

Comparing the Situations of Anthropologists Around the World



A network of national,
regional and international
associations
promoting worldwide
communication and
cooperation in anthropology

Making Anthropology Global
WCAA Task Force

Gordon Mathews, Chair (Hong Kong)
Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto (Chile)
Thomas Hylland Eriksen (Norway)
P-J Ezeh (Nigeria)
Shannon Morreira (South Africa)
Chen Gang (China)
Takami Kuwayama (Japan)

Working Paper/ Document

COMPARING THE SITUATIONS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS AROUND THE WORLD

Introduction

This document was created by the World Council of Anthropological Associations Task Force “Making Anthropology Global,” consisting of Gonzalo Diaz Crovetto, Thomas Hylland Eriksen, P-J Ezech, Shannon Morreira, Yasmeen Arif, Chen Gang, Gordon Mathews (chairperson), and Takami Kuwayama, reporting on Chile, Norway, Nigeria, South Africa, India, China, Hong Kong, and Japan. The task force met via Zoom once a month during the year 2022, with assignments after each meeting, whereby members wrote about the situation of anthropologists in their own societies. Initially, the task force focused on the impact of citation indexes such as the Social Science Citation Index on promotion practices for anthropologists in our different societies; but we soon realized that SSCI was only one factor in how anthropologists were being evaluated, and so we began to examine the more general situations of anthropologists in our different societies. This is the document we have come up with. The chief limitation of this document is that it covers a small range of societies, albeit from a wide geographic range around the world. It is also limited by the fact that different members of the task force joined at different times, leading to some degree of inconsistency in the data presented. We hope that in subsequent versions of this document, we can cover many more societies, to arrive at a full portrayal of the situations of anthropologists everywhere in the world. We look forward to your comments on this document!

1) Anthropologists and Citation Indexes in Different Countries

Chile

Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto

The academic situation in Chile in terms of SSCI citation practices

Anthropology in Chile is currently taught at the undergraduate level, where both professional and academic degrees are awarded in ten universities, both public and private, spread from north to central and south Chile. There are currently five master's programs and two doctoral programs in Anthropology. There are scientific journals specializing in anthropology, as well as other multidisciplinary ones. There is also a Professional Association of Anthropologists that was founded in 1984 and which is responsible, usually in partnership with an university, for organizing the National Congress of Anthropology (the eleventh occurred in January 2023). New and previous generations of anthropologists have been employed as professionals linked to the state, and in the private sector (consulting firms, non-governmental organizations), as well as in universities. Although there was earlier proto-anthropology, the institutionalization of anthropology in Chile was consolidated in the 1960s and 1970s (the Universidad de Concepción, Universidad de Chile and Universidad de Temuco were the first to undertake anthropology as an undergraduate program).

The allocation of national research funds is closely linked to an applicant's CV, which is usually weighted around 40% of the application process - the other 60% is linked to the quality of the project. The National Science Council study group in anthropology and archeology long ago adopted the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) as its major reference value for calculating the score of applicants, but has recently incorporated ERIH

PLUS (a Humanities and Social Sciences Index) as an equivalent, which may lead to changing evaluative criteria. In any case, where an applicant stands in terms of publications in journals in citation indexes is a key factor in whether or not funding is obtained.

In Chile, there is no centralized scientific committee or council that determines the value of journals on some kind of scale or score assigned by peers. Instead, these rankings are based entirely on the world academic system, as embodied in citation indexes such as SSCI and ERIH PLUS. In effect, what matters is less what research is proposed, but rather, one's accumulated value as manifested in citation indexes. Smaller universities usually financially encourage publishing in journals or book chapters that appear in SSCI, Scopus, and Scielo indexes through amounts ranging from US\$400 to US\$2,500 for each publication.

The problem of value being given only to indexed publications, especially the SSCI, has been the fetishization of paper production. What is the problem with this? 1) The time that academics can dedicate to other practices of anthropological value outside of publication becomes increasingly scarce, always submerged by the need for recognized publications—concretely, this means less time for extra-university anthropological projects, for the development and promotion of academic and teaching activities, for internal commitments, and for student care; 2) there is a devaluation of non-indexed publications, such as texts aimed at a broader public; and 3) there is a greater emphasis on metrics in the production of differences between universities, rather than on academic work in and of itself. We cannot validly assume that a text published in x journal or appearing in index y is necessarily worth more than other textual productions or anthropological works that do not appear in indexes.

The reliance on citation indexes takes place not only in terms of research grants, but also in acquiring an academic position and advancement in Chile. Formal entry as a university professor and not as an adjunct professor in the university typically requires prior publication in SSCI-listed journals and in some cases, a prior award of national research grants. Although promotions are not, in many cases, formally determined by SSCI scales, they are certainly influenced by those scales. For example, as an associate professor at my university, I have to publish at least one article in an SSCI-indexed journal and another in a Scielo-indexed journal per year. This varies from university to university in Chile, but almost all anthropologists in Chile are influenced in their career progression by how much they have published within journals listed in SSCI and other citation indexes.

Norway

Thomas Hylland Eriksen

Relative to its population of 5.5 million, Norway has a large anthropological community, and the general public has some awareness of the discipline. There are historical explanations for the strength of anthropology in the Norwegian public sphere and academy, about which I have written at length elsewhere (e.g. 'Norway, Anthropology in', *International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 2018). While Norwegian anthropologists do research all over the world, many work at home, some of them with a focus on the majority population. One of the most celebrated monographs in late-20th-century Norwegian anthropology was Marianne Gullestad's *Kitchen-Table Society* (1984), based on fieldwork among working-class housewives in her hometown of Bergen.

Criteria for ranking of academic staff

There are anthropology departments in four Norwegian universities (Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim (NTNU) and Tromsø), but many anthropologists teach and carry out research in other universities, interdisciplinary centres, polytechnics and independent research institutes as well. One of the unusual characteristics of Norway is the existence of a great number of independent, but often partly state-funded, social science research institutes, ranging from development research to studies of the welfare state. I have been unable to find numbers, but there may be around 500 anthropologists who are active researchers in the country. Not all of them publish academically; many devote themselves to applied research and deliver reports rather than articles. Far from all have a PhD either, but with an MA one is considered an anthropologist if one is in that line of work.

In practice, there are usually just three ranks in Norwegian academia, following decades of simplification and standardisation: Lecturer, associate professor, full professor. In addition, the rank of ‘researcher’, temporarily employed in a project, is used.

All three categories require the incumbent to hold a PhD ‘or equivalent’. For the rank of full professor, a rule of thumb has been (and may still be) that they should have produced, and published, the equivalent of two PhD dissertations. In practice, this usually means a monograph and at least half a dozen articles in reputable international journals, most of them not derived from the same material as the monograph.

Conferral of the rank of professor (or associate professor) by a committee does not automatically mean that the person in question gets the corresponding title and salary. That depends on the job description. A person qualified for a professorship may nevertheless apply individually, to a national committee, for promotion. In the 1990s, all Readers were automatically promoted to Full Professors. As a result, there are many full professors in Norwegian universities. Citation indexes are sometimes invoked (notably the h-index), but are in my experience rarely decisive.

Publication practices, ranking systems and dilemmas

There are three main factors that distinguish the Norwegian case from many other countries here. First, SSCI is rarely used systematically in anthropology, although both SSCI and Google Scholar are often invoked.

Second, the issue of language is fraught and controversial. Norwegian national identity rests to a great extent on a complex linguistic basis, and the unions, interest groups and politicians involved in scientific matters regularly voice concern about the declining proportion of Norwegian-language publishing. On the other hand, if scholars want to be read, they have to write in English, which is feasible for most Norwegian academics. If their English is poor, they can apply for (and often receive) funding for language-editing. However, the strong linguistic nationalism permeating national discourse directly contradicts the equally strong incentives to ‘publish internationally’, producing a complicated double-bind. The political debate about language is currently (2020s) being intensified owing to an increasing predominance of the English language.

Third, journals are ranked according to a national set of criteria decided largely by the disciplines themselves. These differences make a difference when people apply for jobs. Publishing ‘internationally’ is not enough. An article in the JRAI obviously counts more than one in the Journal of Mauritian Studies. There are three categories; levels 2, 1 and 0. In anthropology, just 14 journals have the rank of 2, while more than a hundred are classified as belonging to level 1. Level 0 consists of journals which may be considered for promotion, and some of them are good, decent journals, but many are de facto predatory, parasitical

money-making machines. A similar ranking system applies to publishing companies. Both quantity and quality count in career building, and journal articles now tend to confer more credit points and prestige than monographs.

Common challenges

There are common denominators between the challenges faced in different countries, notwithstanding the very significant differences regarding working conditions, access to journals, funding for conferences, fieldwork and OA publishing, and so on. Let me try to sum up some of them.

First, the natural sciences tend to dictate criteria for quality and evaluation. For example, in the national database of registration for scientific publications in Norway called Cristin (cristin.no), categories of publications have co-authored journal articles as a default value, whereas book chapters are classified absentmindedly as ‘part of book’. PhD students are now advised to write article-based dissertations with a view to develop their academic careers in a satisfactory way, although social anthropologists (like historians) still tend to consider the monograph the highest literary form of the subject. Writing monographs no longer pays off in the academic reward system. (A main problem with the SSCI, as with Google Scholar, is that they tend to neglect books.)

Second, the question of language is complicated in many of the member organisations. International university rankings tend to give the impression that all non-English-speaking universities are second-rate. Sorbonne is virtually a non-entity in this world. Although the issue of language works differently e.g. in Brazil or Chile (large languages, few are fluent in English) to e.g. the Netherlands or Sweden (small languages, most are fluent in English), the dilemma remains. It is not easy for e.g. East European anthropologists to compete for access to European funding or prestigious publishing channels if they lack the language-editing and copyediting assistance routinely offered in the rich Nordic countries.

Third, degrees of peripherality affect the participation of academics, including anthropologists, in the professional conversation. Historians of anthropology have showed that even card-carrying Englishmen were marginalised if they worked outside of the hallowed academic centres (e.g. Hocart in Fiji, Southall in Uganda); and for most of the member organisations in the WCAA, this is a perennial problem.

Nigeria P-J Ezeh

The Nigerian anthropology situation regarding publication and citation

To be promoted to the three highest ranks in academics—Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor—in most Nigerian universities, the applicant must have published in journals that have journal-metric ranking of foreign provenance as listed in Thompson Reuters, Scimago, and SNIP (Source Normalized Impact per Paper) Citation Indexes. Candidates for these ranks must have two, five, and eight of their journal articles, respectively, in such journals. For books too, publication in publishing houses that are well-known internationally and are of foreign ownership is encouraged. A rulebook in one of the universities gives as examples of such publishers: “an Academic Press, Elsevier, Longman, Macmillan, [and] Saunders.”

