

Section I

AN INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION

I. JAMES QUILLEN
Stanford University

Professional educators today face many problems. These problems are produced by such factors as the complexity and heterogeneity of American culture, the rapidity and inco-ordination of cultural change, the effort to provide equality of educational opportunity for all children and youth, the increase in the birth rate, the competition for the tax dollar, current ideological conflict, and conflicting theories of education. Educational problems center in such areas as the cultural role and objectives of education, the organization and administration of the school, the content of education, methods of teaching and learning, the evaluation and guidance of the student, and public relations and the provision of adequate financial support.

In the solution of school problems, professional educators have for some time utilized knowledge from such disciplines as biology, psychology, history, philosophy, and sociology. More recently increasing attention has been directed toward anthropology as a resource for conceptual knowledge and research methods which can contribute directly to the improvement of education. Anthropologists and educators have recognized areas of common interest and concern and have begun to work together on common problems. These co-operative efforts have been limited thus far, but this symposium is an indication both of the significant progress that has been made and of future possibilities. This introductory paper attempts to define some of the problem areas in education where anthropology can make a contribution. The overview by George Spindler, following, maps out some areas in anthropology that are relevant to these problems and surveys the articulation and historical contacts of the two fields.

Education is the instrument through which cultures perpetuate themselves. It is the process through which the members of a society assure themselves that the behavior necessary to continue their culture is learned. Since education is a cultural process, it is important for educators to have a clear conception of the meaning of culture. Confusion over this meaning is an important factor in confusion and conflict concerning the proper role of the school. Here is a basic area where anthropologists can make a significant contribution.

The school is concerned with the transmission, conservation, and extension of culture. Cultural transmission and personality formation are perhaps the two most important functions of the school. The anthropologist deals with enculturation, acculturation, and socialization. A knowledge of these processes as they occur in a variety of cultures can help educators to secure a clearer conception of their roles and provide them with a reservoir of tested experience from which they can draw ideas and techniques that may be useful in American schools. An understanding of the relationship between culture and personality will shed light on the nature-nurture conflict in education and contribute to improved guidance and counseling procedures.

For some time there has been considerable conflict in the United States concerning the role of education in the extension and improvement of American culture. This conflict became acute during the depression period and has been intensified by the current concern about communism. George Counts dramatized the issue when he wrote *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* The problem here concerns the role of the school in cultural innovation. This is another area where the interests of anthropologists and educators converge.

The school is only one educative agency in American culture, and perhaps not the most important. The family, church, young people's organizations, and the media of mass communication all play important roles in the education of the child. In many instances, out-of-school agencies, particularly the mass media, compete with the school for the attention of the child and produce behavioral changes which are contradictory to those which the school is trying to establish. In other instances, out-of-school agencies reinforce the efforts of teachers and other school personnel. If formal education is to be effective, teachers need to understand the role and influence of nonschool educational experiences. Content from anthropology can help greatly toward this end.

Education involves the changing of behavior in a desirable direction. The school is an educational institution specifically established to produce desirable changes in behavior. Educational objectives consist of descriptions of behavior which the school seeks to produce. The over-all objectives of the school are defined by a description of the behavior of the ideal citizen, including his knowledge, values, skills, and abilities. In a heterogeneous culture such as ours, the description of the ideal citizen is difficult, and confusion and conflict concerning educational objectives result. Anthropologists can help educators to develop a conception of the ideal cultural man and can assist in identifying the core values which Americans seek to preserve and perpetuate in an age of conflict.

The school program of study consists of those areas of experience and content which are essential to the development of the desired characteristics of behavior which have been chosen as objectives. The contents and experiences included in the school program are selected from the total range of possibilities which exist in the culture. Intelligent selection can be based only on considerable cultural insight and understanding. If those

who make the school curriculum do not understand the changing culture of which they are a part, deadwood will be carried indefinitely in the school program, and there will be important gaps in what is taught and learned. Harold Benjamin showed the proneness of schools to perpetuate outmoded content and experiences in his satire, *The Saber-Tooth Curriculum*.

The complexity, heterogeneity, and rapidity of change in modern culture make the selection of curriculum content particularly difficult. Anthropologists can help educators to understand better their community, nation, and world. The techniques of community study developed by anthropologists can be used by teachers to study their own community.

