Received: 21 January 2024 | Accepted: 10 May 2024

DOI: 10.1111/etho.12434

ETHOS

COMMENTARY

With instead of *about*: Toward an anthropology that is critically integrated into Global Early Childhood Development interventions

Carolina Remorini PhD

AFIN Research Group & Outreach Centre, Departament d' Antropologia Social i Cultural, Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Correspondence
Carolina Remorini, AFIN Research Group & Outreach Centre, Departament d' Antropologia Social i Cultural, Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona.
Email: carolina.remorini@uab.cat

Abstract

This comment posits questions and opens debates around the recent article by Scheidecker et al. based in the author's experience in anthropological research and applied work in child development in the Global South. The article advocates for a critical review of how anthropologists in the Global South carry out and disseminate their research, in order to broaden audiences beyond the academy. Finally, it is argued that for anthropological evidence to hold a place at the table on Global Early Childhood Development (ECD), anthropologists must engage in practices, methodologies, and forms of collaboration that make our findings and perspectives hearable. For this to happen, anthropologists should take an active part in institutions and fields of work they tend to avoid. Only in this way can we positively impact children and families by incorporating the inherent diversity of ECD beyond the parameters and values of normalcy that predominate in the so-called minority world.

KEYWORDS

childhood interventions, engaged anthropology, Global ECD, Global South

Resumen

Este comentario plantea preguntas y abre un debate a partir de las ideas presentes en el reciente artículo de Scheidecker et al. basado en la experiencia de investigación antropológica y trabajo aplicado de la autora en el campo del desarrollo infantil en el Sur Global. El artículo aboga por una revisión

crítica de cómo los antropólogos desarrollan y y difunden sus investigaciones, con el fin de ampliar audiencias más allá de la academia. Argumenta que para que la evidencia antropológica ocupe un lugar en los debates e intervenciones sobre el desarrollo infantil temprano (DIT) los antropólogos debemos comprometernos en prácticas, metodologías y formas de colaboración que hagan que nuestros hallazgos y perspectivas sean audibles. Para que esto suceda, debemos tomar parte activa en instituciones y campos profesionales que solemos evitar. Sólo así podremos impactar positivamente en niños/as y sus familias, incorporando la diversidad inherente al DIT más allá de los parámetros de normalidad que predominan en el llamado "minority world".

In their article critiquing the exclusion of the social sciences from "Global Early Childhood Development (ECD) interventions," Scheidecker and colleagues (2023a) have detailed a challenge and issued an invitation. It's not possible as anthropologists to read this piece without feeling simultaneously uncomfortable and called to engage in some self-assessment, whether we hail from the North or the South, and work with people and communities in the majority world (Alam, 2008) or within institutions and with colleagues more closely identified with the minority world or WEIRD societies (Henrich et al., 2010). Global ECD is a broad series of scientific and political interventions that "aim to bring about economic and societal development by improving young children's development, including their 'brain structure and function'" by directly intervening in parenting practices, especially in those populations where several risks for children's development derived from "poor" stimuli and caring practices are identified (Scheidecker et al., 2023a, 5)

The questions and ideas shared here arise from my personal and professional experience in the Global South, specifically in South America, and are not necessarily applicable in all contexts or regions. In sharing these thoughts, I wish to contribute to the conversation begun by Scheidecker et al. (2023a) and others writing in the same vein (Arnett, 2008; Draper et al., 2022) by drawing on my background in ethnographic research on child-rearing and child development in indigenous communities, my collaboration with variety of professionals on interdisciplinary projects jointly led by the Argentinian government and non-governmental organizations, and my implementation of training programs geared toward professionals working in the field of "developmental sciences." Curiously, anthropologists are typically excluded from that field, an omission that many of them have questioned and sought to correct, myself included.

The article encourages us to really think about how we can work *with* those people most directly impacted by the study of Global ECD. It is not my intention here to emphasize differences in approach to deepen conflicts, cultivate rivalries between divergent paradigms, or reduce the discussion to power relations between disciplines. In fact, focusing on the epistemological and methodological differences between disciplines would likely only contribute to deepening divisions, by promoting the assumption that the incommensurability of paradigms makes communication and collaboration between disciplines impossible, an idea that Popper called "the myth of the common framework" (Popper, 2005). Rather I wish to contribute to a dialogue about our shared concerns regarding Early Childhood Development (ECD onwards) Interventions. Fomenting dialogues and finding commonalities cannot be postponed (Scheidecker et al., 2023b) but nor can it succeed without lengthy, costly—and often frustrating—efforts at cultural interpretation and translation, intellectual humility, and (self-)criticism.

