Experiencing Theory, Theorizing Methodology: Teaching Anthropology through Short-Time Ethnographic Fieldwork Projects in Multi-Disciplinary Academic Contexts

Vassilis Dalkavoukis[1], Paraskevas Potiropoulos[2]

[1]Democritus University of Thrace, Greece; [2]H.F.R.C, Academy of Athens, Greece

Abstract

Often enough, Anthropology seems as an 'abstract' discipline, especially when students of other social sciences or humanities try to get acquainted with its theory, methodology or the main anthropological discussion in general. Under these specific conditions, 'teaching Anthropology' becomes a task of high difficulty without a simultaneous ethnographic practice in the 'field'. It is this specific 'rite de passage' which makes students under training in Anthropology seek theoretical schemas and methodological tools in order to 'experience' theory and 'theorize' methodology. In this paper we present ethnographic material collected from various teaching contexts where Anthropology is neither the main academic background nor the stated educational outcome for students taking the courses. In these courses, anthropological knowledge comes to the surface through an empirical engagement with ethnographic practice as an applied theory in a research project. This connection between theory and practice brings Anthropology to the foreground, since it engages students with both - the procedure of "doing field work" (something substantial for Anthropology) and their own social experience within this process. The ethnographic material for this reflective approach derives from various academic contexts where we have experienced the emergence of this type of learning. This includes ethnographic and anthropological courses (undergraduate or postgraduate) at the Department of History and Ethnology in Democritus University of Thrace Greece, and field trips including ethnographic exercise for the students and the Konitsa Summer School for Anthropology, Ethnography and Comparative Folklore of the Balkans, organized by the Border Crossings Network in collaboration with the University of Ioannina and the Municipality of Konitsa, Greece, at the Greek-Albanian border.

Keywords: ethnographic exercise; research project; anthropological courses; practice; reflective approach.

Introduction: Teaching Anthropology in Greek Universities

Anthropology in Greece, either 'social' or 'cultural', is a relatively new cognitive academic field. It first became part of Panteion university curriculum during 1982-83 (Tsaousis 1985: 11), but the first department of Social Anthropology was established in the Aegean university in 1987-88, at the graduate level, and in 1988-89, at the undergraduate level[1]. At the beginning of the following decade Anthropology was already an autonomous field in new university departments as well. The department of Social Policy and Social Anthropology of Panteion university was founded in 1990 (*Study guide* of the Social Policy and Social Anthropology department 2001: 9), has becoming the autonomous department of Social Anthropology in 2004-05. Anthropology has also been taught since 1999-2000, in the History, Archaeology and Folklore department of the University of Thessaly, which was renamed as department of History, Archaeology and Social Anthropology in 2002[2]. However, Anthropology is also taught in other university departments (such as the History and Archaeology departments of the University of Crete, the University of Peloponnese, and Aristotle University of Thessaloniki) and even in a few Pedagogical departments of Primary Education (e.g., University of Western Macedonia, Democritus University of Thrace)[3]. It should however be mentioned that Anthropology has been taught, in the beginning by A. Kyriakidou-Nestoros, since the 1980's, both as an introductory course along with Folklore and as an independent course in the department of History and Archaeology of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, where the laboratory of Folklore and Social Anthropology was established.

In such departments, one of which is the department of History and Ethnology of Democritus University of Thrace, Anthropology is a 'peripheral' course: unlike other subjects, such as History for example, Anthropology is being taught fragmentarily (as part of the Ethnology, together with Archeology, Natural Anthropology, Demography, Folklore), selectively and mainly in a complementary way, so that students acquire a general perception of it, or in terms of specific knowledge in the context of its use in education, where mostly graduates are to be employed.

The structure and the objectives of the curricula where Anthropology has a peripheral or even marginal role, bring about a number of consequences for the teaching process which give rise to enormous difficulties in transferring a satisfactory picture of Anthropology to students. This to a great extent, alters its physiognomy as a science: in terms of its content, it drastically shrinks; in terms of teaching methodology, Anthropology, which by its nature is a 'field' science, is being trapped within the university halls, articulated in 'dry' academic speech from where 'local voices' are absent.

