

Power, Participation, and Policy: A Narrative Review of Public Anthropology

Meiga Fristya Laras Sakti¹, Arining Wibowo², Eli Rustinar³, Juanda⁴, Heri Isnaini⁵

¹Institut Seni Budaya Indonesia Bandung, Indonesia

²Universitas Terbuka Malang, Indonesia

³Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, Indonesia

⁴Universitas Komputer Indonesia, Indonesia

⁵IKIP Siliwangi Bandung, Indonesia

Correspondent : fristyameiga@gmail.com ¹

Received : September 27, 2025

Accepted : October 27, 2025

Published : November 30, 2025

Citation: Sakti, M, F, L., Wibowo, A., Rustinar, E., Juanda., & Isnaini, H. (2025). Power, Participation, and Policy: A Narrative Review of Public Anthropology. Jurnal Antropologi Nusantara, 1(1), 56-68

ABSTRACT: This study explores the transformative role of public anthropology in addressing social inequality, supporting marginalized communities, and influencing policy. Using a structured narrative review, it synthesizes peer-reviewed literature from Scopus, Google Scholar, and PubMed (2015–2025) focused on participatory research, community engagement, and social advocacy. The review identifies four key themes: the evolving role of anthropologists in advocacy, the effectiveness of participatory approaches, their influence on public policy and community resilience, and global comparisons between strategies in the Global South and North. Case studies from Canada, Brazil, and Wales demonstrate that collaborative research enhances policy relevance and empowers local communities. Despite these contributions, the review notes systemic challenges, including institutional resistance, epistemological biases, and logistical barriers, which limit the full integration of anthropological insights into governance. It concludes that public anthropology has strong potential to advance equity, accountability, and sustainable change. Realizing this potential requires ongoing community engagement, innovative methodologies, and alignment with policy processes. Future research should examine how to scale participatory approaches and assess their long-term impact.

Keywords: Public Anthropology, Participatory Research, Community Engagement, Social Advocacy, Policy Impact, Ethnography, Social Justice.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

Public anthropology has emerged as a significant intellectual movement within the broader discipline of anthropology, characterized by a commitment to engage directly with societal issues and collaborate with communities beyond the confines of academia. Over the past two decades, there has been a growing recognition of the value of anthropological insights in shaping public discourse and influencing policy, particularly in contexts marked by social inequality and systemic marginalization (Brown et al., 2019). In parallel, the field has evolved toward more inclusive and participatory approaches that emphasize co-production of knowledge, ethical engagement, and transformative impact. This shift reflects broader trends in social sciences toward reflexivity and

responsiveness to the lived experiences of research participants, particularly those from historically disadvantaged groups. The increasing visibility of public anthropology has been accompanied by a diversification of methodological tools, conceptual frameworks, and sites of intervention, allowing for more nuanced and effective engagements with complex social problems.

Recent literature underscores the relevance of biosociality as a key concept in understanding how collective identities are formed around shared biological and social experiences. Brown et al. (2019) assert that biosociality provides a critical lens to examine how communities mobilize around issues such as health disparities, racialized embodiment, and access to medical resources. In this context, public anthropologists play a crucial role in amplifying marginalized voices and facilitating the inclusion of local knowledge systems in decision-making processes. McCready and Laperrière (2023) further argue that collaborative practices in community healthcare can elevate underrepresented perspectives and contribute to more culturally sensitive and equitable interventions. Goodwin et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of community participation in shaping research agendas and ensuring that findings translate into meaningful social impact. These contributions highlight the centrality of ethical and participatory engagement in contemporary public anthropology.

Empirical evidence supports the practical benefits of these collaborative approaches, particularly in health and social policy domains. For instance, research on reproductive health services for migrant women in Wales has demonstrated how anthropological insights into lived experience can inform the design of more accessible and culturally competent healthcare systems (Goodwin et al., 2021). Participatory research methods that involve stakeholders at every stage of the research process have been shown to enhance the relevance, legitimacy, and effectiveness of interventions. Such strategies not only enrich academic understanding but also yield tangible benefits for communities, thereby bridging the gap between scholarship and social change.