To organize the present discussion, I take as a point of departure several questions posed by Scheidecker et al. (2023a) that encourage us to consider how a critical engagement with Global ECD could benefit those children and families in majority world communities who are typically described and

evaluated according to "…a predefined epistemic framework consisting of a set of measures, constructs, and theories derived from minority world thinking" (Scheidecker et al., 2023b, 1). In other words, how can we ensure that the scientists, policymakers, and practitioners involved in Global ECD equally value the evidence derived from ethnographic research, so that when they say they are using "the best available evidence," they really are? For this to happen, I believe that we, as social scientists, have to become more "hearable."[1] In other words, that our discourse be heard, confronted, and enriched within the context of a debate in domains that have so far been dominated by certain, limited discourses.

If we start from the idea that early childhood development is a multidimensional and complex subject, and if we believe that anthropological knowledge can and should play a key role in it, then it is necessary to reformulate what the Global ECD movement understands as "the problem," that is: "optimizing early childhood development, and especially brain function and structure" (Schreidecker et al., 2023a, 5). Thinking about development only in terms of neurodevelopment and centering the brain without considering the child as a whole organism existing within a specific environment, leaves no room for disciplines like anthropology and cultural psychology that focus precisely on individuals developing in the context of dynamic interactions with their environments. (Bronfenbrenner, 1987). Refocusing "the problem" in this way would benefit from the inclusion of additional ways of understanding child development, starting with expanding our concept of "evidence" in both scientific and cultural terms. This, in turn, leads me to revisit some recent, related arguments (Morelli et al., 2018), the most relevant of which is that Global ECD is based on a belief in the universality of human developmental potential, regardless of the circumstances in which a person's life unfolds, and that the only thing preventing someone from fulfilling that potential are the deleterious effects of an "impoverished" environment.

A second argument, which is a direct consequence of the first, is that all human beings can be evaluated using the same parameters and instruments. A third is that differences in developmental trajectories can be explained as "failing to reach one's fullest potential"; that is, any deviation from the standard is synonymous with deficit or disorder. It's not necessary to cite here the mountain of ethnographic evidence that contradicts this series of assumptions (Bronfenbrenner, 1987; Ingold, 2000; Rogoff, 2003; Säljö, 2020). Nor are the objections limited to ethnography, as the same assumptions have been challenged and disputed by evolutionary biology and biological anthropology (Cullin et al., 2021), as well as through less mainstream perspectives within psychology and biomedicine (Reel & Athan, 2015). I myself have participated in this conversation in an inter-disciplinary way, including with an article, co-authored with a pediatrician, that was born out of our shared desire for mutual involvement and listening in the study of ECD (Remorini & Rowensztein, 2022).

The second issue addressed by Scheidecker and colleagues is that the evidence about how early childhood development unfolds that buttresses Global ECD derives from research conducted in the fields of developmental psychology and neuroscience almost exclusively in the minority world, while being applied to the entire world (Scheidecker et al., 2023a). This epistemic exclusion is also about ignoring research that does not readily fit into a predefined framework that excludes other cultural ways of understanding child development.

To this end, I want to emphasize here the importance of reclaiming the study of child development, a subject that contributed greatly to the origin and professional identity of anthropologists in the early 20th century, thanks to Franz Boas and the entire generation of anthropologists who were shaped by his ideas on biological plasticity, adaptive flexibility, and human variation that arose as a result of the interplay of specific and ever-changing historical and environmental conditions, ideas which eventually developed into a clear epistemological and political stance.[2] My goal is not to look backward and rehash the historical factors and academic traditions that shaped the development of anthropology in the Global South, especially since much has already been written on the subject. Rather, I wish to move us forward, by encouraging us to think about how to build concrete ways of collaborating and articulating our contributions, so that anthropological evidence leaves the margins and takes its rightful place in debates about and models of ECD, not only in the Global South but *globally*.