Methods of teaching and learning are perpetual problems in education. How can methods be used in the classroom that will transfer directly to effectiveness in living outside the school? What methods are most appropriate to the development of democratic citizenship? How can spiritual and moral values best be developed? How can the school produce sound character and wholesome personality? These are questions that many teachers are asking today. Anthropologists can help teachers understand how imitation, participation, communication, and informal methods are used to further enculturation in other cultures. They can also contribute to an understanding of the relationship between cultural motivation, incentives, and values and school learning.

A number of educators and social scientists have been concerned recently about the effects of the cultural experiences of an individual on his performance in intelligence tests. This has resulted in an effort to develop a "culture fair" intelligence test. Teachers need to be helped to see the significance of such activities in the furtherance of equality of educational opportunity.

Closely related to the question of the meaning of the I.Q. is the question of grouping. To what extent is homogeneous grouping in the school compatible with the values of democracy? What is the significance of the variety of cultural backgrounds of American children and youth for grouping and educational methods generally? The heterogeneity of American culture provides an excellent opportunity for the development of intergroup understanding and the improvement of human relations. In this area the concept of race is of special importance. Anthropologists can help clarify the meaning of race and the relationship between race, intelligence, and culture.

Finally, educators have become increasingly concerned about the development of intercultural and international understanding. A number of educators and anthropologists have participated in UNESCO's activities in this area. Educators need to be helped to develop more effective techniques for the study of the ways of living of people of other cultures. In many instances comparative culture studies in the school tend to reinforce prejudice rather than to increase understanding and appreciation. In addition to intercultural and international understanding, educators are concerned with the role of education in the international technical assistance programs. American educational methods are now being exported

to other nations. To what extent is this possible and desirable? How can American educators contribute most effectively to the improvement of the ways of living of people of other cultures? These are pressing problems where anthropological knowledge and research can again make a major contribution.

The papers and discussions included in this volume are addressed to some of these problems, and others will emerge out of the cross-disciplinary interchange within the group discussions. It may be anticipated that future studies and similar conferences will provide approaches unanticipated at present.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION: AN OVERVIEW

GEORGE D. SPINDLER
Stanford University

Though no "educational anthropology" exists at present, and this conference is not aimed at its creation, the purpose of this overview paper is to survey the articulation of these two fields. Education is not listed in *Anthropology Today* (Kroeber, 1953) as a field of application for anthropology. There are only rare instances of self-conscious attention to the mutual relevance of these two fields in the various interdisciplinary symposia. Few professional anthropologists are required by the institutional definition of their positions to interact with professional educationists, and only a handful of joint appointments in education and anthropology exist in American colleges and universities.

Despite this, some educational philosophers cite the concept of culture as most important in their systematic thinking, modern texts used in the training of teachers abound with references to anthropological literature, elementary school teachers include projects on "Peoples in Other Lands" and "Our Indian Friends," and a growing number of departments of anthropology are offering courses with the specific needs of teachers-in-training in mind. But most surprising is the fact that the relations between these two fields have a history in this country extending back to at least 1904, when Hewett wrote his first pieces on education for the *American Anthropologist* (1904, 1905).

These introductory statements suggest that a whole symposium of papers could be devoted to the systematic explication of these sometimes obscure and unacknowledged relationships. Only this overview paper will serve this interest directly. Its purpose is to outline the parts of both anthropology and education as they articulate into one mutually relevant framework of interests, trace briefly the history of such articulations, indicate what anthropologists have written about education and what educators have used of what anthropologists have written, and describe certain potentials and problems that exist in the relationships. It follows upon the introductory statement by Dean Quillen of the problems in education for which anthropological help is sought.

The purpose of this overview is thus sharply different from that of the rest of the papers in this symposium. It is *about* the relations of edu-

cation and anthropology. The other papers are designed to put into motion some applications of mutual relevance to both fields. They are experimental and question-raising, therefore, since no articulated education-anthropology structure exists from which they could draw. Most of them move well out toward the margins, away from traditional anthropological interests. This is not necessarily good, but it is assuredly inevitable.