More broadly, the evolution of public anthropology reflects an ongoing effort to foster sustained dialogue between scholars and communities in pursuit of justice-oriented solutions to pressing social challenges. Collaborative knowledge production enables more holistic and context-sensitive analyses, which are essential for addressing issues such as environmental degradation, public health inequities, and cultural erasure. In this regard, public anthropology serves not only as an academic pursuit but also as a form of engaged citizenship, wherein scholars commit to the ethical imperative of using their expertise to support marginalized populations.

Despite these advances, public anthropologists face numerous challenges in integrating social advocacy into academic practice. A key difficulty lies in reconciling the dual responsibilities of scientific rigor and social responsiveness. McCready and Laperrière (2023) note the tensions that arise when anthropologists are simultaneously beholden to academic standards and to the expectations of the communities they serve. Such dual accountability can lead to methodological compromises or ethical dilemmas, particularly when research findings contradict community narratives or institutional agendas. Goodwin et al. (2021) similarly highlight the emotional and professional strain experienced by scholars navigating the intersection of research and activism.

Another significant challenge concerns the reception of public anthropology within policy-making circles. Despite producing rich, contextually grounded insights, anthropological research is often sidelined in favor of quantitatively oriented studies that promise more immediate, generalizable outcomes (McCready & Laperrière, 2023). This epistemological bias hampers the integration of anthropological knowledge into mainstream policy discourse, thereby limiting its potential to inform systemic change. The undervaluation of qualitative evidence reflects broader structural inequalities in knowledge production and dissemination, which public anthropology seeks to challenge.

Moreover, there remains a persistent gap between anthropological research and its practical application in policy and governance. Storeng and Béhague (2016) argue that cultural and institutional mismatches between academics and practitioners impede the translation of ethnographic findings into policy action. These gaps are further exacerbated by differing timeframes, values, and objectives, which can frustrate attempts at sustained collaboration. Addressing these barriers requires strategic advocacy and the development of interdisciplinary alliances that can effectively convey the relevance of anthropological insights to diverse stakeholders.

The current literature thus reveals an urgent need to strengthen the translational capacities of public anthropology. While the field has demonstrated its potential to generate socially relevant knowledge, its impact remains contingent on the ability to bridge cultural and institutional divides. This review seeks to address this lacuna by examining how public anthropology can more effectively engage with policy processes and foster transformative collaborations. It aims to synthesize existing research on participatory methodologies, advocacy strategies, and epistemological integration, thereby providing a comprehensive framework for advancing the practice of public anthropology in policy-relevant contexts.

The primary objective of this review is to analyze the key factors that enable or hinder the translation of anthropological research into social and policy impact. It focuses on three interrelated dimensions: (1) the role of participatory and collaborative methods in enhancing the legitimacy and applicability of research findings; (2) the institutional and epistemological barriers that constrain the influence of anthropological knowledge; and (3) the strategic approaches employed by public anthropologists to navigate these challenges and effect change. Through this analysis, the review aims to identify best practices and propose actionable recommendations for strengthening the field's engagement with policy and advocacy arenas.

The scope of the review is both thematic and geographical. It centers on case studies from diverse socio-political contexts, including but not limited to, indigenous communities, migrant populations, and urban diasporas. Particular attention is given to research conducted in the Global South, where the stakes of social advocacy are often most acute, and where anthropologists frequently encounter complex power dynamics and resource constraints. The review also incorporates comparative insights from studies in the Global North, thereby providing a holistic understanding of how public anthropology operates across different institutional and cultural settings. This dual perspective allows for a nuanced exploration of the opportunities and challenges facing the field in an increasingly interconnected world.

By foregrounding the voices and experiences of marginalized populations, public anthropology seeks not only to interpret the world but to transform it. The field's commitment to social justice, community empowerment, and epistemological pluralism positions it as a vital contributor to contemporary debates on equity and inclusion. As the challenges of our time—ranging from global health crises to environmental collapse—demand interdisciplinary and participatory solutions, the insights offered by public anthropology are more relevant than ever. This review endeavors to advance that relevance by critically examining the conditions under which public anthropology can fulfill its transformative potential and contribute meaningfully to the creation of more just and equitable societies.