Why is anthropology not automatically associated with child development, as are identity, cultural heritage, migration, indigenous rights, and, more recently, sustainability, climate change, and environmental

contamination? One reason may be how few anthropologists, at least in South America, have studied ECD. In Argentina, for example, biological anthropologists study growth and nutrition, while ethnographers investigate carework, childrearing, childhood, learning, linguistic socialization, and health. Despite the involvement of anthropologists in those areas, the study of child development trajectories seems to be considered someone else's job.[3] While there do exist interdisciplinary studies from the region focused on indigenous populations[4] that have included ethnographic methodology, those studies are from the fields of cultural psychology, linguistics, and biological anthropology.

Throughout my career, I have watched as the progressive fragmentation of thematic areas within the "Anthropology of Childhood" has contributed to this dispersion and isolation from other fields. Anthropologists are either absent from or constitute only a small minority of the scientific societies, typically led by health professionals, that work in child development in the Global South. Meanwhile, anthropology conferences often feature working groups with names like "The anthropology of education," "Anthropology and child nutrition," "Anthropology of child labor," and so on, separating subjects into field-specific silos when instead there should be interdisciplinary debate and collaboration. This dispersion can also be observed at the medical conferences to which I have been invited, where reproductive health is presented separately from perinatal health, lactation, and mental health, while the health of children aged 0–5 is categorized by type of illness and, consequently, presented apart from "the first thousand days" or "developmental disorders" round tables.

The fragmentation of life trajectories, of people, and of the sciences is obvious wherever you look. Faced with this reality, I ask: Is it possible to recover anthropology's holistic approach not only for the good of our discipline, but also for the benefit of our colleagues in other fields, and, ultimately, for the maximization of our shared knowledge about human beings?

I agree with Scheidecker et al. (2023a) that ethnographic literature is usually excluded from publications on Global ECD interventions because anthropologists and other ethnographers purposefully avoid many terms commonly used to classify people, behaviors, and society, in favor of terms used by the people themselves. This results in our publications not appearing in keyword searches or being included in meta-analyses. What's more, many ethnographic contributions from the Global South are ignored simply because they are not written in English, due to cultural and linguistic biases that also apply to texts by authors from the Global North. This criticism also applies to Scheidecker et al. 2023a, who cite only one text in a language other than English, all the more surprising since the authors are of different national origins and much of their research is based in non-English speaking communities of the majority world.

It is also necessary to acknowledge that ethnographic knowledge does not often escape the confines of anthropology or academia. It's true, as the authors contest, that ethnographic evidence is plentiful and it's *there*. But where is "there"? What reasons could explain why someone who works in public policy or designs screening instruments for child development would either not know of and/or fail to appreciate this vast body of evidence? Is it that they simply decide to ignore it, or is it that we have not found the way for our own research to enter into dialogue with that of others? I believe that, to a certain extent, both are true.

Working with physicians—previously in Argentina and now in Spain—I have noticed that, even among those who are the most committed to incorporating perspectives that might help them resolve the challenges they face in their clinical practice, very few, if any, read the social science literature. Their reasons are understandable and range from language issues, lack of time, absence of training in social science discourse, or simply the limitations of their daily practice. On the other side of the divide, when anthropologists seek to publish in public health or medical journals, the format, emphasis on quantitative data, and length limits often prove insurmountable barriers, ultimately dictating that ethnographic descriptions simply "don't fit."

I am convinced that instead of denouncing our exclusion, to become more hearable we need to transform our writing practices, engage more in mixed-methods research, transcend the qualitative-quantitative dichotomy, and find creative ways to communicate our findings in forums accessible to non-academic professionals. Only then will we start to overcome the view that ethnography provides "anecdotal" evidence due to its lack of representativeness as compared to neuroscientific or biomedical research derived from numerically "representative" populations. I agree with Claudia Fonseca when she says:

> No fundo, surge a questão da própria ciência: em que consiste uma ciência legítima, de peso… e útil? Para esses gestores, vale mais uma ciência que produz enunciados claros e contundentes (mesmo quando pouco conformes à realidade complexa) ou uma ciência cuja sofisticação lógica é tal que só os colegas acadêmicos têm a paciência de colher as frutas e imaginar aplicações práticas? (Fonseca, 2019, 9).

The third issue presented by Scheidecker et al. (2023a) that I will address here is related to the need to decolonize our conceptual models and methodological tools for addressing ECD and asking important questions, such as: How can ethnographic evidence contribute to intervention in the field of ECD? What role can we play in revising the models, instruments, and categories that inform both public policies and everyday practices?