There are two basic views: one that favors this exocentric position that is conflated with higher quality, and the other that favors what might be called an Afrocentric position. Each

of the views might be found along individual and institutional lines. Some universities, e.g. the University of Benin in Nigeria, actually encourage local articles while not rejecting the need to publish in foreign journals.

The University of Nigeria, founded in the year of Nigeria's independence from Britain to seek knowledge that would promote scholarship from the African standpoint, ironically, seems now to be in the forefront of this exogenous stance, seeking foreign publication. The turnabout is ironical because some journals founded in the early days of the university attained international renown. Examples can be given of *Okike* (for African literature), *Ikenga* (for anthropology), both based in the University of Nigeria, and *West African Journal of Archaeology* (based in University of Ibadan). Important publishing houses also emerged and performed very well. The unfair competition with better-funded foreign rival meant that many of these went under, and those still around are struggling. Less determined scholars, who happen to be in the majority, panicked into writing to suit the academic fashion of the day, not the truly original research they would have preferred to pursue.

At a conference in Tanzania in 2016 I met Dr Ebrima Sall, the former Executive Secretary of the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, or CODESRIA, based in Dakar, Senegal, who told me of a plan to develop a journal metric that would address African needs. He did not seem to have gone far with that before his tenure ended, and his successor does not seem to have made the project a priority. Sadly, *African Anthropology*, a journal that used to be published by CODESRIA has become moribund—another victim of the unfair competition.

South Africa **Shannon Morreira**

The South African anthropology situation regarding publication and citation

There are anthropology departments at multiple South African universities: in some cases, anthropology and sociology are combined within one department, but in many of the places where anthropology is taught in South Africa, there is a department devoted to it. Anthropologists are also often situated in research institutes within universities. Anthropology is thus a relatively strong discipline within South Africa, and student numbers have risen in recent years. There is also a regional anthropological association, the Anthropology Southern Africa Association, which produces a high-calibre academic journal, *Anthropology Southern Africa*.

South African history and its impact on structural and power relations into the present means that universities can be broken down into various categories: 'historically white universities'/HWUs were reserved for white students and staff under apartheid and were well-funded. These are still research-intensive universities that are more highly ranked within global university ranking systems (for example, the University of Cape Town and the University of the Witwatersrand, both of which have dedicated anthropology departments, and which will expect multiple publications from their academics). 'Historically black universities'/HBUs were reserved for black students and staff under apartheid and were under-resourced; at present they are greatly strengthened but still are not as resource-rich as the historically white universities. Examples include University of the Western Cape and the University of Fort Hare (which both have combined

anthropology/sociology departments). These universities tend still to have more students per staff member (leaving academics with less time for research), and to be slightly less research-intensive than historically white universities. A third category is that of ‘merged universities’, which resulted from a post-apartheid attempt to unify the differentially resourced higher education sector by bringing together technical colleges and ‘traditional’ (read: research-intensive academic universities) and/or merging HWUs and HBUs. An example is the University of Johannesburg, which has climbed university rankings in recent years and is now a research-intensive university where publishing expectations on academics are high. UJ has a dedicated anthropology department. Finally, there are two new post-apartheid universities, Sol Plaatje University and the University of Mpumalanga, which have been built and developed entirely in the post-apartheid period. Sol Plaatje has a new anthropology department; UMP does not have one, although it does have anthropologists among its academic staff.

I mention the categories above as publishing expectations (in terms of the numbers of publications expected per year, and the places of publication) can be different in different categories of university. Many universities tend to expect a minimum of two articles per year; many academics will publish more than this, particularly near the beginning of their careers, when they are establishing their positions. Across all universities, regardless of expectations of how many articles will be published per year, the South African Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) subsidy policy has an impact on *where* academics, including anthropologists, publish. DHET provides universities with a government subsidy for each publication, as long as the publications, if they are in journals, are on the DHET-approved journal list (indicating peer review and good publication praxis within the journal), or, in the case of books, if the book is peer-reviewed and a letter of proof of peer review is submitted. The list of DHET-approved journals includes both local South African journals and international journals; subsidy for journal articles is the same whether published in a local or international journal, as long as it is DHET-approved. This means that local South African journals are a regular space of publication for academics, including anthropologists. As mentioned above, there is a local journal devoted to Southern African anthropology, *Anthropology Southern Africa*. The DHET list is linked to the SSCI, in that if a publication is listed on the SSCI it will be DHET approved: nonetheless, South African academics are more likely to be familiar with the DHET list than with the SSCI. In terms of status, however, international journals are often perceived as more prestigious than local ones. As long as a publication is on the DHET list, it counts for subsidy, regardless of its ranking within international categories. As in other parts of the world, this has led to an emphasis on quantity over quality, though promotions and hiring practices tend to differentiate publications in terms of quality (as determined by international reputation and impact factor of journals).

Most universities in South Africa have permanent academic posts, which mean that being hired into a Lecturer level post can be a job for their rest of one’s working career, within which the academic will then be able to progress from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to Associate Professor and then to Professor. Even at entry level, an anthropologist needs a good publication record. There are also of course many anthropologists in more precarious positions, on contract roles within departments, within which most performance is judged in terms of teaching but who also must be publishing if they hope to secure a more permanent academic role.

At all universities in South Africa, DHET-listed journals and peer-reviewed books are seen as legitimate spaces of publication. It is sufficient for early-career academics to have only published in local (South Africa) DHET-listed journals; by the stage of Senior Lecturer, however, there is an expectation across universities, whether research-intensive or not, that anthropologists will begin publishing in international journals as these are often seen as higher status. Books and monographs are also highly rated across universities, as they earn a large subsidy; chapters in books are seen as equivalent to journal articles. Applications for promotion also generally expect academics to submit bibliometric citation profiles, showing that their work has been cited locally and internationally. Some research-intensive universities require academics to have an international reputation (proved via citations and invitations to speak internationally at conferences) in order to be promoted, particularly at the Associate Professor and Professor level.

There is in South Africa a National Research Foundation which funds many research projects in anthropology; it has its own internal rating system, separate from university academic ranks. The NRF rating system is oriented towards high-impact-factor international journals; an academic is required to list their “five best publications” and the advice is usually to include in that list at least some from the highest impact-factor journals. In sum, the structures within SA academia tend to support peer-reviewed local journals, of which there are many very strong ones, but also to direct more prestige towards publication in high impact-factor international journals.

China

Chen Gang

The academic situation in China in terms of citation practices

In China, there is great pressure for professors in all disciplines to publish. It is a common practice in all universities in China that at the end of a year, one needs to submit his/her annual work report. Then their work will be ranked “excellent,” “pass,” or “fail,” according to the scores they get. Scores in teaching and scientific research are most important. For individual professors, which of these two is more important depends on whether they work at teaching departments or research institutes. Scientific research rankings include both the grants one receives and one’s publications: books and articles. Each university has its own way to rank publishers both in China and in foreign countries. For articles, each university usually has two lists of journals which put academic journals in different ranks, such as A, B, C, D, E. One list is for journals published in China, usually in Chinese. The other is for journals published in foreign countries. For Chinese journals, the CSSCI (the Chinese Social Sciences Citation Index, developed in 1997 and now managed by Nanjing University) and CSCD (the Chinese Science Citation Database, developed in 1989 and managed by the Chinese Academy of Science) are most important. For foreign journals, SSCI and SCI are the most important indexes to rank journals. How to rank these journals in A, B, C, D, E categories are decided by each university. For anthropologists, Chinese universities usually use CSSCI to evaluate articles in Chinese, and SSCI to evaluate articles in English.

The Ministry of Education in China issued regulations in 2020 which require that universities should not use publication in SSCI- and CSSCI-indexed journals as the only criteria to evaluate a professor’s work. But different Chinese universities continue to use

their own criteria of evaluation. Usually, articles published in SSCI-indexed journals receive higher scores. In many top universities in China, if one wants to get promoted to professor position, one needs to publish papers in SSCI journals. This not only affects one's promotions, but also one's income. Many universities give bonuses to stimulate professors' publication. In my university, if you publish a paper in the journal of *Social Sciences in China* or *Nature* or *Science*, you might receive 200,000 yuan (roughly a 25,000US\$) reward. If you publish a paper in a regular SSCI or CSSCI indexed journal, you might receive a 10,000-20,000 yuan (roughly 1500-3000US\$). In order to break the hegemony of SSCI and CSSCI, many universities have started to include other indexes into their evaluation system, such as the Chinese Core Journal List (developed by Peking University in 1992), and the Journal Citation Report of Chinese Academy of Sciences. Major universities usually put SSCI papers above CSSCI papers. Most public universities in China have an office called the Office of Scientific Research, or Office of Social Science Research, listing journals both in Chinese and English and with scales of evaluation of those journals open to all professors and researchers. The practice of my university is that the office will send message to all faculty members before they update the list and ask for suggestions on which journals should be included in the list.

At present, in most universities in China, there is no tenure. However, there is a system of evaluation for promotion from teaching or research-assistant position up to full professor position. These evaluation scores will affect one's promotion, as well as financial benefits. At the end of a year, universities usually give incentive bonuses according to the scores provided by the Office of Scientific Research. The evaluation system in Chinese universities is a recent development regulated by the Ministry of Education in China. It is a part of the reforms that the Ministry of Education has conducted since the 1980s. When I worked at Xi'an Jiaotong University in 1983, there was no such evaluation system. At that time, promotion was primarily based on the number of years you worked for the university, and then on your teaching and research work. In those years, once you got a job in a university, you would not be fired and would be promoted steadily. The criteria for promotion have indeed changed since then.

Hong Kong Gordon Mathews

The academic situation for anthropologists in Hong Kong in terms of citation practices

In Hong Kong, there is great pressure for anthropology professors to publish. The only anthropology department in Hong Kong is at the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), although there are anthropologists in all of Hong Kong's eight public universities. Each year we must each compile our individual annual reports. In publication, to "exceed expectations," one must have in a given year, publish "1 journal article or book chapter of international excellence or high-impact; or 2 journal articles or book chapters of international reputation or with potential for high-impact." What "high-impact" means is not defined.

Anthropology belongs to the Faculty of Arts at CUHK. This means that SSCI is not used as a measure by which to judge journals, although it is used in the social science faculty at CUHK. In the Faculty of Arts, the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI) is also not used. This is largely because the Faculty contains such a wide range of scholars—from poets to linguists to historians to artists to composers—that no single set of citation indexes could cover them all; furthermore, many professors in the arts primarily publish books rather than

articles, which aren't measured by many citation indexes. Professors have very persistently protested against being judged in terms of whether their publications fit the criteria of being in citation indexes, and so these measures are not used.