Thus, classroom-teaching as a well-established educational practice seems not to be sufficient, even with the use of both the existing literature and the new ICT media (films, ethnographic documentaries, Internet, etc.),[4] even with the support of invited speakers. How can we talk about societies and cultures in different parts of the earth, while, at the same time, we are, physically, far from them? How can we highlight the possibility of exploring every human society, explain how it can serve as a research and interpretive tool of social reality, and convince about its role or even its possible intervention as a science in the central issues that concern the modern Greek society and, more broadly, the whole world; and finally, how can we inspire students to deepen and engage more thoroughly with it? Especially those who do not intend to become anthropologists, and according to a prevailing perception, might not even need anthropology?[5]

"Anthropology is not Ethnography", but…

This paper proposes an approach to teaching anthropology through the use of ethnography as a form of both experiential and practical learning and as a method of better understanding of the discipline itself. This approach falls within what has been described as "experiential learning" (Mills, Drackle and Edgar 2004: 7) which includes the classroom as a venue for the course but at the same time emphasizes the interaction that is developed through the participation in field research exercises and the knowledge gained through this experience. Key elements of this approach are teamwork; orientation and engagement with specific topics/research questions; the combination of activities within the class and in the field; and the intensive communication among teachers and students; all issues that have been part of Anthropological discussion since the early 20th century (Mills, Drackle and Edgar 2004: 4-6).

Fieldwork research is considered as the fundamental way of producing anthropological knowledge and at the same time the kind of passport ritual that formalizes the integration of the prospective anthropologist into the scientific community of Anthropology. In modern times its inclusion as a part of the undergraduate students' education takes place both in the classroom with the use of texts and the reference to the personal experiences of the teachers, and by the performance of short-term (which can be completed within a six-month course) or long-term research projects. This is a practice embedded in most undergraduate curriculum programs of Anthropology in Europe[6], although it does not seem to have been the case across American universities. According to Gupta and Ferguson (1997: 102),

> It is astonishing, but true, that most leading departments of anthropology in the United States provide no formal (and very little informal) training in fieldwork methods—as few as 20 percent of departments, according to one survey. It is also true that most anthropological training programs provide little guidance in, and almost no critical reflection on, the selection of fieldwork sites and the considerations that deem some places but not others as suitable for the role of "the field." It is as if the mystique of fieldwork were too great in anthropology for the profession even to permit such obvious and practical issues to be seriously discussed, let alone to allow the idea of "the field" itself to be subjected to scrutiny and reflection.

The necessity of student participation in fieldwork research exercises at the undergraduate level and the incorporation of these actions into the teaching methodology of Anthropology has been a major concern for British Anthropology during the 1990s[7]. Given that fieldwork is traditionally associated with long durations in the field, there was much disagreement over the benefits of introducing shorts undergraduate field exercises (Watson 1995: 153-154). Ingold (1991) criticized the integration of fieldwork research into the activities of undergraduate

students. His reservations were that organizing and guiding fieldwork exercises is hard and time-intensive for both teachers and students, hence its effectiveness would be dubious at undergraduate level. He also highlighted the students' deficient knowledge concerning anthropological concepts; knowledge which should precede any research activity or risk students being confused and unable to manage the research experience. Finally, he stressed that there is a danger that this emphasis on research activity may create the illusion that the essence of Anthropology is the fieldwork itself rather than its ability to compare, theorize, generalize and express views on the social and cultural diversity of the world.

Those in favor of using practical field research for teaching stressed that students' involvement in research exercises is a kind of a fieldwork simulation, where one experiences all of its stages, even on a small scale (Hanley 1989, Sharma 1989, 1991, Shore 1990, Watson 1995). The ultimate benefit for participants is improving their understanding of what Anthropology is and what it does. Supporters argued that learning at the undergraduate level through participation in research activity was aa pedagogically fruitful and effective method of teaching both in the USA (Boyer 1990) and in Britain (Jenkins et al., 2003). The anthropological theory produced in the classroom and the library, generates the "large issues" which are to be ethnographically explored in the "small places" (Eriksen 2001) of the field research. Incorporating experiential learning into Anthropology consequently seeks to relate theory to practice. Furthermore, the lived experience of being in the field with the culturally familiar and/or different, builds direct awareness of the ways in which social reality is shaped and perceived by informants.

This direct contact and personal experience can also trigger reflective thinking and opportunities to theorize their own way of perceiving reality[8]. In this way, fieldwork experiences can bring out, in the most energetic and representational way, realisations about the benefits of anthropological intervention on pressing social issues. Choosing research fields that are relatively familiar to students is not only a methodological tool for 'anthropology at home', but can help students consolidate learning on the method itself, since a more familiar environment can make it easier for them to manage its contradictions and difficulties[9].