The absence of anthropology from the discussion around Global ECD is related to its negligible presence within the clinical teams that assess, follow, and treat child development. In Argentina, although these teams refer to themselves as "interdisciplinary," their members are still primarily drawn from the suite of professions within the fields of biomedicine and psychology. In my work in various early childhood care contexts in Argentina and Spain, I have observed commonalities in the ways that clinical practices are organized and in the manner in which professionals interact with children and their families. In both places, medical institutions are caring for a population that is diverse in its ethnic and geographic origin, residence, education level, and socioeconomic status, which would present challenges to even the most thoughtful and open-minded of professionals. However, it has been striking to me that even when both provider and patient hail from WEIRD populations, there is still significant diversity in the consulting room, a diversity rarely captured by WEIRD professionals. In other words, the typical approach excludes not only those who are very "different," but those who are presumed to be very similar, since it is based on a series of unquestioned assumptions usually devoid of any curiosity about what people actually think, do, or prefer in their everyday lives.

If indeed we are seeing the gradual opening up of some institutions to the inclusion of anthropological perspectives in the initial and ongoing training of medical professionals, there remains no accepted way for anthropologists to participate in ECD consultations. For this to occur, two things are required: significant change at the organizational level regarding what is meant by "*comprehensive* attention to development," and anthropologists who wish to engage in this type of work.

The final topic I address here ties together all that I have expressed so far and relates back to a previously mentioned question posed by Scheidecker et al. (2023a), "How could anthropological engagement in ECD make a difference for the targeted communities?" We know—because anthropologists have shown—that no community prepares and educates its children using a single formula, holding up one type of interaction as "normal" and "healthy," or mandating specific ways of organizing family life or parental roles. Why, then, would we assume that the best possible development for any child is to restrict her to a limited set of tasks to be carried out within the framework of very specific social interactions with certain people, as is promoted by the various guides and models of Global ECD intervention?

As I and co-authors have suggested in other forums (Remorini, 2021; Remorini & Rowensztein, 2022) the use of standardized instruments for measurement and evaluation—percentiles, tests, screenings, etc.—which are characterized by over-emphasis on chronology and the quantification of development milestones, leaves no room for confronting the biases that uphold the universality and normativity of a specific developmental sequence, nor does it allow for attending to the individual timing of each child, including within her own development trajectory over time (Karasik et al., 2010; Super & Harkness, 2015). The reduction of clinical assessment to the achievement of a handful of milestones prevents us from taking a comprehensive view that would include consideration of the environments in which a child is living and growing, and instead contributes to pathologizing normal developmental processes simply for deviating from standards that were established with skewed, although supposedly representative, samples (Remorini & Rowensztein, 2022). Notably, concerning Global ECD's oft-mentioned reliance on "evidence-based research," Zubler et al. (2022) found in a review of milestone checklists for ECD routinely used in pediatric consultations in the United States that the original sources of the milestones were uncited, and adaptations

were based mainly on clinical opinion, or verbal reports, not on empirically informed evidence. Moreover, ages specified for individual milestones are inconsistent across sources.

Contrary to a deficit perspective, what ethnographic investigations demonstrate is the richness of the opportunities offered to children by many different types of communities. Several studies in the Global South, perhaps not coincidentally undertaken by anthropologists and cultural psychologists, have taken as starting points the *local* definitions of developmental milestones within the framework of *local* socio-material ecologies and incorporated *local* cultural knowledge and values about childhood, personhood, and social relationships (Alonqueo et al., 2022; de León, 2019; Grove & Lancy, 2015). This approach is evidenced in numerous individual (Desperes & Remorini, 2022; Remorini, 2009; 2015) and collective publications (de León & Remorini, 2023).

In the end, the advantages of including ethnographic evidence in Global ECD interventions will only be appreciated to the extent that anthropologists sustainably occupy these spaces. According to Robin Nelson

> While anthropology, in particular, has been stuck in the 'savage slot' since its inception, much has been made of the outsized influence that WEIRD societies have had on studies of human behavioral norms in other fields. (Nelson 2021, 6)

Put another way, oversampling WEIRD communities has obscured our understanding of the role of cultural context in shaping human development.