An effect of this system is to evaluate publications not by quality, but by quantity; professors can be quite sure that higher-ups, at least beyond their own department, have not actually read anything that they have written. We tell junior professors in anthropology, “you should have a minimum of one but preferably two international publications a year.” Publications generally must be in English; and they generally must be published outside Hong Kong to count. Most professors are native speakers of Chinese—Cantonese or Mandarin—but writing in their own language is widely acknowledged as counting for less than writing in English. Chapters in books also count, although perhaps slightly less than a journal article. Publishing a book counts greatly, but because this rating system operates each year, an anthropologist cannot simply focus on writing a book over a number of years but must also have a regular stream of shorter publications.

Yearly rankings are part of the process whereby professors are evaluated for tenure and promotion. In some recent years, as many as half of the candidates for tenure (known as “substantiation” in Hong Kong, typically applied for in one's fifth year) have failed to receive it in the Faculty of Arts; in anthropology, when an assistant professor received tenure several years ago, it was the first time in well over a decade, after several denials, that any anthropology professor had obtained tenure. The largest barrier to tenure is not at the department level, but at the faculty level and university level, with decisions made by senior university committees. The key to success or failure in the tenure application are these four or five external referees, who are partly chosen by the department, and partly by higher-ups in the university. In my own experience as department chair, I have seen that even the slightest negative comment by an external reader may doom the candidate's chances of gaining tenure. SSCI does not factor into these ratings; but one key in referees' ratings will be the purported quality of the journals and publishers who publish the candidate's work. The publications of an anthropologist pursuing tenure generally must be in English. If a professor seeks to publish in Chinese for a local or a national audience, this will generally not count for much, both because publications in Chinese are sometimes deemed to have insufficient refereeing and also because many of the anthropological experts who judge tenure applications do not read Chinese.

Every six years, a Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is conducted at CUHK, by which academics' research is assessed in Hong Kong by a panel of international experts in one's discipline. The Research Assessment Exercise does not have direct relevance for individual anthropologists' fate but has enormous weight at the departmental level—some 25% of the Department's budget is determined by performance in the RAE. The RAE claims to evaluate Chinese-language research by the same standard that they evaluate English-language research, but it is believed by almost all Hong Kong academics that Chinese-language research is in fact at a distinct disadvantage.

Hong Kong university provosts and other top management, like university management around the world, are obsessed with university rankings. These range from being in the top fifty in the world to in the top two hundred in global rankings for CUHK as well as several other Hong Kong universities; clearly the top management of universities in Hong Kong obsess over the rise or fall of a few places in these rankings. This may be reflected in the

rigidity of tenure evaluations; as a provost once explained to me, “if someone might never be outstanding, why would you want to keep them any longer than necessary?” This is a serious barrier to the well-being of anthropologists and other academics in Hong Kong. So, all in all, while SSCI is not itself used in evaluation of publication for anthropologists at CUHK, there is a very rigid and harsh evaluation system that at least indirectly reflects Anglo-American hegemony in world anthropology.

Japan

Takami Kuwayama

The academic situation in Japan with reference to citation practices

I wrote in an earlier article that “as of April 2017, a total of 82 journals are listed in SSCI under the category of anthropology, which includes physical anthropology, archeology, and linguistic anthropology. Of these, the US accounts for 38, the UK 21, Germany 6, Australia 3, the Netherlands, 3, Chile, 2, France 2, Spain 2, Argentina 1, Italy 1, New Zealand 1, Slovenia 1, and Switzerland 1. The US accounts for 46.3 percent of these publications, and when this number is combined with the output of the UK, these two countries together account for 72.0 percent of all the journals listed on SSCI” (*Asian Anthropology* 16(3): 162-163.) This situation is largely unchanged in the five years since then. Anglo-American hegemony is an indisputable fact in anthropological journal publishing; with a few exceptions, SSCI journal publishers are in the US and western Europe.

Seen from Japan, where scholarship has flourished since premodern times, this is a deplorable situation. Curiously, however, very few Japanese cultural anthropologists pay attention to this inequality. A major reason for this indifference is that no Japanese-language journal is on the SSCI list. Japan has a huge domestic publishing market, and even a minor field like anthropology has highly-esteemed journals written in Japanese. Because the SSCI list does not carry any Japanese-language journal, there is no reason to refer to it, at least when writing for domestic readers. Another reason may apply in other countries as well. Cultural anthropology has an aspect of area studies to it, which makes it necessary to refer to relatively minor journals specializing in the study of a particular geographic area. Such specialized journals are ordinarily not listed in SSCI.

This does not mean, however, that Japanese anthropologists are indifferent to foreign scholarship. Although the beginning of Japanese anthropology dates to the late nineteenth century, it has strongly been influenced by the US, the UK, and France since the end of the Second World War; it is impossible to conduct research without referring to the works produced in these countries. However, even under such circumstance, SSCI is seldom on the lips of Japanese anthropologists, if not completely unknown, and there is little room for SSCI to affect promotion. This works favorably for Japan in keeping independence of mind, but it does have drawbacks. In Japan, at least in the humanities and social sciences, there is no clear distinction between papers published in internationally prestigious journals and those published in in-house university journals, many of which are effectively for private circulation. However dubious in quality, a paper is a paper and counts as such when professors are reviewed for promotion. Scholars familiar with the overseas situation often worry about this, but their concern tends to be dismissed on the grounds that it is difficult for non-specialists to judge the quality of a foreign journal.

There are, however, certain standards of judgment, whether specified or unspecified, for promotion reviews. At higher-ranking Japanese universities, to be promoted to full professorship, by far the most important consideration is whether the candidate has a single-authored book. Because this works against scholars at the scientific end of the social sciences continuum (e.g., statistics specialists in the sociology department), the rule has recently changed at Kwansai Gakuin University, where I currently teach. Under the new system, a prescribed number of professional papers are considered comparable to a single-authored book. As for promotion to associate professorship, a prescribed number of journal publications and good teaching are ordinarily considered enough. Because there is no US type of tenure system in Japan, there seem to be no strong pressures on junior scholars. Until a few decades ago, ambitious young scientists took advantage of this organizationally relaxed milieu, devoting themselves to long-term research projects without worrying about immediate results. This fact has contributed to Japan producing many Nobel Prize winners.

However, the situation is rapidly changing, due to the impact on higher education of the growing influence of globalization and the neoliberal policies arising from the global competition throughout the world, especially to world university rankings, at which Japan has not done well. Certainly, rankings such as the Times Higher Education World University Rankings may be biased toward the Anglophone world. In the neoliberal age, however, when audit culture is steadily spreading, the influence of such rankings is apparent. At Hokkaido University (HU), where I earlier taught, which was one of the 13 recipients of Japan's 500-million-dollar project called 'Super Global' (2014-2023), a major goal is to be a top 100 university as defined by THE. Professors are now being urged to write and publish in English because, by the 2013 THE rating, HU's 'citation' score was only 8.5 points, whereas the average of the top 100 was 24.2 points, with 30 points being the highest score. As noted earlier, the Japanese language is now regarded as a sort of 'liability,' if not an 'obstacle,' at major Japanese universities. Also, professors are being urged to collaborate with overseas researchers to help raise HU's 'research' score from 8.5 points to 12.0 points. Indeed, HU proposed to increase the proportion of English-language instruction from 17.3 percent to 50.0 percent for graduate courses, and from 2.9 percent to 12.0 percent for undergraduate courses, in just 10 years. For this purpose, it was proposed that the proportion of non-Japanese professors be raised from 24.9 percent to 41.7 percent by 2023. Undoubtedly, HU will be praised if all these figures become a reality but will be punished if they fail. Because I left Hokkaido University in early 2018, I am not certain if the above goals have been achieved.

The crux of the matter is this: The global competition in higher education, particularly for Japanese the rapid advance of China, has at last changed the traditional mindset of Japanese academics. Among junior anthropologists, it is beginning to be an asset in terms of promotion or job search to have English-language publications on their vitae. As far as I can see, the effects of SSCI citation practices on professional careers has been almost nil among Japanese anthropologists, but the impact of the intense global competition Japan's higher education is undergoing is beginning to be felt, especially among junior researchers.

2. Interviews with younger anthropologists in different societies, to understand contemporary changes

Norway

Thomas Hylland Eriksen

Owing to health problems, I have not been able to interview younger colleagues, but the above points pretty much cover the gist of the stakes involved. They are aware that they need to publish in English, in reputable journals, and that they ought to have published at least one monograph, with a good publisher, to get a tenured job. A broader question, which could be taken on by this task force later, concerns other criteria for qualifying than mere academic publishing: Can a scholar who has prolifically produced reports for the public sector, and has served on many committees giving policy advice on anything from waste management to minority policy, and who wishes to return to academia, be evaluated along alternative criteria? Could ten reports on applied issues, or five popular books on anthropological topics, qualify an applicant for a full professorship, or does academia remain secluded, conservative and enclosed?

Nigeria

P-J Ezeh

The following are the views from our younger colleagues at various Nigerian universities

An anthropologist at Federal University, Lokoja, Nigeria

Publications in impact-factor rated journals are considered as necessary for academic promotion. However, publication of articles is only one of the criteria needed for promotion. Others include years since earlier promotion and service to the university. The saying "publish or perish" is taken seriously in the institution, a policy applying to anthropologists just like other scholars/academics. I am not satisfied with this policy as it affects anthropology and field-sourced disciplines; it lacks acknowledgment of fieldwork. There are no specific marks allocated for fieldwork in considering promotion. Anthropologists and such field-based disciplines should be awarded extra marks in academic reckoning for ground-breaking fieldwork. This will motivate anthropologists and related scholars to integrate serious fieldwork with classroom tasks.

An anthropologist at Enugu State University of Science & Technology, Agbani, Nigeria

I have always wondered why publication in foreign impact-factor rated journals has to be a benchmark for promotion. My understanding of the Impact Factor is that it has to do with the number of times selected articles are cited within a certain number of years. Yet it does not take into cognizance the scientific nature or worth of individual articles. What about fields that may not involve large numbers of citations?

In my university, publication in impact-factor-rated journals determines how and when academics climb the ladder of promotion, especially from senior lecturer position upwards. This may actually be counterproductive, in that in encouraging quantification can lower standard of academic research.

For anthropologists whose works are culture-specific, how often would such works be cited in mainstream academia? The fact that this does not often happen means that anthropologists in the academy may not easily rise to higher positions. I suggest that the nature of disciplines should be considered. I liken this issue to a case where one is said to be an illiterate because he/she couldn't read, write and/or understand English, while such a person

may be an expert in traditional medicine or crafts. Would such a person not be recognized based on his/her field of expertise? I think the importing of the impact factor into promotion, especially as the main standard for promotion, is limiting academic excellence by not recognizing excellence in some other forms, e.g. originality. It is important to appreciate original contributions which may not be trending: originality is not always trending at the time of conception.