"Focused Ethnography" as an "Incomplete" Alternative

"Focused ethnography" projects can facilitate beneficial ethnographic experiences in a shorter time frame. According to Hubert Knoblauch (2005: 1), focused ethnography is "a distinctive kind of sociological ethnography which is particularly, though not exclusively, adopted in applied research (…) In comparison with conventional ethnography, focused ethnography keeps a complementary role rather than a controversial one". It is applied in a variety of disciplines where qualitative research projects contribute essential knowledge such as nursing, workplace studies, architecture, museum research, marketing and consumer research. Knoblauch suggests that focused ethnography is the most appropriate type of ethnography for research projects within one's own society where the "bestrangement" of the familiar prerequisites "alterity" rather than the "strangeness" found in conventional anthropological ethnography. Here 'alterity' stresses the differences that emerge within shared knowledge:

> Alter ego may be a different actor; alter ego may even know different things, but is accessible in the backdrop of common, shared knowledge. It is in this backdrop of communality that sociological ethnographers attempt to identify differences, i.e., specific features: differences between them and other types of persons, differences of scenes, settings and situations, differences of fields. It is in this context that ethnography can attempt to take the natives' point of view (Knoblauch 2005: 3).

Today, given the time pressure for academic anthropologists, short term fieldwork is increasingly used for collecting ethnographic material. It is one of the alternative forms of field research aiming to restore a sense of duration through repeated short visits of the field over time to maintain continuity of contact and monitor changing local lives, along with the use of modern technologies, digital media and social media.
Regardless of the acceptance or not of the Knoblauch's conceptualization, focused ethnography as a set of techniques seems to be extremely useful for framing student fieldwork exercise projects. First of all, focused ethnographies are short-term and not continual. Many of our fieldwork projects are planned so field visits go at regular intervals that coincide with specific events. As Faubion suggest, good ethnography does not have to mean long durations in the field:

> Good anthropology will always take time. Yet, I can see no reason for concluding that the time it takes must in every case be spent in its bulk in a physical field site (…). The ethical profile of the good anthropologist, in short, yields no methodological a priori concerning the appropriate duration of a project. Everything hinges on the terms and requirement of the question of research itself. (Faubion 2009: 163)

In focused ethnography the lack of time is normally balanced by an intensive data collection and a data analysis procedure. It means that beyond the typical practices of observation and field notes, researchers aim for a large amount of technically recorded data which is

> accessible to multiple listeners and viewers at the same time. This resource is exploited by the institution of data sessions, i.e., the gathering of researchers listening to and viewing the same data [and] this procedure opens data socially to other perspectives. In order to support this opening, data session groups are helpful, the more they are socially and culturally mixed. (Knoblauch 2005: 6)

Here Knoblauch introduces fieldwork as a process of working-in-groups. Moreover, a focused ethnography approach requires planning, applying theoretical and methodological principles in order to focus on specific aspects of a field rather than studying the whole structure more open-endedly. It also orientates researchers to focus specifically on "actions, interactions and social situations" (Knoblauch 2005: 7) and consider their communication practices. In other words, focused ethnography is the perfect methodological tool to manage student fieldwork exercises as group work within multilingual, interdisciplinary and /or time limitations.

However, a question remains: what kind of knowledge is being produced through this type of fieldwork? Is it 'proper', 'reliable' or 'complete'? George Marcus introduces two parallel ideas adapted especially to such educational circumstances concerning fieldwork: the concept of "design process" and the "norm of incompleteness". According to Marcus:

> A design process is open-ended. It incorporates scenarios of anticipation and changing course, requires the presentation for review of an ethnographically sensitive research imaginary before the undertaking of fieldwork that overreaches it and is revisable in terms of it. Research conceived as a design process keeps attention focused on material –data sets– all along the way and insists on results that are closely accountable to it. Thus, it encourages theoretical work at the level of material –the stuff of fieldwork as I call it– and privileges found concepts that emerge from it. It also looks beyond the confines of its own production to response and revision. While still preserving the responsibility of individual work, it recognizes collaboration as a normative principle, incorporates broad receptions and finds a place for the anthropological community in this (…) Both under present conditions and in research imagined as a design process as just discussed, incompleteness would be a positive norm of practice, even a theorem of practice, expected of kinds of inquiry that remain open-ended even when they are "finished". Incompleteness is a dimension of thinking about what can be said about what one has done. (Marcus 2007: 356)

