating with the public but also for developing their academic arguments. We should not be limited by narrow conceptions of dissemination or indeed by the apparent divide between public and academic anthropology, especially when it comes to producing ethnographically-nuanced modes of education. Teaching an appreciation of the richness of diversity around the world by presenting learners with topics as familiar as social media, but appropriated in vastly different forms, can be a tool for both personal and societal transformation. We have a duty to promote to as broad an audience as possible the kind of cultural sensitivity that anthropologists take for granted, so that people who see cultural difference as a potential source of anxiety,

might come to appreciate, and even delight in, the multitude of ways there are to be human. A sense of uncertainty can be a good place from which to start.

Acknowledgements:

I am grateful to the following people for comments on earlier drafts of this article: Daniel Miller, Andrew Cropper, Matt Jenner, and an anonymous reviewer.

References:

- Alexander, R. J. (2005). 'Culture, dialogue and learning: notes on an emerging pedagogy', *International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology (LACEP) 10th International Conference*, University of Durham, UK, 10-14 July 2005. [Lecture]. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.617.1955&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- (2008). 'Culture, dialogue and learning: Notes on an emerging pedagogy', in N. Mercer and S. Hodgkinson (eds), *Exploring talk in school*, Sage, pp. 91-114.
- Balzani, M. (2016), 'The Chief Examiner Role in Pre-University Anthropology: personal reflections', *Teaching Anthropology*, 6: 28-36. Retrieved from https://www.teachinganthropology.org/index.php/teach_anth/article/view/441
- BBC Future 9/3/2017. 'Why China's internet use has overtaken the West' by D. Robson. Retrieved 10 March 2017 from <http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20170309-why-chinas-internet-reveals-where-were-headed-ourselves>
- Bennett, D. (2015). 'The Global Financial Crisis, Anthropology and Public Education: A Review Essay', *Teaching Anthropology*, 5: 64-73. Retrieved from https://www.teachinganthropology.org/index.php/teach_anth/article/view/384
- and Mills, D. (2016). 'The Anthropology A-level: A retrospective', *Teaching Anthropology*, 6: 1-5
- Borofsky, R. (2010). *Why a public anthropology?*. Kaneohe, Hawaii: Center for a Public Anthropology, Hawaii Pacific University.
- Carey, M. (2012). 'The rules in Morocco? Pragmatic approaches to flirtation and lying', *HAAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 2(2): 188-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14318/hau2.2.011>
- Comaroff, J. (2010). 'The End of Anthropology, Again: On the Future of an In/Discipline', *American Anthropologist*. American Anthropological Association 112(4): 524-38.
- Douglas, M. (2007). *Seeing Everything in Black and White*. [Lecture]. Retrieved from <http://projects.chass.utoronto.ca/semiotics/cyber/douglas2.pdf>
- (2013). *Risk and blame: Essays in Cultural Theory*, London: Routledge.
- Downes, S. (2006). 'Learning networks and connective knowledge', in H., H. Yang and S. C. Yuen (eds), *Collective intelligence and elearning 2.0*, Hershey, New York: Information Science Reference, pp. 1-26.
- The Economist (5/3/2016). 'The medium is the messengers', Retrieved 1 February 2017 from <http://www.economist.com/news/science-and-technology/21693905-global-study-reveals-how-people-fit-social-media-their-lives-medium>
- Eriksen, T. H. (2006). *Engaging Anthropology*, Oxford: Berg.
- (2008). 'The Otherness of Norwegian Anthropology', in A. Boskovic (ed) *Other People's Anthropologies*, Oxford: Berghahn, pp.169-185.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1954). *The Institutions of Primitive Societies: A Series of Broadcast Talks*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Ford, E. (2016). 'Beyond Anthropology A level: opening up anthropology education', *Teaching Anthropology*, 6: 40-46. Retrieved from https://www.teachinganthropology.org/index.php/teach_anth/article/view/443
- Gadsby, J., Latham, D., and Maric, T. (2016). 'Teaching Experiences', *Teaching Anthropology*, 6: 20-25. Retrieved from https://www.teachinganthropology.org/index.php/teach_anth/article/view/439
- da Col, G. (2017). 'Debate Collection: Two or three things I love or hate about ethnography', *Hau* 7(1): 1-69. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14318/hau7.1>
- Ingold, T. (2016). 'Tim Ingold on the Future of Academic Publishing', *Allegra Lab* [Online]. Retrieved from <http://allegralaboratory.net/interview-tim-ingold-on-the-future-of-academic-publishing/>
- Ito, M., Gutiérrez, K. D., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J. E., Salen Tekinbas, K., Schor, J., Sefton-Green, J., and Watkins, S. C. (2012). *Connected learning: An agenda for research and design*, Digital Media and Language Research Hub. Retrieved from <https://dmlhub.net/publications/connected-learning-agenda-for-research-and-design/>
- Lave, J. (1991). 'Situating learning in communities of practice', in L. Resnick, B. M. J. Levine, and S. D. Teasley (eds), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 63-82. Retrieved from <http://www1.udel.edu/educ/whitson/files/Lave%20Situating%20learning%20in%20communities%20of%20practice.pdf>
- Lupton, D. (2013). *Risk: key ideas*, Cambridge and New York: Routledge.
- McAuley, A., Stewart, B., Siemens, G., and Cormier, D. (2010). 'The MOOC model for digital practice', in *MASSIVE OPEN ONLINE COURSES Digital ways of knowing and learning* [Online]. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ad53/b9655587771edcf4ae028d4490a218d87ff2.pdf>
- Merrill, M. D. (2009). 'Finding e3 (effective, efficient and engaging) Instruction', *Educational Technology*, 49(3): 15-26. Retrieved from http://mdavidmerrill.com/Papers/Designing%20e3_instruction.pdf
- Miller, D. (2017). 'The ideology of friendship in the era of Facebook', in *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 7 (1): 377–395. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14318/hau7.1.025>
- and Costa, E., Haynes, N., McDonald, T., Nicolescu, R., Sinanan, J., Spyer, J., Venkatraman, S. and Wang, X., (2016). *How the world changed social media*. London: UCL Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14324/111.9781910634493>
- and Sinanan, J., (2017). *Visualising Facebook*. London: UCL Press.
- Mohammad, S. (2016). 'Local Literacies at Play: Making and Breaking Learning in Trinidad and Tobago', in L. Robinson, J. Schulz, H. S. Dunn (eds) *Communication and Information Technologies Annual (Studies in Media and Communications, Volume 12)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.131 - 155.
- Piaget, J. (1976). 'Piaget's theory', in *Piaget and his School*, Berlin, Heidelberg, Chicago: Springer, pp. 11-23.
- Pountney, L., and Maric, T. (2015). *Introducing Anthropology: What Makes Us Human*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Samimian-Darash, L. (2013). 'Governing future potential biothreats: Toward an anthropology of uncertainty', *Current Anthropology*, 54(1): 1-22. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1086/669114>
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1995). 'The Primacy of the Ethical: Propositions for a Militant Anthropology', *Current Anthropology*, 36(3): 409-441. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2xq430hc>
- Siemens, G. (2005). 'Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age', *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning (ITDL)*, 2(1):3-10. Retrieved from <http://er.dut.ac.za/handle/123456789/69>
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Simon and Schuster; reprint, 2005, B.F.Skinner Foundation.