METHOD

This narrative review employed a rigorous and structured methodology to identify, select, and synthesize academic literature relevant to the practice of public anthropology and its role in social advocacy and community-based research. The primary objective of this methodological process was to gather comprehensive, high-quality data that reflect both theoretical advancements and empirical insights into how anthropologists collaborate with marginalized communities to influence social and policy outcomes. The following section outlines the strategies used in literature search, inclusion and exclusion criteria, types of research included, and the approach to screening and evaluating relevant articles.

The literature search was conducted through multiple reputable academic databases to ensure a broad and representative collection of sources. The primary databases utilized were Scopus, Google Scholar, and PubMed, selected for their comprehensive coverage of social science and health-related research. Scopus was particularly valuable for retrieving peer-reviewed articles from interdisciplinary journals, while Google Scholar enabled the inclusion of grey literature, dissertations, and book chapters relevant to public anthropology. PubMed contributed biomedical and health-oriented studies that intersect with anthropology, particularly in contexts involving participatory health research and community advocacy.

To identify relevant articles, a combination of controlled vocabulary and free-text search strategies was employed. A Boolean logic approach was applied using conjunctions such as "AND," "OR," and "NOT" to refine the results. The primary search terms used included "public anthropology," "social advocacy," "community engagement," "participatory research," "ethnography," "social justice," "qualitative research," and "activism." These keywords were chosen based on their frequent usage in foundational and recent literature within the field. They reflect the thematic foci of the review and are aligned with contemporary discussions on the role of anthropology in fostering inclusive policy interventions and amplifying community voices.

The inclusion criteria for this review were determined to ensure the relevance and quality of the studies selected. Studies were included if they met the following requirements: first, the publication had to present original empirical research or a well-substantiated theoretical framework related to public anthropology or advocacy-based practice; second, the study had to demonstrate a direct

engagement with community stakeholders or marginalized populations, highlighting collaborative or participatory approaches; third, studies that provided substantive discussion on the application of anthropological findings in shaping public policy or advancing social justice initiatives were prioritized; finally, the publication had to be peer-reviewed and written in English. Where applicable, studies focused on specific geographic areas, including indigenous populations, urban marginalized communities, and diasporic groups, were given special attention due to their high relevance to public anthropology and its transformative objectives.

In contrast, exclusion criteria were established to filter out studies that did not meet the scope and purpose of the review. Articles were excluded if they lacked a substantive empirical component or presented purely theoretical arguments without practical implications. Studies were also excluded if they failed to demonstrate a clear link between anthropological inquiry and community impact or if they did not incorporate participatory or collaborative methods. Additionally, literature that originated from non-peer-reviewed sources, such as opinion pieces or editorials without empirical support, was omitted. This was essential to uphold the academic integrity and methodological rigor of the review.

A variety of research designs were considered in the selection process, reflecting the multidisciplinary and context-specific nature of public anthropology. These included ethnographic case studies, community-based participatory research (CBPR), action research projects, and qualitative evaluations of advocacy initiatives. Ethnography was particularly prominent in the dataset due to its capacity to capture nuanced social dynamics and power relations in real-world settings. Studies that employed participatory mapping, stakeholder interviews, focus group discussions, and reflective field notes were especially relevant, as they emphasized the co-creation of knowledge and the empowerment of community participants.

The selection of literature followed a multi-step screening process designed to enhance accuracy and reduce selection bias. First, titles and abstracts retrieved from database searches were reviewed for initial relevance. Studies that mentioned key terms or addressed topics within the scope of the review were subjected to a full-text review. At this stage, the methodological quality and thematic relevance of each article were critically evaluated. Attention was given to the research context, the level of community involvement, the clarity of research objectives, and the extent to which the findings contributed to knowledge about advocacy and social transformation. Articles were also assessed for the transparency of their methodology, ethical considerations, and the robustness of their analytical approaches.