These concepts allow us to argue for the pedagogical use and value of this kind of fieldwork exercise and to respond to the question concerning knowledge production. The open-ended process of research reveals the interplay between theory and ethnographic practice, not only in terms of re-arranging research tactics and strategies but also as a constant play of problematizing, rethinking, and redoing the inquiry. The knowledge that is being produced is one of the multiple accountabilities of the research but is not definite. It refers to one of the multiple possibilities of analysis and interpretation of the fieldwork. The "norm of incompleteness" takes the ethnographic material for an "archive" of knowledge that allows multiple readings, uses, and interpretations, that is subject to revision by later and other work; it is an "open archive" for the ethnographies of the future.

Describing Some "Good-to-Think" Projects

Let's take a look at a few characteristic examples, in the form of empirical material, highlighting the above theoretical and methodological aspects of the discussion.

Doing fieldwork in interdisciplinary student groups

The first example derives from our common experience in the framework of the Konitsa Summer school where we both participated as teachers of the course "Doing Fieldwork: Theory, Method and the Production of Anthropological Knowledge" and concurrently, as students' supervisors of a short-term ethnographic fieldwork[10]. The duration of the summer school ranges from 15 to 20 days, and the program in terms of the ethnographic fieldwork exercise is divided into three stages: preparation, fieldwork itself, process and a first presentation of ethnographic data in the form of research reports. This course is an introduction to ethnographic fieldwork, providing basic outlines on epistemological, methodological, and practical issues of ethnographic research, in

order to develop an understanding of the relationship between methodological practice, data analysis and the writing of ethnography.

Fieldwork ethnographic exercise is the key element of the summer school, in understanding the role of fieldwork research in producing anthropological knowledge. As it is mentioned in the course description:

> The course will encourage an appreciation of the problems of anthropological fieldwork and address issues such as access to the field, norms and conventions in applying research techniques in particular cultural contexts, the processual nature of fieldwork, ethical concerns, and the personal and emotional commitment of the researcher. It will also concentrate on the process of recording ethnographic data through field notes and reflect on the process of turning fieldwork data into a narrative account of fieldwork.

It is an intensive, short term ethnographic fieldwork exercise featuring student team working. An important element is the differences between the participating students themselves. These concern their countries of origin, their scientific field and their educational level, but more so, their relationship with anthropology itself and their prior experience in field research. It is a challenge where the aforementioned variations, which could be perceived as disadvantages, are turned into advantages for the fieldwork, since they can become a positive component of the students' ethnographic experience. The aim is therefore to let those variations help students to activate their personal experiences and knowledge, namely their personal background, in the process of understanding the ethnographic method. This background is initially activated by the students while they select the subject of their research, the research group, and even the field of the research. In the same way, this personal background plays an important role during the ethnographic fieldwork exercise, as it can be a safe way for students to enter the field and for the first time approach its issues. Moreover, during this initial approach, the cognitive background of each and every one of them is also important while analyzing and interpreting the collected data.

We can briefly refer to a few examples: The first example concerns the processes of building a local identity, through music, in a border region of northwestern Greece. Music was the subject that 2 of the 4 members of the group were studying (Greek musicologists), which explains their choice to focus on music in their fieldwork. The ability of the third member of the group, of a Croatian anthropology student, to play a traditional musical instrument, made it easier for them to contact the locals, particularly some folk musicians, during fieldwork. In this way, working as a group, not only was a potential language barrier overcome, but also a very fruitful form of communication based on the musical code was established. The fourth member of the group, a postdoctoral student in linguistics and literature, from Brazil but with Italian origin, had space to also focused on their own interests by recording the words of the songs and the narratives of the researchers themselves. This short-term ethnographic research had the characteristics of a focused ethnography as visits also coincided with the holding of a folklore festival and of other music and dance events in the region. While the fieldwork for the students had been a feast of sounds and intense experiences, the process of turning fieldwork into a narrative fieldwork account was more challenging. However, at this point the contribution of the fourth member of the group was rather significant. Using her theoretical background of linguistics, structural analysis, and comparative approach, she helped greatly to organise the data in a project report.

In this example, which was one of many over the years, the use of personal experiences and knowledge had greatly helped students attempt to reach out and understand the local community in their own ways. It also helped them familiarize themselves with the process of field research, its requirements and difficulties. Moreover, it helped them to experience how theory is associated with action, namely the ways in which anthropological theory interacts with ethnographic action in a two-sided relationship. What is clear is that it is not primarily the production of anthropological knowledge as such, that counts here, but rather the understanding, on the part of the students, of the anthropological approach and above all deepening an understanding of the continuity of identity and otherness in both researcher and informant.