This limited focus, together with an equally limited commitment to studying WEIRD segments of contemporary Global North societies, has led other fields to advocate for the cultural practices of the minority world as models of optimal development. As a result, we left too much space in human development studies to other scholars, and the voices and experiences of majority children have been marginalized. A critical engagement in building evidence that includes all human beings requires theoretical, methodological, ethical, and political criticism. It is only by considering the evidence that we ourselves produce and committing to make that evidence hearable to the Global ECD movement, that we will achieve the goal expressed by Ruth Benedict: "*The purpose of anthropology is to make the world safe for human differences*."

ORCID

Carolina Remorini PhD https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0806-8635

ENDNOTES

[1] Here I borrow an idea from Argentine music therapist Alejandra Giacobone (2020), that maintains that being "hearable" necessitates others not only learn to listen, but also to give space to other forms of discourse beyond the dominant one.

[2] It is not necessary to elaborate in this brief commentary on the American tradition on culture and personality, cross-cultural studies, and its central exponents. The ideas formulated by Boas in "Instability of Human Types" (1912) as in other of his works, inspired debates about the inseparable articulation between the cultural, the biological and the psychological, dimensions that unfortunately appear disarticulated in hegemonic models of child development. during most of the 20th century.

[3] In fact, in Argentina, there is only one line of research on child development supported by CONICET—the country's largest scientific funding organization—in Anthropology, which my team and I have been developing since 2009. The most recent information can be found here: https://www.conicet.gov.ar/new_scp/detalle.php?id=24299&keywords=desarrollo%2Binfantil&datos_academicos=yes

[4] See, for instance, the research conducted by Andrea Taverna (CONICET, Argentina) with Wichi Peoples, by Paula Alonqueo Boudon and colleagues (Laboratory of Cognition and Culture, UFRO, Chile) with Mapuche Peoples, and by Claudia Valeggia (Yale University) with Qom and Wichi Peoples.

REFERENCES

Alam, Shah. 2008. "Majority World: Challenging the West's Rhetoric of Democracy." *Amerasia Journal* 34: 88–98. https://doi.org/10.17953/AMER.34.1.L3176027K4Q614V5.

Alonqueo, Paula, Ana-María Alarcón, Carolina Hidalgo, and Viviana Herrera. 2022. "Learning with Respect: A Mapuche Cultural Value (Aprender con respeto: un valor de la cultura mapuche)." *Journal for the Study of Education and Development* 45: 599–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/02103702.2022.2059946.

Arnett, Jeffrey J. 2008. "The Neglected 95%: Why American Psychology Needs to Become Less American." *American Psychologist* 63(7): 602–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.63.7.602.

Boas, Franz. 1912. "Plasticity in Child Development. ("Instability of Human Types")." In *Anthropology and Child Development. A Cross-Cultural Reader*, edited by Robert A. LeVine and Rebecca Staples, 18–21. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1987. *La ecología del desarrollo humano: Experimentos en entornos naturales y diseñados*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Cullin, Jennifer M., Virginia J. Vitzthum, and Andrea S. Wiley. 2021. "Mind the Gap: Contesting Normal/Abnormal Constructs of Human Biology and Behaviors." *American Journal of Human Biology* 33(5): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23666.

de Leòn Pasquel, Lourdes, ed. 2019. *Nacer y crecer en Mesoamérica y los Andes: teorías parentales y prácticas de crianza infantil contemporáneas*. México: CIESAS, Publicaciones de la Casa Chata.

de León, Lourdes, and Carolina Remorini, eds. 2023. "Aprendizaje infantil en la América indígena" *AnthropoChildren* 11(2023): 1–15. https://popups.uliege.be/2034-8517/index.php?id=3783.

Desperes, Pilar, and Carolina Remorini. 2022. "Será que la suerte lo sigue a él: relaciones niñas/os-hacienda en las tierras altas argentinas." *Revista Avá*, 40(2): 26–45.

Draper, Catherine, Lisa Barnett, Caylee Cook, Jorge Cuartas et al. 2022. "Publishing Child Development Research from Around the World: An Unfair Playing Field Resulting in Most of the World's Child Population Under-Represented in Research." *Infant and Child Development* 32(6): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2375.

Fonseca, Claudia L. W. 2019. "Crianças, seus cérebros… e além: Reflexões em torno de uma ética feminista de pesquisa." *Revista Estudos Feministas* 27(2): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9584-2019v27n256169.