An anthropologist at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

To be promoted to a senior academic position, publications in impact-factor rated journals is very important because impact-factor rated journals (those in Thompson Reuters or Scopus) are scored 3 points while others are scored 2 points and below. However, the effect of this policy is not so great on the career progress of all academics, since publishing in impact-factor-rated journals is not the sole criteria for progress. The candidate is also required to publish in journals that score 2 points or lower and also books and monographs. All disciplines are treated the same here; but employing the same criteria for valuation of research in different specializations is untenable. It makes no sense, since different disciplines produce different forms of knowledge. Methods and subjects/objects of research in natural and physical sciences differ from those in arts, humanities and social sciences. As such, weighing criteria should not be the same. I suggest that candidates be assessed on the basis of their discipline.

An anthropologist at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria

For promotion, publication in impact-factor-rated journals is important but not too important. What is more important is the number of publications in quality journals. For anthropologists, because we do extended fieldwork, it may take us a longer time to get papers out for publication. Still, I'm satisfied. One needs to work hard. The only problem in Nigeria is that teaching and administrative responsibilities are overwhelming. To solve this problem, we need to reduce teaching load and administrative responsibilities for academic staff. Second, some universities make it difficult for anthropology lecturers to do individual fieldwork. I suggest that students should be allocated to teachers who could develop research themes in his/her area of research. This will help lecturers in focusing on research interests and in the development of theory.

China

Chen Gang

I have spoken with young teachers in my university who know little about the old evaluation system. They believe that the current evaluation system is better, because it is more transparent. They know the scores they get from their publications and research grants, and can compare their scores with others' scores when they compete for promotion. I once attended a meeting to evaluate the work of those applying for promotion. The Personnel Office gave a data-sheet that contained all the evaluation scores of the candidates. I could clearly see how many SSCI or CSSCI-indexed papers all candidates published, and how many research grants they had received. The final decision was based on the quantitative data.

My younger colleagues told me that they were not under direct pressure to publish papers in SSCI-listed journals, but rather in CSSCI-listed journals, which they must do. To publish in English in SSCI-listed journals is encouraged and can bring bonus rewards, but is less immediately necessary. They also told me that books were more important than papers since

books could bring them higher scores. For example, an article published in a CSSCI-listed journal may receive 20 points, but a book (my university has a list of publishers ranked at four levels) might receive 50-100 points. Like many other universities in China, my university does not have a tenure system at present. But we do have a contract system. Every four years, all teachers will sign a contract with the university assigning a certain amount of teaching and research and publishing tasks. If one fails to complete the tasks, he or she might be punished by salary deduction or relocation to a non-teaching or research position. Even though this rarely happens, it gives my younger colleagues much pressure. My younger colleagues told me that the quality of their papers or books did not matter much; quantity is more important than quality. Unless they apply for a job in another university or compete for awards, their articles or books will not be evaluated by other anthropologists or professors in the same academic fields in other universities.

Hong Kong

Gordon Mathews

I have interviewed several assistant professors of anthropology at my university, CUHK. They have indicated that they are not under direct pressure to publish in SSCI-listed journals or follow other citation indexes. This pressure was, however, felt somewhat more by archaeologists than cultural anthropologists, since archaeologists still emphasized journal publication, whereas for cultural anthropologists, books were central, although articles also had to be published. All felt that the key for their substantiation (known as tenure in other parts of the world) was how the referees for their substantiation evaluated their performance. These referees were senior scholars from around the world that the Dept. of Anthropology had a voice in selecting. My view is that while the selection of referees was generally appropriate, even a single negative comment by any referee was enough to doom an application for substantiation. This is what these assistant professors most worried about. A single grumpy comment—"I don't think that this scholar's work quite merits a position among top junior scholars in her field"—by one senior scholar is enough to negate glowing reviews by the others: any negative comment probably means the termination of a contract.

These junior scholars were adamant that the difficulty of obtaining substantiation today is far greater than it was when I myself was an assistant professor. How true is this? It certainly is true that today at CUHK, no one would be hired for a position of assistant professor without one or two publications; I myself was hired in 1994 with no publications (although I did have a book contract). However, I was given tenure in 2000 with a book published, a contract for a second book, and publication in four second-tier but not first-tier journals: I know this rating of journals not through citation indexes but more through the broad informal knowledge in anthropology of what "the best" journals are. I gather that these criteria are similar today, although the specific tiering of journals has changed. Hurdles to permanent employment have always been daunting; but young scholars may be right that they are more daunting today than they were thirty years ago.

Japan

Takami Kuwayama

To find out generational differences among Japanese anthropologists, I interviewed by Zoom two of my junior colleagues, one at a small private university near Tokyo, the other

at a national university in Tokyo, both male and in their mid-30s. Both these anthropologists have heard of SSCI but said that it did not matter. One said that researchers in the natural sciences may worry about citation indexes, but that those in non-science fields generally do not. However, both are aware that publications in English are becoming important in terms of getting academic jobs and being promoted to higher status. In their minds, what matters is not whether they have published in journals listed in SSCI, but whether they have English-language publications at all.

The anthropologist at the national university in Tokyo has one journal article and one book chapter in English, both of which were published overseas. He thinks that this record probably worked positively for him when he was considered as a candidate for his current position. He has also given a few academic presentations overseas, in the United States. The other anthropologist has no English-language publications. To advance his academic career, he wishes to go to either the US or the UK for study. Being a China specialist who conducted two years of fieldwork in a rural village, he regrets that, among foreign researchers, Japanese scholarship on China is not esteemed as highly as it once was, while that of British and American scholars is taken seriously even if it does not deserve much attention. He therefore wishes to learn to speak and write in English to make his research better known throughout the world.

As I earlier noted, in the world university rankings of the Times Higher Education (THE), top Japanese universities have suffered from their low citation scores. This is almost inevitable because, in non-science fields, Japanese scholars' output is mostly in Japanese. We must remember, however, the irony of "publishing globally and perishing locally." Being widely cited by the global community of specialists often contradicts being highly appreciated by the local reading public.

In fact, in the THE rankings, Japan's overall scores in teaching are quite high. This probably results from the efforts Japanese professors make, or are forced to make, to meet the public demand for good teaching. According to the anthropologist at the national university in Tokyo, what surprised him most is that far more time is spent teaching than he expected. The emphasis of teaching is mainly on advanced undergraduate and postgraduate students, but still the relatively heavy teaching load means that publication is not the only criterion when professors are reviewed for promotion. He gave one example in which a full professorship has recently been given to an anthropologist who authored no book after being appointed as an associate professor. The anthropologist in a private university is occupied with the task of educating relatively unmotivated undergraduate students. At his university, the standard teaching load is six classes a week, in addition to two practicum courses in fieldwork. Promotion is basically by seniority. No one may be promoted to associate professor without serving at least five years as a faculty member.

About ten years ago at Hokkaido University, one of the former imperial universities in Japan where I taught, a merit-based salary system was introduced. Behind this change was the Japanese government's strategy to increase scholarly output, thereby making Japan's higher education globally

competitive. At that time, however, professors had the option of shifting to the new salary system or staying in the traditional system based on age and seniority. Today, at many national and public universities, the merit-based system is increasingly used for junior professors. Furthermore, the US type of tenure system is beginning to be introduced. Typically, newly-appointed assistant professors will be put on probation for the first five years or so. During this period, they must meet the demand set for them in both teaching and research to be tenured. In terms of employment, this is probably the most significant change that has occurred at Japanese universities in recent years .

The anthropologist at the national university in Tokyo worries that this movement may result in the lowering of the levels of research among young academics. Obviously, under a stringent tenure system, it is more profitable to study and write about “manageable” topics than engaging in ambitious but time-consuming projects. Because writing in English takes a much longer time than writing in Japanese, they are tempted to reap more rewards by producing in their first language, which has the opposite effect on Japan’s globalization than what is intended by the policy. The introduction of the US type of tenure system, as well as that of merit-based rewards, stem from the recent neoliberal policies of the Japanese government, under global academic competition.

These professors also mentioned that among senior scholars in Japan, men seldom did housework in their homes, and had the luxury of spending all their time on research, while younger men today not only share housework, but also help bring up their small children. In Japan and other parts of East Asia, drinking and eating together with colleagues, often until late at night, has been an important part of scholarship. Both academic and private ties are built up this way. But this custom has excluded female researchers from the circles of communication, particularly junior ones involved in childbearing and child-rearing. Hopefully, the changing lifestyle will help change Japan for the better; there is now a notoriously low rate of women in leading positions.

Charts

Chart 1: Conditions of Anthropological Scholarship in Different Societies

Person/Place	Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto Chile
Annual Report Requirements	National research funds depend on the applicant's curriculum vita; this includes around 40% of the application process, and the rest depends on the quality of the project. Each university has its own requirements. An associate professor, for example, must publish at least one article in an SSCI-indexed journal and another in a Scielo-indexed journal per year.
Ratings and Types of Publication	One is expected to publish articles, books, or book chapters. The SSCI index is used to rate publications; it is the highest reference value. The ERIHPLUS index has been incorporated as an equivalent of SSCI. There is no scientific committee or council that provides a scale or score assigned by peers; instead, SSCI and ERIHPLUS are used directly.
Promotion of Scholarship	Some smaller universities provide financial rewards to academics if they publish in journals in SSCI, Scopus, or Scielo indexes in amounts ranging from US\$400 to US\$2,500 for each publication. These indexes have thus had a significant impact on academic behavior.
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	Universities prioritize academics who have published in SSCI journals, and worked on national projects. Having permanent employment as a professor comes after one or two years of “performance agreement.”
Generational change: How are young professors’ employment conditions different than their elders?	The competition for formal, and not temporary, access to the University has become tougher lately, and is focused, above all, on research capacities, especially with regard to the possibility of publishing in high-impact journals and applying for public research funds. Similarly, there is greater emphasis on individual careers than collective projects.