Spyer, J. (forthcoming, expected 2017). *Social Media in Emergent Brazil*, London: UCL Press.

Venkatraman, S. (2017). *Social Media in South India*, London: UCL Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781911307914>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, X. (2016). *Social Media in Industrial China*, London: UCL Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14324/111.9781910634646>

Warschauer, M., Cotten, S., Morgan, G., and Ames, M. (2011). 'One Laptop per Child Birmingham: Case Study of a Radical Experiment', *International Journal of Learning and Media*, 3(2): 61-76. https://doi.org/10.1162/ijlm_a_00069

Watson, D. M. (2001). 'Pedagogy before technology: Re-thinking the relationship between ICT and teaching', *Education and Information technologies*, 6(4): 251-266. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012976702296>

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Endnotes

¹ See the entire Why We Post book series on the UCL Press website: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ucl-press/why-we-post>

² The Why We Post MOOC on FutureLearn: <https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/anthropology-social-media>

³ See the Why We Post website: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/why-we-post>

⁴ See for example: 'Users fear social media is making them ill, but they still can't stop', *The Independent* 26/02/2017 (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/smartphone-social-media-apps-mental-health-negative-check-plugged-in-communication-technology-a7600686.html>); 'Friends' pictures on social media have biggest impact on body image', *The Guardian* 05/03/2017 (<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2017/mar/05/friends-pictures-on-social-media-biggest-impact-body-image>).

⁵ See the WWP website for findings related to social media and individualism: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/why-we-post/discoveries/1-social-media-is-not-making-us-more-individualistic/>

⁶ The Why We Post blog: <https://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/global-social-media/>

⁷ See this OCR unit guide for details on the Why We Post inclusion in the curriculum: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/183362-globalisation-and-the-digital-world-delivery-guide.pdf>

⁸ Teachers Laura Pountney and Tomislav Maric, authors of the recent school-level textbook 'Introducing Anthropology' (Pountney and Maric, 2015), were responsible for the inclusion of the WWP project in the sociology curriculum.

⁹ A worksheet on social media and gender can be downloaded from here: <http://www.resourcd.com/@anthropologyexchange/file/show/20828>

¹⁰ See the WWP Facebook page (<https://www.facebook.com/whywepost/>) and Twitter profile (<https://twitter.com/UCLWhyWePost>).

¹¹ Source: UCL Press. 'Downloads' may be of a chapter or an entire book. Figures include data from JSTOR and UCL Discovery, UCL's open access repository.

¹² See translated version of the Why We Post course: <https://extendstore.ucl.ac.uk/product?catalog=UCLXWWP-en>

¹³ For example: Miller, D 2017 The Ideology of Friendship in the era of Facebook. *Hau* 7 (1) 377-395; Costa, E. 2016 The Morality of Premarital Romances *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication* 9 (2), 199-215; McDonald, T. (Submitted Mar 2017, currently undergoing 'revise & resubmit') Strangership and social media: Indeterminate connections with outsiders in rural China. *American Anthropologist*.