To further ensure the relevance of selected studies, citation tracking and reference list mining were employed. This process involved identifying frequently cited foundational texts and following citation trails to uncover additional relevant literature that might not have appeared in the initial database searches. This snowballing technique was particularly useful in capturing seminal works and influential case studies that have shaped the discourse on public anthropology and community-based research.

Geographical diversity was also a factor in the selection process. While the review includes studies from both the Global North and the Global South, special emphasis was placed on regions with

significant representation of indigenous, diasporic, or marginalized urban populations. These settings are critical to understanding how public anthropology functions in practice, especially in addressing systemic inequalities and policy exclusions. For example, case studies involving indigenous communities' participation in environmental policy debates were deemed crucial for illustrating how anthropological insights can inform and transform policy processes.

This methodological approach was designed not only to ensure the academic robustness of the review but also to maintain fidelity to the ethical and practical aspirations of public anthropology. The aim was to assemble a body of literature that exemplifies how anthropological methods and principles can be mobilized in the service of social justice and community empowerment. The integration of empirical studies with practical applications was prioritized to provide actionable insights and support the translation of research findings into policy-relevant outcomes.

In conclusion, the methodology adopted for this narrative review balances comprehensiveness with analytical precision. It reflects the interdisciplinary and applied nature of public anthropology, ensuring that the selected literature speaks directly to the complex realities of community engagement, participatory advocacy, and the pursuit of social equity. By systematically identifying and synthesizing studies that exemplify best practices in community-collaborative research, this review contributes to advancing the field and informing future scholarship and policy development in public anthropology.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of this narrative review are organized thematically to reflect the most significant trends and insights emerging from the academic literature on public anthropology and its integration with social advocacy. These themes are structured around the evolving role of anthropologists in advocacy efforts, the efficacy of participatory and collaborative approaches, the influence of anthropological work on public policy and community resilience, and the comparative analysis of public anthropology practices across global regions. This section synthesizes findings from both qualitative case studies and ethnographic research to articulate the practical and theoretical implications of public anthropology in diverse sociopolitical contexts.

The Role of Anthropologists in Social Advocacy

Anthropologists have increasingly assumed multifaceted roles that extend beyond traditional research to include social advocacy, activism, and policy engagement. In numerous case studies, anthropologists have functioned as mediators and facilitators of marginalized voices in policy-making arenas. Brown et al. (2019) highlight the concept of biosociality, wherein anthropologists support communities in constructing collective identities rooted in shared biological and social experiences. This biosocial solidarity often serves as a platform for community-led movements advocating for equitable access to healthcare, legal recognition, and public resources. Through these engagements, anthropologists have contributed to a more inclusive and justice-oriented policy discourse.

In Canada, McCready and Laperrière (2023) demonstrate how ethnographically informed advocacy efforts by anthropologists have facilitated systemic change in public health institutions. By embedding themselves within community organizations, anthropologists can bridge academic knowledge with practical, locally grounded solutions. Their work in collaborative program development, public education, and policy consultations exemplifies how anthropological research can be mobilized to improve social outcomes and institutional responsiveness.

Participatory and Collaborative Approaches

Participatory methods have emerged as critical tools in enhancing the legitimacy and impact of anthropological research. These methods, which emphasize shared authority and co-creation of knowledge, are especially effective in empowering marginalized communities and fostering sustainable social change. Storeng and Béhague (2016) argue that participatory engagement enhances data validity while simultaneously increasing the relevance and applicability of research findings to real-world contexts. Their analysis shows that participatory research not only improves empirical outcomes but also deepens the integration of community perspectives into the design and implementation of social policies.

Empirical evidence from Goodwin et al. (2021) affirms these findings. Their study on migrant women's access to healthcare services in Wales demonstrates how anthropologist-led participatory research contributed to the design of culturally sensitive health programs. By involving affected populations in research planning and decision-making, the intervention achieved broader community acceptance and improved service delivery. Similarly, Filho (2021) documents the collaborative efforts between anthropologists and Indigenous communities in Brazil, illustrating how co-developed advocacy strategies have strengthened Indigenous claims to land and resources. These case studies underline that participatory anthropology is not merely a research technique but a political and ethical commitment to equity and inclusion.