Person/Place	Thomas Hylland Eriksen Norway
Annual Report Requirements	Until around 2010, professors had to submit annual reports. This is now largely done by the administration based on recorded activities (publications and teaching) and input from professors. There are no formal sanctions or awards for those who produce more or less than expected. However, those who exceed expectations may apply for promotion.
Ratings and Types of Publication	Journals and publishers are classified into three categories: 0 (not acknowledged), 1 (accepted as academically OK) and 2 (considered excellent). Publications in the latter two categories release funding for the department and prestige for the scholar.
Promotion of Scholarship	Publications in category 2 journals (typically Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute or American Ethnologist) play a significant role in promotions and appointments. There is a national committee which evaluates applications for promotion annually. Monographs are also important. As a rule, the rank of full professor can only be conferred to a scholar who has produced the equivalent of two doctoral dissertations.
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	There has been a significant growth in part-time and temporary academic staff in recent years, to the dismay of younger colleagues and unions. Tenure does not follow from a postdoc or even an externally funded research project, but can only be obtained when a new position is advertised. Competition for tenured positions is international, and the number of applicants has increased steeply in the last decade, Norway being one of a few countries where anthropology is not endangered. Research (articles + a monograph) is still the most important criterion, but teaching, procuring external funding and (in theory) public service are also criteria for tenure.
Generational change: How are young professors' employment conditions different than their elders?	Owing to the exponential population growth among academics in general, including anthropologists, the scene is far more competitive than in the 1990s, which in turn was considerably more competitive than the 1970s. In Norway, an alternative trajectory for those PhDs who are determined to carry on with research can be to work in an external (non-university) institute of social research, of which there are a fair number, especially in Oslo. They would then mainly work in interdisciplinary teams on applied issues.

Person/Place	P-J Ezeh Nigeria
Annual Report Requirements	In Nigeria academics do not write annual reports. A report on one’s own performance becomes necessary only when applying for promotion. It will then be assessed by someone of a superior rank within the discipline and afterwards to three other assessors sitting as committees, and then, for applications at professorial level, sent to assessors in three other universities. The report by the candidate will include publications, teaching, and administrative experience. Many applications fail.
Ratings and Types of Publication	The ranks that are available to be promoted are Senior Lecturer, Reader (Associate Professor), and full Professor. Applicants must publish in journals that have three journal-metric rankings of foreign provenance: Thompson-Reuters, Scimago, and SNIP. Usually candidates need two, five and eight of their articles to be published in journals in those indexes in order to be promoted.
Promotion of Scholarship	
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	
Generational change: How are young professors’ employment conditions different than their elders?	

Person/Place	Shannon Morreira South Africa
Annual Report Requirements	<p>Publishing expectations are higher in research-intensive universities; 'historically white universities' and 'merged universities'. Expectations are in terms of the numbers of publications expected per year and the places of publication. Academics have to account for their publications and supervisions to the University each year, as well as accounting to the government (in public universities) for how they spent their time proportionally on research, teaching and administration.</p> <p>Individual access to research funding from the university is also linked to how much you have published since the last reporting period.</p>
Ratings and Types of Publication	<p>Publication occurs primarily in English-language journals. Research intensive universities expect around a minimum of two articles per year. The South African Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) has its own list of approved journals; this has an impact on where academics publish. The DHET list is linked to the SSCI, so if a publication is on the SSCI list, it would probably be approved by the DHET. However, South African academics are more familiar with the DHET list. This has led to emphasis on quantity over quality. DHET-listed journals and peer-reviewed books are seen as legitimate spaces of publication, especially for early-career academics who have published locally. Senior Lecturers progressing towards Associate Professors have to publish in international journals. Books and monographs are highly rated across universities and are subsidized. Chapters of books are equivalent to journal articles. The South Africa National Research Foundation has its own rating system, different from university academic ranks. This system is oriented towards proving an international reputation.</p>
Promotion of Scholarship	<p>The South African Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) provides a government subsidy to the university for each publication in journals that are on the DHET-approved journal list. In the case of books, they must be peer-reviewed and a letter of proof of peer review submitted. Individual access to research funding from the university is also linked to how much you have published since the last reporting period.</p>

	<p>Academics can apply for rating from the National Research Foundation (NRF) on the basis of their publications -- being rated gives prestige and access to funding calls.</p>
<p>Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?</p>	<p>To be hired as an academic, you need to have publications. Most South African universities have permanent academic posts; this means that one can be working as a Lecturer-level post for their entire working career. There is usually a one to three year probation period, after which the permanent post is finalised. Then academics can progress from Lecturer, to Senior Lecturer, to Associate Professor and then finally to Professor. In order to prove they are solid researchers, it's important to keep publishing. In addition to these permanent posts, however, there is a rise in shorter-term contract teaching positions.</p>
<p>Generational change: How are young professors' employment conditions different than their elders?</p>	<p>There is more expectations of publication for young scholars today than in the past. There is also a rise of precarious employment, and decline in government support of universities. But there are also strong positive changes in terms of transformation in terms of race and institutional culture, as compared to pre-1994 South African universities which existed under apartheid. South Africa now has very strict Employment Equity laws in order to shift the racial and gender makeup of staff at universities away from apartheid's legacy.</p>

Person/Place	Yasmeen Arif India
Annual Report Requirements	Annual reports are common in both public and private universities. They are compiled by each department with information on set criteria are usually asked for, which include publications, academic work of various kinds like conference organizing or participation. Professional memberships, visits to other institutions, awards, and grants are counted here. University-wide and department-wide reports are regularly compiled
Ratings and Types of Publication	Central Govt.-regulated universities follow a countrywide body called the University Grants Commission and that body mandates whatever appraisal criteria must be applied to publications. They have placed a higher priority on hard science journals and have only an imprecise idea of what goes in social science journals. Citation indexes which are included in these criteria have been changing in recent times. While SSCI has not fully served as a benchmark, a recent trend has been the SCOPUS index system, but that was more applicable to hard sciences. Recently we have a UGC-CARE index, another unfathomable website carrying a list of acceptable and ‘ratified’ journals instead of ‘predatory journals’: https://ugccare.unipune.ac.in/Apps1/User/Web/CloneJournals English is the language of publication and international publications are aspired towards. Very few local journals exist in Anthropology/Sociology in English. The verdict on quality is a contentious matter. International publications are considered better than local in most instances. <i>Contributions to Indian Sociology</i> can be an exception as a long running journal of quality.
Promotion of Scholarship	Nothing in particular. No local university presses have taken shape.
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	Tenure used to be guaranteed at the time of hire in public universities. The system is now changing. The same rule applies in private universities, but contracts are also known to be offered. A huge contentious issue in the massive university systems like Delhi University that I was a part of, is non-hiring for years which has kept many sanctioned positions empty. The teaching load has been taken care of by temporary hires, which are called ad-hoc or guest lecturers (like adjuncts in the US), who have abysmal conditions of work and no job security
Generational change	Tenure used to be guaranteed at the time of hire in public universities. The system is now changing. The same rule applies in private universities, but contracts are also known to be offered.

Person/Topic	Chen Gang China
Annual Report Requirements	In China, it's a common practice in all universities to submit your annual work report. That work will be ranked as "excellent", "pass", or "fail", according to your score. To get promoted to a professor position, in some important universities in China, such as Peking University and Zhejiang University, it's necessary to publish in journals listed in SSCI. For most universities, it is necessary to publish papers in CSSCI (the Chinese Social Science Citation Index) journals. To expand their evaluation system, many universities are including other indexes besides SSCI and CSSCI, such as the Core Journal List and the Journal of Citation Reports of the Chinese Academy of Science.
Ratings and Types of Publication	Each university decides how to rank journals in A, B, C, D or E categories. For Chinese journals, CSSCI (the Chinese Social Sciences Citation Index) and CSCD (the Chinese Science Citation Database) are the most important indexes to rank journals. For foreign journals, SSCI and SCI are the most important indexes. Books receive higher scores than articles, with book publishers ranked in categories by each university.
Promotion of Scholarship	Many universities give bonuses or rewards to promote a professor's publications. In a very prestigious journal (<i>Social Sciences in China, Nature, or Science</i>), one might receive the equivalent of a US\$25,000 reward. Papers published in an SSCI or CSSCI indexed journal, might receive US\$1,500-3,000. Today, many universities try to attract professors. They have set up positions with much higher salaries and other benefits. When one applies for such positions, their papers will be sent to three outside professors for review.
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	Grants are necessary for professors to get promoted in most universities in China. Grants are classified into different levels, from university, to provincial, to state levels. At the top are grants awarded by the Chinese Social Sciences Foundation and the Chinese Natural Sciences Foundation, which are most prestigious. There are also grants from NGOs, business companies and other non-government sources. These kinds of grants will receive scores according to the amount of money they bring to universities.

<p>Generational change: How are young professors' employment conditions different than their elders?</p>	<p>There is an obvious generational change in Chinese universities regarding evaluation and promotion. The evaluation system is a recent development regulated by Ministry of Education in China. When I worked at Xi'an Jiaotong University in 1983, there was no such system. At that time, promotion was primarily based on the number of years you worked for the university, and secondarily your teaching and research work. In those years, once you got a job in a university, you would not be fired and would be promoted steadily. I remember that each year there was a quota for promotion of positions at different levels and the competition sometimes was quite high. Deans and department heads had power. So the <i>guanxi</i> (connection) with the leaders were important. Now the promotion is quite transparent. All applicants are scored based on their publications, grants, and teaching.</p>
---	--

Person/Topic	Gordon Mathews Hong Kong
Annual Report Requirements	Each year professors compile their individual annual reports, which are rated as "far exceeding expectations," "exceeding expectations," "meeting expectations," "below expectations," and "far below expectations," in terms of research, teaching and administration. These are rated by Dept. Chairs, gone over by Deans, and then used to determine salary raises, if any. These are also used as a factor in considerations of tenure and promotion.
Ratings and Types of Publication	Usually the department chair rates all professors and then the faculty dean reassess and determines the final mark. Anthropology belongs to the Faculty of Arts at CUHK, and because of this, SSCI is not used to rank the journals. The reason is because the arts faculty has a wide range of scholars, so that no single set of citation indexes could cover them all. Besides, articles are less published by professors than books which can't be measured by citation indexes. The outside referees will rate you depending on the quality of the journals and publishers.
Promotion of Scholarship	There are no explicit rewards given for publication in certain journals; there are "Excellent Researcher Awards" given by each faculty each year, but that is not a major motivator. The major motivation is simply that if you don't publish much, you cannot be promoted and you may lose your job if you do not yet have tenure.
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	Tenure, known as "substantiation" in Hong Kong, is extraordinarily difficult to obtain, with some half of applicants not obtaining it in some recent years, and being forced to leave the university. The key is external referees from around the world. Even one negative comment from any of five referees will doom one's chances. Generally, a book and 4-5 international articles published and well-developed plans for a second book are deemed essential for cultural anthropologists to get tenure. At least one research grant is also necessary, as generally awarded by the Research Grants Council in Hong Kong. Without at least one such grant, substantiation may be difficult.
Generational change: How are young professors' employment conditions different than their elders?	It is widely assumed that conditions for getting tenure have become more difficult in recent years, with anthropology positions becoming scarcer. This has not been the case in Hong Kong, but is no doubt true globally. Anthropology is not yet threatened by the National Security Law in Hong Kong, passed in 2020 to make Hong Kong resemble mainland China.