Relevant Fields and Interests in Anthropology

Some of anthropology articulates, or can articulate, with education, and some of it does not. Anthropology as the "study of man," with its traditional interests in cultural variability, culture history—both ethnological and archeological—language, race, and human evolution, is admittedly a prime potential contributor to a good general education. While no claim is made here that anthropology should necessarily become the skeleton or the core of a complete "liberal arts" education at the secondary school or college level, it seems clear that no other existing discipline provides an integration, however loose, of so much that is important concerning man and his manifold behaviors. The study of man thus broadly conceived makes it possible to bridge the gap between the human animal and the human being, to conceive of both the relativity and universality of human behavior and propositions about it, to project human affairs upon a time plane that stretches far into the past and future, and turns the focus upon the basic round of life and man's relation to nature.

It is not even necessary, as is often done, to argue that the vicarious cross-cultural experience afforded by an anthropological Cook's tour leads to a better understanding of our own culture. It does or can lead to a more universalistic understanding of human life, and this is more important. Anything else is a by-product.

The implication is clear that anthropology should be used as a contribution to general education more widely than it is. It should not be taught as it is to young anthropologists-in-training or as it usually is at the college level—as an introduction to a discipline—but rather as an introduction to a new perspective on human life. It should also be taught at the secondary school level, possibly under some more conventional and already-existing rubric (Spindler, 1946). It is being taught at the elementary school level when teachers develop lesson units or activities centering on American Indian tribes—but sometimes badly because the teachers have had little or no exposure to anthropology as such and consequently contravene the primary goals of this kind of curriculum design. Anthropologists have been aware of these possible contributions of their field to general education and have written about it (Ehrich, 1947; Howells, 1952) but they have only rarely done anything about it, because they conceive of themselves primarily as producers of data and contributors to science and secondarily as teachers or curriculum designers.

In the sense outlined above, all of anthropology is relevant to education.

From this point on, the relationships real and potential are more selective. But these selections need not be made only from the sociocultural side of the discipline. Indeed, the contribution of physical anthropology to education had an early and significant beginning in Montessori's fascinating applications in a "pedagogical anthropology" (Montessori, 1913). To be sure, Maria Montessori, though armed with millimetric tape measures and anthropometers, called for recognition of educable man as a "speaking animal" and a "social animal," and in her practiced philosophy of education anticipated Goldenweiser's arguments for an anthropologically sound and progressive "education for social participation" (Goldenweiser, 1939). But more of Montessori later.

Aside from Montessori the most important contribution of physical anthropology to education has been on the subject of race, and the relationships—or rather the lack of them—between race, culture, and intelligence. Anthropological perspectives on the meaning of race and the myth of racial superiority have been popularized by Ethel Alpenfels in her capacity as staff anthropologist for the Bureau for Intercultural Education, and have become familiar to every well-grounded social studies teacher through this and other agencies. Otto Klineberg has given us the classic treatment on relationships between race, culture, and I.Q. (1935), that has wide circulation in an encapsulated form in a UNESCO pamphlet (1951) and a symposium edited by Linton (1947).

What has not been used sufficiently in education from physical anthropology are the techniques, concepts, and methodology concerning growth patterns, maturational sequences, sexual differences, and glandular processes that could add needed dimensions to the psychosomatic data of educational psychology. Nor have the school plant planners—a new specialization in education—yet consulted the physical anthropologists for ideas, methods, or facts on the anthropometry of the classroom. If anthropologists can design better bucket seats for flying boxcars, they can also design better desks for school children and contribute heretofore unconsidered applications to playground equipment, audio-visual devices, space-to-person ratios, and lavatories.

Directly relevant to the interests of this seminar-conference are the concepts and data of specialized and relatively new fields in anthropology, such as personality in culture and cultural dynamics. In fact, when anthropology-education relations are considered, this is usually where people in both disciplines begin to look first.

For some, interests in cross-cultural education are identical with interests in cross-cultural socialization. This creates confusion. Socialization of the child to human, group-accepted status is a total process of growth and adaptation. The center of the process is the child—adapting to an environment structured by culture, as well as by group size, climate, terrain, ecology, and the peculiar personalities of his always-unique parents or parental surrogates. Education is not this whole process. It is what is done to a child, by whom, under what conditions, and to what purpose. It is the process of transmitting culture—if we can think of

culture as including skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values, as well as discrete elements of behavior. It is the culture of the human being—where culture is used as a verb.