Postgraduate primary education students in the field

The next example concerns ethnographic fieldwork conducted by the students of the postgraduate program 'Innovative pedagogical approaches in multicultural educational environments' of the Department of Education Sciences in Early Childhood at Democritus University of Thrace, where one of us (Vassilis Dalkavoukis) teaches a course titled "Applying Ethnography in formal and informal Education". The students of the program are mostly teachers of primary nursery schools building intercultural readiness, a skill which is considered essential in contemporary schooling, given its multicultural composition. In this context, comprising ten three-hour

meetings, students, after a brief introduction to the discipline of Social and Cultural Anthropology, focus on Anthropology of Education through the Jerome Bruner's model of cultural psychology (1996). During the meetings they are taught the basic methodological techniques of ethnographic fieldwork, specifically participant observation, semi-structured interview, field notes and ethnographic diary, and "focused ethnography".

After clarifying the distinction between culture and civilization as they are used in Anthropology, students are introduced to Bruner's idea that learning is the function of the cultural contexts people use to live (Bruner 1996: 1-43). In this sense, teaching students from different cultural environments requires teachers with critical knowledge: they should know the ways in which their 'Other' students or pupils are able to learn. In other words, the teacher has to study their own cultural presuppositions of learning determined by their own cultural peculiarities (among them language, ethnicity, religion). This task, however, transforms a typical teacher into a kind of 'ethnographer' in –and sometimes out of– his or her school classroom or any other educational environment. In this framework, the postgraduate students have to conduct a short-term fieldwork exercise in an educational context, where they have to apply all this theoretical and methodological information.

It is obvious that the full description of their duty can be shocking for the postgraduate students at first, but they overcome it very soon: what helps them to do so is the freedom to choose their research teams, topics and fields. The classrooms where they often teach are usually chosen as field, since among them there are members from the Muslim Minority of Thrace (of Turkish origin or Slavic speaking and sometimes Roma). Other times they choose the nearby refugee camps, recently established in the cities of Kavala and Drama, where some students take part as volunteers. Sometimes they choose to conduct fieldwork in other informal educational environments searching for vocational education and training from the Post Greek Civil War era (e.g., the Queen Frederica's technical schools or educational institutions in the countries of "Real Socialism"), interviewing aged people who experienced those conditions.

The free choice of the team, the topic, and the field is important for another reason: it often allows students to use their own experience and "cultural intimacy" (Herzfeld 1997) and practice in the process of "defamiliarization" (Bell, Blythe and Sengers 2005, de Jong, Kamsteeg, and Ybema, 2013), which is of particular significance when conducting ethnographic fieldwork 'at home'. Besides, some of the students are members of the Muslim Minority of Thrace or come from repatriated families from the former Soviet Union, thus they are experiencing a mixed identity that normally makes them more sensitive to cultural diversity, since they feel they are "halfies" (Abu-Lughod 1991). Therefore, before undertaking their work, students discuss both their own cultural profile and their ability to enter more easily in certain fields or manage certain issues. Nevertheless, the whole procedure is not always fruitful. But in many cases, the students produce inspired and penetrative essays[11] which suggest that teaching anthropological understanding through ethnography is effective. Below we share an extract from an essay written after such a short-term fieldwork project conducted in a refugee camp, in order to show how the student has sensitively dealt with the issue of borders and boundaries and how she has deftly handled sensitive personal data despite only being introduced to anthropology in a short time:

> Border policy practices are questioned by people who dare to cross them without following all statutory procedures. Border policy –and therefore the existence of the system serving them– owes its status to border travelers. Such travelers are migrants who despite all prohibitions –for a multitude of reasons– choose to move, and also the minorities, stateless people, people with or without documents who are the "foreigners" and are being used politically for the border/ boundary to be defined. Among them, the "Bidoon" from Kuwait, who is the subject of this research project.

> Particularly, I am implementing an ethnographic study that approaches and attempts to analyze the identity-building process of a Bidoon-man from Kuwait, who is in the midst of his refugee voyage from Kuwait to Europe. This youngster is 18 years of age and during this study he stays in one of the Hospitalization Centers in Greece. Since he initially and with enthusiasm approved the study, he was asked to choose which of his identity characteristics could be mentioned in the study so that his life or travel towards Europe would by no means be affected by the publication of it. For the purposes of this study, he therefore chose to be called Rashid.