Person/Topic	Takami Kuwayama Japan
Annual Report Requirements	At Hokkaido University, where I taught 2003-2017, annual reports began to be required in the mid-2010s, when a merit-based salary system was introduced. Each professor was ranked “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” or “poor,” based on his/her publication list. Similar practices probably began at other former imperial universities. This signaled the end to the “paradise” Japanese academics had lived in. At Kwansei Gakuin University, however, a private Protestant school to which I moved in 2018, no annual report is required. Salaries are based on age and years of work, and professors are simply requested to provide information about their new publications to be included in a nationwide database called RESEARCH MAP.
Ratings and Types of Publication	In the humanities and social sciences, the number of books and articles published is ordinarily the only criterion by which professors are judged because the diversity of disciplines makes it difficult for non-specialists to assess the quality of publications in other fields. SSCI and other international indexes are seldom used. The status of in-house journals based in one’s own university is high, and articles published in them often count as much as those published in nationwide journals. However, publications in English are beginning to be generally more highly evaluated than those written in Japanese.
Promotion of Scholarship	In both sciences and non-sciences, major subsidies come from the national government, which provides Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research on a competitive basis. Japanese universities give all faculty members research money every year (usually 3,000 to 4,000 US dollars) as a fringe benefit.
Tenure: Is employment guaranteed upon hiring? What is required to get tenure?	Until recently, there was no US type of tenure system. Once professors were hired, they would not be fired unless they did something that called for severe punishment. This still applies today at many universities, but the situation is beginning to change, especially at national universities. New recruits are now put on probation for 5 years and get tenure only if they have met the standards set for them as beginning scholars. This change is probably due to Japan’s competition for higher status in world university rankings.
Generational change: How are young professors’ employment conditions different than their elders?	Socialization, drinking and eating together with peers after work, at least occasionally, has been an integral part of academic life in Japan. This custom has excluded female researchers from the circle of communication, but this practice is changing among young people who now share housework and child rearing with their partners.

Chart 2: Working Conditions of Anthropologists in Different Societies

Person/Topic	Gonzalo Díaz Crovetto Chile
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	<p>Associate Professor: 36 hours per year (each course lasts between 3 to 4 hours per week, generally meaning 9 courses per year)</p> <p>Assistant Professor Teaching Option 32 hours per year (8 courses)</p> <p>Assistant Professor Research Option 20 hours per year (5 courses)</p> <p>Associate Professor, Teaching Option 28 hours per year (7 courses)</p> <p>Associate Professor, Research Option 16 hours per year (4 courses)</p> <p>Senior Professor, Teaching Option 20 hours per year (5 courses)</p> <p>Senior Professor, Research Option 12 hours per year (3 courses)</p> <p>Department Director Discount (40% class hours)</p> <p>Postgraduate Courses Director Discount (25% class hours)</p> <p>Discount Director of Undergraduate Courses (30% class hours).</p> <p>All academics in the research option must apply for a research project to the National Research Council Each category requires between 1 to 3 annual undergraduate or postgraduate thesis students This is an example of a university and its respective employment status. It should be noted that around the national context there is a great diversity of possibilities between universities around working conditions.</p>
Number and kind of publications required per year	<p>Assistant Professor Teaching Option: 1 Article SciELO;</p> <p>Assistant Professor Research Option 1 Article SciELO; 1 Article Scopus or 1 WOS;</p> <p>Associate Professor, Teaching Option, 1 Article Scopus</p> <p>Associate Professor, Research Option, 1 WOS</p> <p>Senior Professor, Teaching Option, 1 WOS</p> <p>Senior Professor, Research Option 1 WOS and 1 Scopus.</p> <p>This is an example of a university and its respective employment status. It should be noted that in the national context there is a great diversity of possibilities.</p>
Administrative duties	<p>Administrative tasks are multiple beyond teaching, research and thesis students. Unpaid consulting projects, advice, protocol development, information management, etc.: these usually comprise at least 20% of professorial time. Those of us who have managerial positions (directors of courses, centers or departments) have a discount for the hours of teaching, but</p>

	not from our publication commitments or from other types of commitments.
Compensation/salary	Salaries for professors far from the center are usually a little lower than those in the Chilean center, but have incentives for publication in journals indexed in Scopus, Scielo and WOS (from US\$300 to US\$2500), and book chapters and books in certain publishers US\$600 to 1500). This represents a fraction of incentives that universities receive from government for publishing in certain indices. Similarly, through participation in national projects, a researcher can increase monthly salary between US\$400 and US\$700.
Hierarchy between senior and junior professors	<p>Hierarchy means greater autonomy to allocate and control time, but at the same time, the minimum requirements by category must be fulfilled: otherwise, bad evaluations can result in dismissal.</p> <p>In my university there are three main categories: part time (professors hired to do one, two or up to three courses per semester); adjunct professors, that although they have permanent contracts, they must teach more, have fewer publication requirements; and permanent staff: Instructor, Assistant, Associate and Senior Professor. Each of these can have the teaching option (less publication requirements plus teaching hours) or research option (less classes plus mandatory research requirements).</p>
General Information of your own University	<p>Each university in Chile is governed by different parameters. My own very southern university is the Catholic University of Temuco, a regional university, with 11,000 students, 5 Doctorate programs, and 15 Master's degrees. Temuco is the poorest region in the country and our university receives a large part of its tuition from public funds provided by the state for not charging for studying for a university degree.</p> <p>Anthropology as a career and degree has existed since 1973 and the Master in Anthropology since 2015.</p>

Person/Topic	Thomas Hylland Eriksen Norway
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	This varies, but as a rule, professors teach two courses a semester and supervise between four and six MA students plus one to four PhD students at any given time. However, external research funding enables people to concentrate on research (and, really, research administration).
Number and kind of publications required per year	There are no requirements. It is sometimes said, jokingly and a bit unfairly, that the moment someone gets tenure, they go back to sleep. Owing to the strength of the trade unions and the residual welfare state ideology, it is very difficult to fire a state employee. Some have pointed out that an incentive system might have encouraged people to publish more, but the spirit of egalitarianism militates against this kind of practice.
Administrative duties	University departments have a fairly large and competent administrative staff. Apart from organising schedules, curricula, exams etc., they can also help organise conferences and assist in producing research applications. In theory, a tenured professor should teach 45%, do research 45% and do administrative work 10% of their working hours. In practice, we spend lots of time on bullshit work such as email
Compensation/salary	Compared to the private sector, university professors are not particularly well paid. They also usually must spend years paying back loans taken during their student years (until the PhD, which is fully funded). The gap in salary between senior and junior professors has shrunk since the 1980s, largely owing to demands from the trade unions. A full professor may earn about 25% more than an associate professor and 40% more than a postdoc. In this sense, Norway is very different from e.g. the United States.
Hierarchy between senior and junior professors	The egalitarian culture of the Norwegian workplace prevents the formalisation of clear hierarchies. Senior professors cannot delegate tasks to junior colleagues. On the other hand, the youngest and most recently hired members of staff are typically encumbered with unpopular courses. Informal hierarchies certainly do exist, but are systematically under-

	<p>communicated. Everybody is on a first- name basis with everybody else. People are generally aware of their rights, and may voice complaints to the ombudsman, their union representative, the head of department, or the head of administration.</p>
<p>General Information of your own University</p>	<p>The University of Oslo is the oldest and largest in the country, with about 30,000 students and an academic staff of about 3,000. The social anthropology department was founded in 1964, but the subject had been taught for about a decade prior, mainly at the Ethnographic Museum. Our department has a permanent faculty of 17 plus many postdocs, PhD candidates (who are salaried and considered colleagues) and associated researchers. We have about 250 undergrads and 100 MA students. The other main centre for social anthropology in the country is in Bergen, which has a slightly smaller staff and lower student numbers.</p>

Person/Topic	Shannon Morreira South Africa
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	This varies a great deal depending on the size of the department and how many classes they offer. Teaching load is generally not affected by academic rank as teaching is (in theory often) evenly distributed amongst academic staff; however, highly rated researchers may be able to mobilise funding for teaching buyout, to have their teaching time replaced by adjunct staff. Most staff will teach on multiple undergraduate and postgraduate courses in a year, and will take on the responsibility for convening (which carries a high administrative load) a number of courses as well. Student supervision loads also vary –approx. 5 to 15 postgraduate students under supervision at any one time.
Number and kind of publications required per year	There are no strict quantitative requirements but there is an expectation at research intensive universities of one to two articles per year. Books (monographs) are not required, but are valued highly in promotion criteria, especially at associate professor and professor level.
Administrative duties	There is a minimum expectation of convening one or two courses a year (carrying much of the administration for that course--student queries, setting up course sites, etc.--as well as teaching). Management and administration are also built into promotion criteria. Committee work and administrative loads of academics are anecdotally increasing.
Compensation/salary	Academics are well- paid compared to many jobs in the country, but not so well paid on international scales. Salaries vary depending on the university. Labour laws in South Africa are robust; all universities have academic unions. Payment includes benefits such as medical aid for private healthcare, and decreased tuition fees for family members. Retirement savings are automatic, from one's salary to a university pension fund.
Hierarchy between senior and junior professors	This depends on the university: most departments do not have a strict hierarchy, though there is of course a social capital attached to senior professors. Senior staff will carry a higher committee load. Junior staff might (though not always) have a slightly higher teaching load.