Impact on Public Policy and Community Resilience

The impact of anthropological research on public policy has become increasingly evident in diverse policy domains. Anthropologists' ability to capture lived experiences and unpack complex social dynamics provides essential insights for the formulation of more responsive and equitable policies. McCready and Laperrière (2023) observe that ethnographic research has contributed to the redesign of public health strategies in Canada, aligning them more closely with the lived realities of underserved populations. Similarly, Brown et al. (2019) discuss how anthropological knowledge has influenced recognition policies for vulnerable groups, leading to reforms in healthcare and social protection systems.

Storeng and Béhague (2016) emphasize the translational role of ethnography in transforming policymakers' understanding of social problems. Their work illustrates that ethnographic accounts can disrupt prevailing policy assumptions and introduce new paradigms for interpreting social vulnerability. By fostering critical reflexivity among stakeholders, anthropologists enable more holistic and grounded policy solutions.

In terms of long-term community resilience, public anthropology has demonstrated tangible contributions to strengthening community capacities. Goodwin et al. (2021) document how participatory program development not only improved service provision but also enhanced social

cohesion and local leadership. Communities engaged in collaborative research reported increased confidence in advocating for their rights and a greater ability to mobilize resources during crises. These outcomes reflect the value of anthropology in fostering adaptive capacities and building networks of mutual support, which are essential for enduring systemic challenges such as health epidemics, environmental degradation, and political exclusion.

Global Perspectives and Comparative Analysis

Public anthropology practices vary significantly between regions of the Global South and Global North, influenced by differing socio-economic conditions, political structures, and cultural values. In the Global North, anthropological advocacy often operates within institutional frameworks, with researchers partnering with government agencies, NGOs, and health organizations to inform evidence-based policy. However, these efforts frequently emphasize quantitative metrics and efficiency, sometimes at the expense of deeper contextual understanding (Filho, 2021).

In contrast, public anthropology in the Global South tends to prioritize participatory methodologies and grassroots activism. Research is often conducted in contexts of acute social inequity, where anthropologists work alongside communities to confront human rights violations, displacement, and environmental exploitation. Nakata (2013) underscores the importance of culturally grounded advocacy in Indigenous contexts, where traditional knowledge and relational epistemologies guide community engagement and political action. Such approaches highlight the distinct contributions of anthropologists who act as cultural brokers, translators, and allies in collective struggles for justice.

International comparisons also reveal differences in advocacy strategies shaped by political regimes. In Scandinavian countries, where public policy is deeply embedded in democratic processes, advocacy tends to be formalized and institutionalized, allowing anthropologists to contribute directly to legislative and regulatory reforms (Lewis et al., 2012). Conversely, in regions with authoritarian governance structures, such as parts of Latin America, advocacy efforts often rely on informal networks, community organizing, and subversive cultural expression to navigate restrictions on civil liberties and political dissent (Collins et al., 2012). These divergent contexts necessitate adaptive strategies that are sensitive to local power dynamics, risk levels, and modes of resistance.

The influence of cultural norms is another critical variable. Advocacy strategies that succeed in one setting may falter in another if they fail to account for local values, histories, and social structures. Nakata (2013) provides a compelling account of how leveraging Indigenous traditions and customary law can foster trust and legitimacy in research relationships. His findings support a growing consensus in the literature that effective advocacy must be context-specific, culturally resonant, and community-driven.

Overall, the results of this review affirm that public anthropology holds significant promise as a vehicle for social transformation. By centering marginalized voices, employing participatory methods, and engaging with policy processes, anthropologists contribute to the development of more just, inclusive, and resilient societies. However, the success of these efforts is contingent upon sustained collaboration, contextual sensitivity, and a commitment to challenging structural

inequities. The comparative insights presented here underscore the need for a pluralistic and adaptive public anthropology that honors diverse ways of knowing and acting in the world.