Concluding Remarks from a Reflecting Perspective

Ethnography is both the starting point and the ultimate goal of anthropology, says D. Miller (2017: 27). In this context, fieldwork is more than just a methodological technique. It is a kind of an ontological commitment on behalf of the researcher (Ingold, 2017: 23), a kind of dwelling in the field (dwelling for Heidegger was an active participation) (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997: 111-113). Fieldwork then is an act of correspondence and

understanding that facilitates a core tenant of anthropological practice: that 'getting to know' others means anthropologists do not study people but *with* people. In this way, fieldwork serves one of the primary objectives of anthropology: getting to know others and ourselves (Ingold, 2017: 23).

These specific examples of ethnographic practice lead us to insights concerning both the ethnographic exercise itself and its usefulness to students, as well as to some methodological and epistemological ascertainments. Regarding the first, participation in ethnographic exercises is a significant experiential and educational experience for students. It is both a learning and social event, a holistic experience through which they learn while they produce knowledge. Having a complete, as much as possible, ethnographic experience, which includes preparation for the field, fieldwork itself, management, analysis and interpretation of the data collected and finally a first presentation of it is a simulation of an ethnographic act. In this way, anthropological discourse, as well as the methodological and theoretical abilities of the students, is actually being tested as they practically learn about anthropology through experience.

On a second level, these research exercises foster reflexivity on the applicability of ethnographic research and anthropological action. Specifically, a focused ethnography approach can highlight the dynamic benefits of group research. This concerns not only the benefits diverse team mates bring to a developing a multifaceted approach in the field but also recognition of the ways the field is perceived differently by researchers from different traditions of research, methodological practices, as well as scientific fields (folklore, literature, geography, arts, economy, sociology, architecture etc.). It is therefore important to highlight the dynamics and usefulness of interdisciplinarity in the study of cultural and social phenomena. In this way, the benefits of fieldwork research to respond to the modern conditions and requirements, is itself experientially reiterated to students, which ensures its continuity as well (Gupta and Ferguson, 1997: 139).

If "Anthropology is philosophy with the people in", as Tim Ingold stresses (Eriksen 2001: 1), then ethnographic experience seems to be the key agent of accomplishing this understanding:: at first, people –among them students in our case– get to know anthropology's tradition and its epistemological starting points, not in terms of a 'clear' philosophical thought about people in general, but studying themselves as well as 'Others' as specific, historical and culturally defined 'subjects' of the research. Secondly, the philosophical thought which anthropology uses, is being redefined by students through numerous empirical ethnography projects that use both inductive and/or interpretive approaches. In any case, ethnographic experience brings people into a deep philosophical discussion through anthropological theory and practice. This is what it means to "experience theory" and "theorise methodology".

Disclosure statement
No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes

[1] See "History" in the Department's website: https://en.sah.aegean.gr/the-department/department-history/. Accessed on January 25, 2021.

[2] See "History" in the webpage of the Department:http://www.ha.uth.gr/index.php?page=iakahistory. Accessed on January 25, 2021.

[3] For the emergence, integration and establishment of Anthropology as a university sector in Greece, see also Gefou-Madianou (1993), (2000), Papataxiarchis (2003) (2013), Panopoulos (2004).

[4] For the use of ICT media in teaching Anthropology see de Theije and Brouwer (2004), Zeitlyn (2004), Pink (2004), Engelbrecht and Husmann (2004), Edgar (2004). For a short review of ICT using in the Greek academic framework see Dalkavoukis, Manos and Veikou (2010: 25).

[5] Almost the same happens usually in the postgraduate programs of these departments where Anthropology is still a part of a specialization. See for example the Master's Degree in History, Anthropology and Culture in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe (Department of Balkan, Slavic & Oriental Studies, University of Macedonia - https://www.uom.gr/mahac. Accessed on January 25, 2021) and the Master's Degree in Local History – Interdisciplinary approaches (Department of History and Ethnology, Democritus University of Thrace –https://www.he.duth.gr/page/kanonismos-pms. Accessed on January 25, 2021).

[6] For a detailed discussion and bibliographic references see Dalkavoukis, Manos and Veikou (2010: 27-30).