There are many books, monographs, and articles by anthropologists reporting research on socialization of the child in environments structured by various cultural sets. The most recent significant comparative research is Whiting and Child's *Child Training and Personality* (1953). There are relatively few studies on education. British anthropologists, with their functional predilections, have provided many of the most useful descriptive analyses of education as cultural transmission in particular cultural settings. One of the better studies by an American anthropologist in terms of application to the who, what, when, where questions has been produced by Pettit, as he summarizes and analyzes education in North American Indian cultures (Pettit, 1946). This work illustrates the kind of thing that needs to be done with more comparative cross-cultural data.

This suggests the relevance of another field of anthropology—traditional ethnography—the factual core of cultural anthropology. Pettit drew his data from ethnographies written by others. The fact that he could do so is a tribute to the inclusiveness of good ethnography. But he had to search for the relevant facts and too often couldn't find them, or could find only indirect allusions to a who, what, when, and how process in cultural transmission. The success of his search indicates that an ethnographic corpus lies waiting to be cannibalized by researchers interested in cross-cultural education, but that more definitive and inclusive categories of observation need to be devised if future reports are to be of maximum use. Ethnography has produced the raw materials for more treatment than has been committed—and it also furnishes the sources for the vicarious "culture shock" that is an essential step in the education of a public school teacher.

That amorphous and loosely defined problem area in anthropology called cultural dynamics is the source of many relevances—most of them potential. If this field is seen as that concerned primarily with processes of culture change and stability, its relation to educationist interests is immediately clear. Change and stability must be mediated by what is transmitted from parent to child in the educative process. This transmission process is not seen as a causative variable—excepting within a limited interaction cycle. But unless this variable intervening between changes in conditions of life and the adaptations of people is understood, the "dynamic" part of cultural dynamics is left unilluminated. And the educative process can be understood better by viewing it as such an intervening variable, for then it is seen as an instrumentality that is sensitive to the cultural and extracultural exigencies under which it operates. Anthropologists have done little systematizing here. Herskovits has supplied one of the few explicit statements in his "Education and Cultural Dynamics" (1943).

One field of interest in anthropology that has realized relatively more of its potential in relation to educational problems is that of social structure.

If the interests here are conceived as broadly relating to group alignments, prestige ranking, status and role interrelationships, and social control in the community context, all of the very useful work of the Warner group and other closely related efforts may be regarded as a contribution from this area. The contributors include, besides Warner, such workers as Allison Davis, Gardner, Dollard, Loeb, Withers, Useem, and many non-anthropologists who have been strongly influenced therein—such as Havighurst, Taba, Hollingshead, the Lynds, *et al.* The relevance of this field to education, particularly with respect to a concept of social class that has been regularized by Warner and his associates, is indicated by two recent special issues of the *Harvard Educational Review* on the subject (1953). No claim is made that this is exclusively an anthropological domain or contribution, but one of the mainsprings driving the interest and its application is fastened to an anthropological pivot.

In this instance the situation as it exists otherwise in the various potential or emergent articulations with education is reversed. More is known about how the educative process is affected by social class and community structure in Jonesville and Elmtown than in the nonliterate societies that are the accustomed habitat of the anthropologists. To be sure, nonliterate societies rarely have social classes in the same sense that Jonesville has, but some do, and all have groups structured into a social organization. Whether this structure is formalized by a widely ramifying kinship system, or by rank, or by a complex political-social system, or is atomistic and individuated—the who, what, when, and why of education will reflect this structure at every turn. For the sake of a clearer concept of education as a sociocultural process something more should be known about these functional interrelationships between educative system, educative process, and social structure in non-Western and particularly smaller, simpler societies.

Relevant Fields and Interests in Education

When the sights are turned on education, it becomes clear that there are more relevant problems and interests than anthropologists could begin to bear appropriate gifts to—even if they were so motivated. Some of the particularly significant problems have been succinctly described by James Quillen. Others have been listed by Fannie Shaftel in a memorandum circulated to the participants in this conference. The discussion below will approach some of these same problems from a different perspective and describe certain interests and fields in education in which these problems occur.