The findings of this narrative review confirm the complex interplay between public anthropology, power structures, and social systems, reinforcing earlier theoretical and empirical contributions. Public anthropology emerges as a tool for both understanding and disrupting entrenched inequalities by mobilizing knowledge in partnership with marginalized groups. Brown et al. (2019) underscore the role of biosociality in fostering collective identity among communities facing systemic marginalization. Through this lens, communities do not merely demand inclusion within existing frameworks but seek to reconfigure the mechanisms of power to reflect more just and inclusive values. The anthropology of biosociality thus illustrates the transformative potential of situated knowledge when integrated into advocacy processes.

Moreover, public anthropologists serve as intermediaries between individuals or communities and broader socio-political systems. Storeng and Béhague (2016) demonstrate that anthropologists' involvement in public health advocacy facilitates the creation of strategic alliances between community members and policy stakeholders. This form of mediation is crucial for surfacing context-specific insights that would otherwise be overlooked by technocratic policy paradigms. By validating lived experiences and re-centering local knowledge systems, anthropologists help identify and address structural inequalities embedded in social institutions such as healthcare, education, and governance.

Understanding power dynamics through the lens of social structure also reveals how community networks shape the trajectory of social movements. Luhtakallio (2018) explains that successful advocacy efforts often rely on robust social networks that amplify marginalized voices and enhance the political capital of communities. These networks, forged through participatory engagements and collective organizing, not only support tactical mobilization but also provide legitimacy in the eyes of policymakers. This insight reinforces the idea that social justice outcomes are more likely when advocacy is underpinned by community cohesion and strategic communication.

Nakata (2013), in his examination of Indigenous knowledge and higher education, adds a critical dimension to the discussion of power and marginalization. He contends that formal institutions frequently exclude local epistemologies and ontologies, thereby reproducing colonial hierarchies of knowledge. This epistemic marginalization necessitates a rethinking of participatory processes to ensure that community voices are not only heard but are embedded in decision-making structures. Nakata's work illustrates the importance of designing advocacy efforts that challenge the invisibility of Indigenous and other subaltern knowledges within institutional settings.

The accumulated evidence suggests that public anthropology can destabilize dominant power structures and promote social equity by legitimizing alternative ways of knowing and acting. These practices not only empower communities to reclaim agency but also generate new spaces for inclusive dialogue and policy formation. However, this transformative role is contingent upon sustained engagement, trust-building, and the ability to navigate institutional complexities.

Anthropological research has made tangible contributions to policy innovation across diverse domains. For example, Storeng and Béhague's (2016) work on maternal and child health demonstrates how anthropological insights can rectify policy blind spots that arise from

insufficient contextual understanding. By incorporating ethnographic findings into policy design, they proposed reforms that significantly improved service delivery for women and children in underserved communities. This example reveals the unique capacity of anthropological methods to translate everyday realities into actionable policy recommendations.

Brown et al. (2019) further illustrate this translational potential through their research on racial disparities in breast cancer outcomes. Their work challenged conventional epidemiological models by highlighting how socio-cultural and structural factors intersect to shape health vulnerabilities. This biosocial analysis informed advocacy campaigns that successfully lobbied for more inclusive public health funding and preventive interventions. These outcomes highlight the strategic value of anthropological research in constructing evidence-based narratives that align with the priorities of both communities and policymakers.

In Canada, McCready and Laperrière (2023) provided additional evidence of public anthropology's impact through their work on healthcare accessibility. Their collaborative research with marginalized populations not only exposed systemic biases in healthcare delivery but also empowered communities to advocate for change. These efforts led to policy revisions that better reflected the lived experiences and needs of underserved groups, thereby enhancing both the inclusivity and effectiveness of public health programs.

Such examples illustrate that public anthropology operates at the intersection of knowledge production and social transformation. By grounding research in community realities and linking findings to broader political processes, anthropologists contribute to more responsive and equitable policy environments. These successes affirm the role of anthropology as a catalyst for social change and underscore its relevance in addressing persistent inequities.