[7] See the views expressed in terms of discussions and encounters: Sharma (1989, 1991), Sharma and Wright (1989), Thorn and Wright (1990), Shore (1990), Ingold (1991), Grillo (1996), Mitchell (1996), Coleman and Simpson (1999, 2001). For a more recent view see Mills (2004).

[8] For the reflective (re) view of the way students perceive reality through their participation in research activities at undergraduate level, see Dalkavoukis, Manos and Veikou (2010: 30-34, 387-396).

[9]Anthropology at home as a research strategy is widely used by both teachers and students in university departments of southern European countries (e.g., France, Portugal, Italy, Greece - Drackle, Edgar and Schippers 2004:3). However, there is also the view that the orientation of anthropological studies in Greece -in research at home- is inhibiting their development (Panopoulos 2004:201 and Papataxiarchis 2003 and 2013). Regarding modern anthropological thought and research in Greece see also Greek Society for Ethnology (2004).

[10]In collaboration, on a permanent basis, with Professor Vassilis Nitsiakos (University of Ioannina), Associate Professor Ioannis Manos (University of Macedonia) and Assistant Professor Valia Kravva (Democritus University of Thrace).

[11]A collective volume -in collaboration with colleagues of the domestic Department- including elaborated works of this project is planned to be published in Greek.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (1991), 'Writing Against Culture', in R. G. Fox (ed), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present,* Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, pp. 137-162.

Bell, G., Blythe, M. and Sengers, P. (2005), 'Making by making strange: Defamiliarization and the design of domestic technologies', *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*,12(2): 149-173.

Boyer, E. L. (1990), *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate,* New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bruner, J. (1996), *The Culture of Education*, London: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, S. and Simpson, B. (1999), 'Unintended Consequences?: Anthropology, Pedagogy and Personhood', *Anthropology Today*, 15(6): 3-6.
---- (2001), 'Anthropology and Education: Resisting Bureaucracy', *Anthropology Today*, 17(2): 26-27.

Dalkavoukis, V., Manos, I. and Veikou, C. (eds) (2010), *Innocent anthropologists, suspicious students. Teaching Anthropology to whom is 'not concerned'*, Athens: Kritiki (in Greek).

De Jong, M., Kamsteeg, F. and Ybema, S. (2013), 'Ethnographic strategies for making the familiar strange: Struggling with 'distance' and 'immersion' among Moroccan-Dutch students', *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 2(2): 168-186.

De Theije, M. and Brouwer, L. (2004), 'Anthropology and ICT: Experiences of a Dutch Pilot Project', in D. Drackle and I. Edgar (eds), *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields Vol. 2, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 72-84.

Department of Social Policy and Social Anthropology (2001), *Study guide (2001-2002)*, Athens: Panteion University.

Drackle, D., Edgar, I. and Schippers, T. (2004), 'Introduction', in D. Drackle, I. Edgar and T. Schippers (eds), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 1 [1st edition 2003], New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1-6.

Edgar, I. (2004), 'Beginning with Images: An Introduction to Imaginations-Based Educational Methodologies', in D. Drackle, I. Edgar and T. Schippers (eds), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 1 [1st edition 2003], New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 208-226.

Engelbrecht, B. and Husmann, R. (2004), 'Films in the Classroom', in D. Drackle and I. Edgar (eds), *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields Vol. 2, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 112-126.

Eriksen, T. (2001), *Small places, large issues. An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology*, London: Pluto Press.

Faubion, J. (2009), 'The ethics of fieldwork as the ethics of connectivity, or the good anthropologist (isn't what she used to be)', in J. Faubion and G. Marcus (eds), *Fieldwork is not what it used to be: anthropology's culture of method in transition*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 145–163.

Geertz, C. (1973), *The interpretation of cultures*, New York: Basic Books.

Gefou-Madianou, D. (1993), 'Mirroring Ourselves through Western Texts: The Limits of an Indigenous Anthropology', in H. Driessen(ed), *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing: Confrontations of Western and Indigenous Views*, Saarbruecken and Fort Lauderdale: Verlag Breitenbach Publishers, pp. 160-181.
---- (2000), 'Disciples, Discipline and Reflection: Anthropological Encounters and Trajectories', in M. Strathern (ed), *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, London: Routledge, pp. 256-278.

Greek Society for Ethnology, 2004, *Aspects of anthropological thinking and research*, Athens (in Greek).

Grillo, R. (1996), 'Teaching and Learning Anthropology', *Anthropology Today*, 12(1): 1-2.