General Information of your own University	The University of Cape Town is a research intensive university, and the highest ranked university in the country (and on the African continent). As such, research expectations are higher than elsewhere. But we are also in the midst of big shifts to institutional culture and teaching culture; it is a time of flux.
---	--

Person/Topic	Yasmeen Arif India
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	The University Grants Commission stipulates not less than 40 hours per week, for 180 weeks a year, at least with slight variation in different positions, Professors and Associates slightly lower than others. However, practice varies ranging from 4 courses a year to 3. Doctoral supervision is separate.
Number and kind of publications required per year	No stipulation as to how many publications are needed. There are periodic counts needed when anyone is up for promotion - - so movement from Assistant to Associate will need 5 journal publications or a book, minimally (in addition to teaching experience, supervision etc.).
Administrative duties	There are administrative duties that everyone is assigned, usually committee work. Private universities follow 'global' models like undergraduate advisors, postgraduate advisors etc. They can be varied. Professors have additional duties involving university-wide work or other professional requirements in selection/promotion panels.
Compensation/salary	Compensation packages in private universities are considered higher than in public universities. Public faculty salaries are governed by state or central govt salary rules. Some high- end private universities are known to offer more salary to those with foreign degrees and who are foreign nationals.
Hierarchy between senior and junior professors	Hierarchy is a contentious issue. Regional locations can have caste situations that can be toxic. Metropolitan centers are not free from this-- whether in private or public universities. In my own experience, my home department in the public university had a sense of respect for seniors (there were many renowned people plus it was the best department in the country for decades). Of course, it was mixed with the usual intrapersonal politics. However, in recent times, hierarchies are taking many more forms.
General Information of your own University	Sociology and anthropology can be distinct departments in the country, as in a few older places. My public university stint was at the Department of Sociology, Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi and it combined Sociology and Social

	<p>Anthropology in both method and theory. There are colonial and postcolonial explanations for this. There is an anthropology department in Delhi University with the usual divisions of physical, cultural etc. In the private university that I am currently in, Shiv Nadar University, Sociology is again a combination of Social Anthro and Sociology and is part of a School of Humanities and Social Sciences.</p>
--	---

Person/Topic	Chen Gang China
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	China has a semester system. For all ranks, from assistant professors to professors, teaching is an important part of their work. Most universities require a certain number of teaching hours a year. This includes advising graduate students. Each university has its own calculation formula, which is quite complicated. Roughly, lecturers and associate professors must teach 3 courses per semester.
Number and kind of publications required per year	For publication, as a part of the total working load, universities usually set up a score or number. Papers published in SSCI or CSSCI-indexed journals receive scores. Books published by ranked publishers also receive scores. These publications will be reported in the annual reports and then evaluated. Publications are the most important factor in promotion.
Administrative duties	Professors in China usually do not handle administrative duties, unless they are appointed to an administrative position, which will reduce their teaching and research load.
Compensation/salary	Compared to other jobs in China, university professors receive a stable and good salary with compensation such as medical insurance, housing compensation and retirement pension. A professor's income consists of three parts: basic salary, working compensation (for teaching and research, and other work), and rewards (awards for publications and grants).
Hierarchy between senior and junior professors	It is hard to say. In terms of power, hierarchy exists. The department chair certainly has more rights and authority. Financially, full professors get more pay. Young teachers can be compensated by teaching more courses or publishing papers in recognized SSCI or CSSCI journals.
General Information of your own University	

Person/Topic	Gordon Mathews Hong Kong
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	Professors teach two courses a semester, four courses a year. Lecturers, who are not on the tenure track, teach three courses per semester, six per year. Each course meets three hours a week, two for lecture and one for tutorial. Class sizes are 20-100 students. Teachers have tutors—postgraduate students—who handle most tutorials for larger classes, and who help with grading. Professors supervise graduate students, 2-5 per professor and undergraduate projects
Number and kind of publications required per year	There are no specified requirements, but for survival, 1-2 international publications per year in recognized journals (although not necessarily SSCI) are necessary, as well as a book every few years in gaining promotion. Requirements are increasing, it seems, although this cannot be documented.
Administrative duties	Department secretarial staff in Hong Kong handle much work that professors often handle elsewhere. However, if a professor is not contributing to their university or to their discipline in clear ways, they will be in danger. Professors are rated 40% by research, 40% by teaching, and 20% by administration in annual reports, but in fact publication counts most.
Compensation/salary	Hong Kong professors are well-paid by global standards. The competition for tenure is intense, with up to half of candidates failing, and retirement age is at 60-65, with no pension. But salaries are among the highest in the world. One reason for these high salaries is that professors of all disciplines receive the same salaries, linked to civil servant pay scales in Hong Kong.
Hierarchy between senior and junior professors	Early in the history of my department (the only anthropology dept. in Hong Kong), senior professors had considerable ability to assign excessive duties to junior professors.

	Those days are now over, but they could emerge again, depending on the people involved; there is nothing structurally that prevents this.
General Information of your own University	The Chinese University of Hong Kong is one of eight public universities in Hong Kong. CUHK has the only anthropology dept. in Hong Kong, although other universities also teach anthropology; it has 11 faculty members. CUHK was roiled by battles between police and anti-government protesters over Hong Kong’s future in Nov. 2019; anthropologists worry about possible future censorship.

Person/Topic	Takami Kuwayama Japan
Number of courses/hours that teachers must teach; student supervision	At research universities, the required teaching load is generally 4 courses per semester. One course means one 90-minute class a week. At teaching universities, the load is 6 or more courses. Payment may or may not be made for extra teaching. Many Japanese universities have a seminar system, in which a small number of undergraduate students study intensively under professors of their choice. At universities with graduate schools, professors supervise masters and doctoral students, usually no more than 10 in number. Japanese professors often take their students out for drinking and eating together.
Number and kind of publications required per year	There are no specific requirements of publications per year. There is no clear distinction between in-house journals and high-profile journals like those listed in SSCI. Single-authored books are more important than journal articles when academics are reviewed for promotion/ employment.
Administrative duties	Full-time professors do many “chores,” including committee work of different kinds and supervision of entrance exams for undergraduate and graduate programs. Writing and grading exams is often required for graduate programs.
Compensation/salary	Japanese professors are well paid. Salaries at public (national or regional) universities are lower than at private ones, but the teaching load is much lighter. Salaries at private universities outside the big urban centers are at about the same level as public ones. On the other hand, part-time instructors are poorly paid to the point of being exploited.

<p>Hierarchy between senior and junior professors</p>	<p>Because promotion is basically by age and length of service, there has been or still is no reason for junior faculty members to fight for higher status. They just wait until the right time comes. So there is little resistance from below, which means there is no need for the seniors to dominate those who are below. This is an ironic result of Japan being a hierarchical society.</p>
<p>General Information of your own University</p>	<p>I moved to Kwansei Gakuin University in 2018, one of the four major private universities in the Kansai area centered on Osaka, Japan’s second largest city. Before that time, I was at Hokkaido University, one of Japan’s better-ranked national universities.</p>

3) Commentaries on these Statements and Charts, by Topic

Publications: Ratings and Types **Yasmeen Arif**

Because the chart entries include Chile, Norway, Nigeria, South Africa, India, China, Hong Kong, and Japan, my discussion centers around these societies.

The range of criteria for publications and their impact in formal institutional space seems to be quite vast. Some main points are as follows:

- *SSCI index*: It is of very little or no relevance in almost all the listed countries except in China which uses both SSCI and CSSCI (the Chinese SCCI), and in Chile. Some countries use their own indexing system, which may be linked to the SSCI as in South Africa (DHET lists) or Chile. Others, like in Norway, have their nationally developed ranking systems. Japan rarely uses the SSCI and in India, a list of legitimate journals for publication is available (UGC-Care) which is not directly linked to the SSCI. Hong Kong relies on referees who will evaluate individuals according to disciplinary expertise, and the SSCI is not a reference.
- *Language*: Language is a critical factor in some countries. In China, writing in English can have a twofold meaning—enabling international readership on China or avoiding internal monitoring. However, the impression is that writing in Chinese does not count as much as writing in English. English is a higher rated language of publication in Japan, unlike in the past. In India, a variety of local language journals exist; however no ranking is possible. English is still an aspired medium of writing and most competitive academics will publish only in English in India. In South Africa and Norway, academic publications are primarily in English.
- *Impact* : Publications have varying impact -- in countries like Norway, South Africa and Chile, ranked publications may guarantee research funding as well as gain

privilege and monetary rewards for the scholar. In South Africa, a fairly systematic set of criteria and process exist for the recognition of publications and due rewards in both prestige and funding. In other countries, like India, publications are more related to individual career advancement and reputation. No publications or an inadequate record can have severe impact on sustaining positions in China or in Chile. They are important for promotions in India; however, public universities are now very ‘relaxed’ in this as against private universities. In Hong Kong, publications and their evaluation by referees are crucial in keeping a position or losing it.

Books: Books are privileged over journal publications in almost all locations. There are different criteria for ranking book publishers in China. In India, University Presses are considered better than others. However, some other reputed publishing houses also count. Books, in any case cannot be easily ranked using indexes and in Hong Kong, referee opinions, as above, become important in sustaining very competitive positions.

Tenure: Is Employment Guaranteed upon Hiring? What is Required to Get Tenure?

Takami Kuwayama

Among the countries or regions listed in the charts, the tenure system is practiced in one way or another. In some places (e.g., Hong Kong), it is extremely difficult to get tenure, while in other places (e.g., Japan, South Africa) academic employment is relatively stable from the time of appointment at the beginning level. The key factor for getting tenure is publication, although the required level varies from place to place both qualitatively and quantitatively. In Hong Kong and Chile, for example, articles in top journals like those listed on SSCI are needed, but this does not strictly apply in other places. For the promotion of tenured faculty members, it is often important to get external grants (e.g., China), particularly from the state or the world’s leading foundations. There are times when ethnicity, including religion, matters in getting academic positions or being promoted to higher positions. In India, new doctorates from universities in the North (i.e., the so-called “West”) have advantages over those from local universities in job search. Concerns have been expressed about the severe working conditions among part-time or non-tenure track teaching staff (e.g., India, Norway). Throughout the world, academic jobs are becoming precarious for beginning scholars.

Annual Reports

Gordon Mathews

Annual Reports have become necessary in most universities in the societies represented by our task force. In Japanese private universities, where salary may be determined by seniority only, they are seldom used; and in Norway they are put together by administrators rather than professors and are not directly relevant to advancement. However, in other societies, they are of direct importance. In South Africa and Chile, they help decide whether or not a professor can get research funding. In Hong Kong, South Africa, Chile, Japanese public universities, China, and India, they are directly used in helping to determine pay raises and promotion. These annual reports are primarily focused on publication in Japan,

and publication and supervision in South Africa; in other societies, such as Hong Kong, they encompass publication, grants received, teaching, and administration to arrive at an overall score. In societies such as Japan, China, and Hong Kong, these are given broad category rankings, such as "excellent," "very good," "pass", or "fail." Societies that don't use annual reports are either those such as Japan that (in many private universities) don't care about performance but only seniority of professors, or those such as in Norway that focus on applications for tenure and promotion every few years rather than on yearly reports. In other societies, such as South Africa, India, Japan, China and Hong Kong, they are indeed used, and indeed more or less count in gaining pay raises, research funding, and promotion.

Broadly speaking, annual reports represent the effort by administrators to reward those who perform well in a given year, as opposed to those who do not perform well. Who ultimately decides on the ratings given in yearly reports? If it is administrators, can they adequately understand the work of anthropologists? Are the criteria used in annual reports fair? Do they adequately cover all aspects of anthropologists' jobs? (For example, in many places in the world, editing journals counts for nothing.) And is the yearly assessment period too short to be fair? (If one is writing a book, the yearly assessment may show nothing in a given year.) If the reporting required is overly meticulous, then to what extent are anthropologists trapped in documenting what they do at the expense, in time, of actually doing it? All in all, how should we evaluate, as a task force, the necessity and content of annual reports by anthropologists in departments around the world?

Political pressure on academics

Thomas Hylland Eriksen

In many countries, politics restricts and shapes academic work especially in the social sciences and humanities. This can happen in several ways. In India, for example, many academic appointments at state universities are now politically motivated. As a result, the best academics are often neglected if they belong to the 'wrong' religious group or are otherwise known to be critical of the government.