Giacobone, Alejandra. 2020. "El derecho a hacerse escuchar desde temprano. Musicalidad primordial, motive y emancipación." In *Escuchar las infancias*, edited by Miguel A. Tollo, 81–97. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Noveduc.

Grove, M. Annette, and David F. Lancy. 2015. "Cultural Views of Life Phases." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, edited by James D. Wright, 507–15. Amsterdam: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.23146-2.

Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan. 2010. "The Weirdest People in the World?" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33(2–3): 61–83. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x0999152x.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment. Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.

Karasik, Lana B., Karen E. Adolph, Catherine S. Tamis-Lemonda, and Marc H. Bornstein. 2010. "WEIRD Walking: Cross-Cultural Research on Motor Development." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33(2–3): 95–96. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x10000117.

Morelli, Gilda, Kim Bard, Nandita Chaudhary, Alma Gottlieb, Heidi Keller, Marjorie Murray, Naomi Quinn et al. 2018. "Bringing the Real World Into Developmental Science: A Commentary on Weber, Fernald, and Diop (2017)." *Child Development* 89(6): e594–e603. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13115.

Nelson, Robin G. 2021. "Theoretical Constraints: Science, Caretaking, and the Creation of Normative Ideals." *American Journal of Human Biology* 33(5): 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23650.

Popper, Karl. 2005. *El mito del marco común: En defensa de la ciencia y la racionalidad*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Reel, Heather, and Aurélie Athan. 2015. "Dispatch from the Ivory Tower: Reflections on the 20th Anniversary of Deconstructing Developmental Psychology." *Feminism & Psychology* 25(3): 305–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353514562803.

Remorini, Carolina, and Esteban Rowensztein. 2022. "¿Existe una normalidad en el desarrollo infantil?: Alcance y usos del concepto de desarrollo normal en la clínica y en la investigación con niños y niñas." *Salud Colectiva* 18: 1–18. https://doi.org/10.18294/sc.2022.3921.

Remorini, Carolina. 2015. "Learning to Inhabit the Forest." In *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, edited by Maricela Correa-Chávez, Rebeca Mejía-Arauz, Barbara Rogoff, 273–88. Amsterdam: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2015.09.003.

Remorini, Carolina 2021. "La infancia y el tiempo: la obsesión "WEIRD" por la cronologización del desarrollo infantil." *Sociedad e Infancias* 5(1): 57–68. https://doi.org/10.5209/soci.74459.

Remorini, Carolina 2009. *Aporte a la Caracterización Etnográfica de los Procesos de Salud- Enfermedad en las Primeras Etapas del Ciclo Vital, en Comunidades Mbya-Guaraní de Misiones, República Argentina*, Edulp, 1ra ed. La Plata: Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

Rogoff, Barbara. 2003. *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Säljö, Roger. 2020. "Development, Ageing and Hybrid Minds: Growth and Decline, and Ecologies of Human Functioning in a Sociocultural Perspective." *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 37: 100465. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2020.100465.

Scheidecker, Gabriel, Nandita Chaudhary, Heidi Keller, Francesca Mezzenzana, and David F. Lancy. 2023a. "'Poor Brain Development' in the Global South? Challenging the Science of Early Childhood Interventions." *Ethos* 51: 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/etho.12379.

Scheidecker, Gabriel, Bethlehem Tekola, Muneera Rasheed, Seth Oppong, Francesca Mezzenzana, Heidi Keller, and Nandita Chaudhary. 2023b. "Ending Epistemic Exclusion: Toward a Truly Global Science and Practice of Early Childhood Development." *Lancet Child & Adolescent Health* https://doi.org/10.1016/s2352-4642(23)00292-4.

Super, Charles, and Sara Harkness. 2015. "Charting Infant Development." In *The Oxford Handbook of Human Development and Culture*, edited by Lene A. Jensen, 79–93. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199948550.013.6.

Zubler, Jennifer M., Lisa D. Wiggins, Michelle M. Macias, Toni M. Whitaker, Judith S. Shaw, Jane K. Squires, Julie A. Pajek et al. 2022. "Evidence-Informed Milestones for Developmental Surveillance Tools." *Pediatrics* 149(3): 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-052138.

How to cite this article: Remorini, C. 2024. "*With* instead of *about*: Toward an Anthropology that is Critically Integrated into Global Early Childhood Development Interventions." *Ethos* 52: 421–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/etho.12434