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1997), 'Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology', in A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (eds), *Anthropological locations: Boundaries and grounds of a field science*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 101-146.

Hanley, E. (1989), 'Undergraduate Anthropology Projects at Edinburgh', *BASAPPNewsletter*, 3: 4.

Hervik, P. (2004), 'Teaching Anthropology in Norway and Denmark', in D. Drackle, I. Edgar and T. Schippers (eds), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 1 [1st edition 2003], New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 36-54.

Herzfeld, M. (1997), *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*, New York: Routledge.
Ingold, T. (1991), 'Fieldwork Projects in Undergraduate Anthropology', A*nthropology Today*, 7(2): 22-23.
---- (2017), 'Anthropology contra ethnography', *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 7(1): 21–26.

Jenkins, A. Breen, R., Lindsay, R. and Brew, A. (2003), *Reshaping Teaching in Higher Education: Linking Teaching with Research*, London and New York: Routledge.

Knoblauch, H. (2005), 'Focused ethnography', *Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 6(3), Retrieved 10 March 2017 from: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/20/44.

Loizos, P. (2011), 'The death of Positivism is only an exaggeration', in D. Gefou-Madianou (ed), *Anthropological Theory and Ethnography. Contemporary Trends*, Athens: Pataki, pp. 273-295 (in Greek).

Marcus, G. (2007), 'How short can fieldwork be?', *Social Anthropology*, 15(3): 353-357.

Miller, D. (2017), 'Anthropology is the discipline but the goal is ethnography', *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 7(1): 27–31.

Mills, D. (2004), 'Teaching the 'Uncomfortable Science': Social Anthropology in British Universities', in D. Drackle, I. Edgar and T. Schippers (eds), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 1 [1st edition 2003], New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 8-22.

Mills, D., Drackle, D. and Edgar, I. (2004), 'Learning Fields, Disciplinary Landscapes', in D. Drackle and I. Edgar (eds), *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 2, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 2-16.

Mitchell, J. (1996), 'Reflecting on Learning and Teaching in Anthropology', *Anthropology Today* 12(5): 23-24.

Panopoulos, P. (2004), 'Between Self and Others: The Academic Establishment of Greek Anthropology', in D. Drackle, I. Edgar and T. Schippers (eds), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 1 [1st edition 2003], New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 193-205.

Papataxiarchis, E. (2003), 'Social Anthropology in Post-War Greece. First steps', in I. Lambiri – Dimaki (ed), *Social Sciences and Innovation in Greece 1950-1967*, Athens: EKKE - Gutenberg, pp. 115-154 (in Greek).

---- (2013), 'From 'national' to 'social science': Politics, ideology, and disciplinary formation in Greek anthropology from the 1940s till the 1980s', in A. Boskovic and C. Hann (eds), *The anthropological field on the margins of Europe, 1945-1991*, Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia, Vol. 29, Berlin: LIT Verlag, pp. 31-63.

Pink, S. (2004), 'Ethnography, Experience and Electronic Text: A Discussion of the Potential of Hypermedia for Teaching and Representation in Anthropology', in D. Drackle and I. Edgar (eds), *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 2, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 97-111.

Sharma, U. and Wright, S. (1989), 'Practical Relevance of Undergraduate Courses', *BASAPPNewsletter*, 2: 7-9.

Sharma, U. (1989), 'Fieldwork in the Undergraduate Curriculum: Its Merits', *BASAPPNewsletter*, 3: 3-4.
---- (1991), 'Field Research in the Undergraduate Curriculum', *Anthropology in Action* 10: 8-11.

Shore, C. (1990), 'Teaching Undergraduate Anthropology: Projects and Placements', *Anthropology Today* 6(5): 21-22.

Thorn, R. and Wright, S. (1990), 'Projects and Placements in Undergraduate Anthropology',*BASAPPNewsletter*, 7: 4-5.

Tsaousis, D. (1985), 'Social Anthropology in Greece', in G. Lienhardt, *Social Anthropology (Greek Edition)*, Athens: Gutenberg, pp. 11-46 (in Greek).

Watson, C. W. (1995), 'Case Study: Fieldwork in Undergraduate Anthropology: For and Against', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 32 (2): 153-161.

Zeitlyn, D. (2004), 'Lessons Learnt from the Experience Rich Anthropology Project', in D. Drackle and I. Edgar (eds), *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology Education*, The EASA Series: Learning Fields, Vol. 2, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 85-96.