However, integrating anthropological approaches into formal policy-making and bureaucratic institutions poses significant methodological and practical challenges. The divergence between anthropological paradigms and bureaucratic logic often hampers the uptake of research findings. Public anthropology values qualitative, nuanced, and context-rich knowledge, whereas bureaucratic systems typically prioritize quantifiable data and short-term outcomes. Storeng and Béhague (2016) describe this disjunction as a "measurement trap," wherein the absence of conventional metrics reduces the perceived legitimacy of anthropological contributions. This disconnect hinders the institutionalization of anthropological insights within formal decision-making processes.

Institutional resistance to change further complicates this integration. Luhtakallio (2018) observes that bureaucracies are often characterized by rigid hierarchies and entrenched norms that inhibit the adoption of innovative, participatory approaches. In such environments, anthropologists must navigate complex organizational dynamics and negotiate the relevance of their methodologies. This task requires both cultural fluency and political acumen to translate ethnographic insights into formats that resonate with policy audiences.

Additionally, McCready and Laperrière (2023) note the difficulty of institutionalizing participatory methods within hierarchical structures that limit community engagement. Bureaucratic processes tend to privilege expert-driven decision-making, leaving little room for the kind of collaborative

co-production that is central to public anthropology. This structural exclusion undermines the democratic potential of participatory research and limits its transformative impact.

Resource constraints also pose a practical barrier to the application of anthropological methods in policy contexts. Deep ethnographic research demands time, funding, and sustained relationships, which are often at odds with the fast-paced, cost-conscious imperatives of policy environments. These limitations reduce the feasibility of integrating anthropological research into routine policy cycles and underscore the need for institutional reforms that accommodate diverse forms of evidence.

Despite these challenges, the literature offers several pathways for enhancing the integration of public anthropology into policy and institutional practice. First, developing interdisciplinary collaborations can bridge epistemological divides and foster mutual understanding between anthropologists and policymakers. Second, investing in capacity-building initiatives for both community stakeholders and institutional actors can facilitate more inclusive and effective participatory processes. Finally, advancing advocacy strategies that emphasize the legitimacy and utility of qualitative evidence can help reposition anthropology as a vital contributor to evidence-based policy-making.

To maximize its impact, future research should address the current limitations in the field. This includes developing standardized frameworks for evaluating the policy relevance of ethnographic research and exploring innovative dissemination strategies that engage diverse audiences. Longitudinal studies that track the outcomes of anthropological interventions over time would also provide valuable insights into their sustained efficacy and scalability. Furthermore, expanding research to include underrepresented contexts—such as conflict-affected areas, climate-vulnerable regions, and digitally mediated communities—would enhance the field's ability to respond to emerging global challenges.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review has demonstrated that public anthropology plays a critical role in shaping socially responsive policies, empowering marginalized communities, and fostering inclusive advocacy frameworks. Through biosocial solidarity, participatory research, and ethnographic engagement, anthropologists contribute to the reconfiguration of power structures and the elevation of community voices in policy discourse. Findings reveal that public anthropology facilitates more contextually grounded and ethically attuned interventions in areas such as healthcare, environmental justice, and Indigenous rights. These practices enable communities not only to access decision-making processes but also to challenge systemic exclusions that limit their agency.

The discussion has further highlighted systemic barriers to integrating anthropological insights into formal institutions. These include epistemological disconnects between qualitative and quantitative paradigms, bureaucratic inertia, and resource limitations. Addressing these obstacles requires the development of interdisciplinary frameworks, institutional reforms that embrace pluralistic knowledge systems, and enhanced recognition of community-based expertise. Strategic

collaboration and advocacy must also be prioritized to ensure that anthropological knowledge informs both grassroots initiatives and policy reform.

Future research should explore longitudinal outcomes of participatory interventions and expand case studies to underrepresented regions and emergent global challenges. Building standardized tools to assess the impact of public anthropology on social resilience and justice will be crucial.