Academic freedom is also limited to varying degrees across the world. In countries such as India, China and Turkey, academics risk losing their jobs if they express views which are understood as being subversive or critical of the political leadership.

Informal sanctions are also applied within academia, and they seem to have been strengthened during the present century. Harsh criticism and 'no-platforming' has been known to ruin academic careers, e.g. in the USA, and such sanctions may be imposed both from the left and right politically.

Finally, an instrumental view of knowledge, which was never entirely absent, seems to have been strengthened in the same period. This is being felt in many countries, including Norway and Chile, where knowledge not deemed 'useful' is underfunded and carries low prestige. Research foundations, acting on directives from politicians, ask for 'innovation' and 'groundbreaking research', but what they really mean is profitable and useful knowledge. This ideological bias skews the focus of research in a way detrimental to the curiosity-driven impetus which is fundamental to anthropology.

Generational change among anthropologists--the situation now as compared to decades ago in different societies.

Chen Gang

Education has been developing quite fast globally. Generation changes among anthropologists exist in China, Hong Kong, Japan, India, and Norway as reported. More competition and more pressure seem to be current situations for anthropologists globally.

In China, there are obvious generational changes in Chinese universities regarding evaluation and promotion. The evaluation system in Chinese universities is a recent development regulated by Ministry of Education in China. It is a part of reforms that the Ministry of Education has conducted since the 1980s. Before that, there was no such evaluation system. Promotion was first based on the number of years you worked for the university, and then one's teaching and research work. In those years, once you got a job in a university, you would not be fired and would be promoted steadily. Deans and department heads had power. So the *guanxi* (connection) with the leaders were important. Now the promotion procedure is quite transparent. All applicants will be scored based on their publications, grants, and teaching.

In Hong Kong, it is widely assumed that conditions for getting tenure have become more difficult in recent years, reflecting global conditions in anthropology, with anthropology positions becoming scarcer. In Japan, socialization, namely drinking and eating together with peers until late at night, at least occasionally, has been an integral part of academic life. This custom has excluded female researchers from the circle of communication, but it is changing among young people (males) who now share housework and child rearing with their partners. A major issue that is being discussed today, especially among young female anthropologists, is the alleged sexual harrasment they were subjected to while doing fieldwork.

In Norway, owing to the exponential population growth among academics in general, also anthropologists, the scene is far more competitive than in the 1990s, which in turn was considerably more competitive than the 1970s. An alternative trajectory for those PhDs who are determined to carry on with research can be working in an external (non-university) institute of social research. They would then mainly work in interdisciplinary teams on applied issues.

In South Africa, the changes are more expectations of publication, a rise of precarious employment, and decline in government support of universities. But there are also strong positive changes in terms of transformation in terms of race and institutional culture, as compared to pre-1994 South African universities which existed under apartheid. South Africa now has a very strict Employment Equity laws in order to shift the racial and gender makeup of staff at universities away from apartheid's legacy. In India, there is a huge growth of 'qualified' candidates, and a dearth of desirable positions. In some primary universities there is an open preference for 'white Northern' degrees.

Impact: Professional and Public

Gordon Mathews

Every society's anthropology as profiled in the preceding pages is concerned about the professional impact of anthropologists. There are rewards given to those who publish in recognized journals within a given society, and often to those who publish internationally, particularly in English. It is country-specific whether one needs to focus on international publications (as is particularly the case in Chile) or can focus on domestic publications (as has been the case particularly in Japan). But in the preceding essays and charts, public impact seems almost absent. The reward structure in different societies seems to be based on professional rather than public contribution. In Chile, the great emphasis placed on SSCI and other citation indexes means that public anthropology is devalued, and writing for the larger public is not encouraged. This is stated explicitly for Chile in the earlier pages of this document, but is implied everywhere.

This is in some societies complexified by language. In Japan and to an extent China, publication in English provides young scholars with considerable benefits. But this remains professional publication: publication beyond the academy is not emphasized. In fact, in societies such as Japan, China, and Norway and other societies, many anthropologists do indeed publish popular books outside the academy in their native languages, because there are not many academic presses in these societies. But as Kuwayama notes about Japan, "Being widely cited by the global community of specialists often contradicts being highly appreciated by the local reading public," with the former counted and the latter not counted. This is more or less true in all the societies discussed in these pages. Beyond reaching the reading public, Eriksen asks, concerning Norway, "Can a scholar who has prolifically produced reports for the public sector, and has served on many committees giving policy advice on anything from waste management to minority policy, and who wishes to return to academia, be evaluated along alternative criteria? Could ten reports on applied issues, or five popular books on anthropological topics, qualify an applicant for a full professorship, or does academia remain secluded, conservative and enclosed?" The answer at present is generally no, in Norway and elsewhere.

Might this be changing? In the Research Assessment Exercises that have been requisite in the United Kingdom and other societies, including Hong Kong, a recent category that has been added has been Impact, meaning impact on public policy of government or NGOs or other stakeholders beyond the realm of professional anthropology. This has become a surprisingly important measure of research assessment scores, with anthropology departments' fundings based in part on whether at least a few individuals in a given department have had impact beyond the academy. Measuring impact is controversial in many ways—simply writing a widely read book about an anthropological topic would not of itself count as "impact" without some more specific measurement of effects on policy--but this new emphasis does seem to indicate a new effort to encourage a more public role for academics. Perhaps in a decade or two, a chart such as those set forth above will indeed emphasize public impact more than they do at present.

**Pressure from the Global North:
Anglo-American hegemony in publication and citation practices**
Shannon Morreira

While the particular systems that exert pressure in each context discussed in this document

might differ, there is no doubt that all contexts experience some form of pressure in terms of where work is published and in what form. In some spaces the SSCI carries a great deal of weight (Chile; India; China), while in others other local ranking and indexing systems matter more (Japan, South Africa, Norway). Whether SSCI or a local system of determining the legitimacy of academic publications is used, however, it seems that ‘international journals’ or ‘international publishing houses’— often shorthand for publications based in the global North – carry prestige, particularly those with high impact factors. There is thus some kind of pressure exerted on anthropologists across all the contexts discussed here to publish at least some of their work in English-language journals based in the Global North. This pressure may be seen in terms of job security and/or career progression (South Africa, Nigeria; India; Hong Kong); income incentives (Chile; China); the desire to be internationally read and cited (Norway, South Africa, India), or the pressure exerted by academic management to ensure a rise of their institution in global university rankings (Japan). Thus, while there is no context in which publishing in internationally recognized journals is the sole criteria for the academic progress or job security of anthropologists, in all spaces it matters in one way or another.

The above has effects on the kinds of knowledge produced, who it is produced for, the language in which it is produced and read, the citational universes of particular fields, and the survival rate of local journals. One of the questions asked during the RhodesMustFall student protests at the University of Cape Town in 2015 was whether research agendas were relevant to local communities and local questions, and whether academic research was concerned with academic prestige or with social justice. The patterns from across the different contexts discussed in this task force show these still to be very relevant questions. Anthropology has always taken local/endogenous concepts seriously in our analytic work, but it is clear from the discussion across the different contexts of Chile, Norway, India, South Africa, Nigeria, China, Hong Kong, and Japan, that where this work is published affects its perceived legitimacy, and affects how often it will be read and cited. As long as citational metrics remain a measure of value, anthropologists will be encouraged to produce work that falls within this internal system of prestige-making, which limits the possibilities of anthropology and anthropologists contributing to different systems of meaning making.

4) Suggestions for improving the situations portrayed in these pages

Broad Global Issues in Anthropology

a) Some form of evaluation of anthropology professors seems inevitable. The earlier situation of Japan, where seniority alone was effectively the only grounds for promotion, is broadly untenable. However, evaluation that is inhumanly strict, as in Hong Kong, is also untenable. We suggest a middle ground.

b) Evaluation should take place using not simply one criterion of publishing in certain specified professional journals. Rather, it should encompass other activities as well, such as contributing policy reports or writing for the larger public, both of which are important. This is already the case in China, in terms of writing policy reports, to a degree, but not elsewhere, such as Norway, and most other societies. Participating in anthropological

conferences or meetings should be taken into account in the evaluation. Writing in languages other than English for a larger public should also be acceptable as both a vehicle for scholarship and popular writing.

c) Anglo-American domination of citation indexes such as SSCI is deeply unfortunate, and can be solved only by anthropologists in a range of societies citing from local, national, and regional sources, rather than from the Anglo-American “core.” However, at present, it is a reality. While publication in the Anglo-American core need not necessarily be discouraged, publication within other dimensions—the regional, the national, and the local—should be equally encouraged in the anthropological worlds of different societies, and should “count” in the evaluation of professors.

d) There is a vast discrepancy in pay and benefits as well as in expected duties among anthropologists in different societies, just as there is within each society between professors and adjuncts. This cannot be addressed within the narrow scope of this document; but it does, lamentably, color the entire background of this document.

e) The gap between the Global North and the Global South in anthropology is not only apparent in citation indexes, but also in places where anthropologists do fieldwork, and how they are funded. Anthropologists from the Global North come to the Global South to do research, but the obverse rarely happens. The implication of the funding disparity is that funders in the Global North do not trust scholars—anthropologists—in the Global South. We hope that funders, and, more broadly, anthropologists in the Global North, can work to overcome this problem.

f) World university rankings have become ubiquitous, and place particular pressure on the Global South. Universities of the Global South, almost by definition, lack the resources of the Global North, and so to place all these universities on a single global scale is problematic. This is especially true of anthropology, since in many countries of the Global South, it is under threat as an independent discipline. For example, how many students are willing to go from the Global North to the Global South to study anthropology (as opposed to doing research)? Very few. This can only be rectified in the long term, but it must be steadily worked towards.

More Immediate Issues Relating to this Task Force and WCAA

a) This document will be posted to the WCAA website. A major limitation of this task force has been that it consists of anthropologists from a limited number of societies. We need to expand the societies represented. On the WCAA website, we can certainly allow for comments, but could we have some form of open document, where anthropologists can add their own societies to what we have been discussing? Or will this simply open the door for spammers and pranksters? We need to think of a series of steps to make this document more inclusive: It would be great if it could represent most societies in the world! We may need to have multiple stages of revisions.

b) We should look for transnational funding (e.g. Wenner-Gren) to encourage ethnography of our main topics of this task force, and to help accomplish the aims stated above. Another important use of funding might apply to *Deja Lu*, to translate various of its articles into multiple languages, to make *Deja Lu* more truly global: this too would be valuable.

c) Perhaps there could be a global task force working to create a global anthropological index of value recognition. Although there are great historical differences between Southern and Northern anthropologies, between nations and between universities, there are certain issues that seem to persist for anthropology that have not been valued universally. These might be explored.