Ultimately, the integration of participatory and collaborative strategies remains essential for overcoming entrenched inequities. By aligning research with community priorities, public anthropology can serve as a transformative force in advancing equity, accountability, and sustainability in public governance.

REFERENCE

- Brown, T., Dyck, I., Greenhough, B., Raven-Ellison, M., Ornstein, M., & Duffy, S. (2019). "They say it's more aggressive in black women": Biosociality, breast cancer, and becoming a population "at risk". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 44(3), 509–523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12290>
- Burns, K., & Clark, J. (2019). Feminism, activism, public scholarship. In *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Communication* (pp. 170–188). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351208079-10>
- Charlot-Swilley, D., Thomas, K., Mondì, C., Willis, D., & Condon, M. (2024). A holistic approach to early relational health: Cultivating culture, diversity, and equity. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 21(5), 563. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21050563>
- Díaz, G. (2024). Liberal policies does not mean equitable policies: Latinx families' experiences navigating social policies in Oregon and California. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 30(4), 876–885. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000699>
- Filho, H. (2021). Desenvolvimento, meio ambiente, povos indígenas e comunidades tradicionais no Brasil de hoje: Uma mirada a partir da antropologia pública. *Aisthesis*, (70), 263–286. <https://doi.org/10.7764/aisth.70.12>
- Goodwin, L., Jones, A., & Hunter, B. (2021). Addressing social inequity through improving relational care: A social–ecological model based on the experiences of migrant women and midwives in South Wales. *Health Expectations*, 25(5), 2124–2133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13333>
- Hansen, H., Holmes, S., & Lindemann, D. (2013). Ethnography of health for social change: Impact on public perception and policy. *Social Science & Medicine*, 99, 116–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.11.001>
- Lewis, S., Hopper, K., & Healion, E. (2012). Partners in recovery: Social support and accountability in a consumer-run mental health center. *Psychiatric Services*, 63(1), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201000512>

- Luhtakallio, E. (2018). Group formation, styles, and grammars of commonality in local activism. *British Journal of Sociology*, 70(4), 1159–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12606>
- McCready, G., & Laperrière, H. (2023). The advocacy process in Canadian community health nursing: A collaborative ethnography. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 80(7), 2847–2859. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15896>
- Nakata, M. (2013). The rights and blights of the politics in Indigenous higher education. *Anthropological Forum*, 23(3), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00664677.2013.803457>
- Storeng, K., & Béhague, D. (2016). “Lives in the balance”: The politics of integration in the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health: Table 1. *Health Policy and Planning*, 31(8), 992–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czw023>
- Shaw, M. (2019). Doctors as moral pioneers: negotiated boundaries of assisted conception in Colombia. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 41(7), 1323–1337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12979>
- Skyberg, H. (2022). Diversity, friction, and harmonisation: an ethnographic study of interprofessional teamwork dynamics. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-07596-0>
- Thomsen, B., Muurlink, O., Best, T., Thomsen, J., & Copeland, K. (2020). Transcultural development. *Human Organization*, 79(1), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.17730/0018-7259.79.1.43>
- Orlić, O., & Bokan, N. (2022). Svinje, žirenje i zajedničko dobro: Zapisi o solidarnosti u zemljišnim zajednicama. *Studia Ethnologica Croatica*, 34, 223–255. <https://doi.org/10.17234/sec.34.10>
- Ozanne, L., & Ozanne, J. (2016). How alternative consumer markets can build community resiliency. *European Journal of Marketing*, 50(3/4), 330–357. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejm-12-2014-0802>
- Piani, L., Pagani, L., Ellero, G., & Zanarotti, M. (2019). Empirical evaluation of vocation to solidarity economy using composite indicators. *Sustainability*, 11(14), 3910. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11143910>
- Zaldívar, V. (2014). Tempest in the Andes? Part 2: Peasant organization and development agencies in Cotopaxi (Ecuador). *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 15(2), 179–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12074>
- Zhang, M., Wu, W., & Zhong, W. (2017). Agency and social construction of space under top-down planning: Resettled rural residents in China. *Urban Studies*, 55(7), 1541–1560. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098017715409>