One of the areas within education that most obviously calls for an anthropological contribution is that of the "foundation" fields. These are designated by various names in teachers' colleges and schools of education about the country. The general rubrics are social, psychological, philosophical, historical and comparative, and biological. They represent

what is drawn into education as a science, and into education as a professional field, from the behavioral and social sciences, the humanities, and natural sciences, as their data and concepts are used in empirical and logico-deductive analyses of the educative process, and in the training of teachers.

Anthropology has only recently begun to make a significant contribution to these fields, largely because of its newness as an academic discipline. Within the social-behavioral foundations, educational psychology has clearly dominated the scene, partly because of a historical accident that institutionally wedded psychology and education rather early—at least in America—and partly because the problems of educational tests and measurements, principles of learning, and personality development have been naturals for psychological applications. In many teacher-training institutions psychology is still the only behavioral science explicitly recognized in the organization of professional education courses.

Of the various social sciences, education as a professional field has drawn from political science, economics, and jurisprudence, but particularly from sociology. Educational sociology has its own house organ, numerous texts bearing its name, and an impressive pile of research to its credit. Most foundation courses in professional education in the social area are called "educational sociology." In a few places where teachers are trained in America—particularly at Teachers College at Columbia under the leadership of Lyman Bryson and now Solon T. Kimball, at New York University under Ethel Alpenfels, and at Chicago, Harvard, Yale, and Stanford—an explicit anthropological contribution is integrated with those of other social sciences in the foundation program. Hunter College, in New York City, may soon be the site of an unusually wide-ranging curriculum of "foundational" education and anthropology (Rosenstiel 1954), and New York University's School of Education has a long-standing development of this sort. Courses in anthropology are required of teachers-in-training at some universities and colleges where there is no formalized integration of anthropological contributions with the foundation fields in education.

At Stanford, as an illustration of the ways in which anthropology can contribute to the foundation fields in teacher training, relevant materials are presented in three courses: "Social Foundations in Education"; "Cultural Transmission"; and "Social Anthropology in Education." These courses are given under the aegis of a joint appointment in the School of Education and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and credit is given in both fields.

"Social Foundations in Education" is required of all upper division education students and all candidates for the Master of Arts degree in education, as well as for the various professional credentials. It combines selected materials from sociology, anthropology, and social psychology. The anthropological contribution lies mainly in a systematic analysis of American cultural patterns and values as they bear directly upon the role and functions of the teacher and public school system. Cross-cultural data

are used here for illustrative purposes. Other topical areas covered include social class and education, problems in student-teacher communication, group stereotypes and prejudice in schools, the community context of the school, and the school as a social system.

"Cultural Transmission" is offered as a course for doctoral candidates, and is presented within the advanced social foundations sequence in education. Its coverage includes the construction of a frame of reference for viewing transmission and enculturation processes. This frame of reference is then used in the analysis of these processes in two nonliterate societies, one European society, and American society. The course ends with analysis of case studies of selected types of teachers and their classrooms, and schools, in our society. Sociometric, autobiographic, socio-economic, observational, and community "social base" data are included in the case study materials.

"Social Anthropology in Education" is a seminar constituted of a majority of advanced graduate students in education and a sprinkling of degree candidates in anthropology and psychology. It has been devoted so far to an analysis of the educative process in nonliterate societies, using standard ethnographic references. A simple outline of educative process is used, with major headings like "teaching personnel," "content taught," "time and sequence of impact," "techniques used," and "formal and informal contexts."

These courses accomplish different things in different ways. An important point in relation to the problem of education-anthropology articulation is that only in the seminar is the greater part of the frame of reference supplied by anthropology; in the other courses it seems essential to provide an integration of selected aspects of sociology and psychology. This is not simply because the titles of the courses are self-determinative. When the educative process is the focus and particularly in our own society, the anthropological frame of reference is not sufficient alone. But it is essential. The core of the contribution is in the attention to culture as a behavioral compulsive, as a perception-directing set of patterns, and in the attention to the variable forms these patterns take. *Cultural awareness* is one vital aim of each course, but not merely generalized cultural awareness; the aim is to create in the teacher an awareness of how culture influences specifically what he does as a teacher, and how to think about, observe, and analyze this influence. Courses in conventional institutionalized anthropology do not serve this same purpose, though they are quite necessary as a first phase of the experiences of the student in training as a professional educator.

This role of anthropology in the foundation fields of education may be regarded as a contribution to teacher training. The conclusion to be drawn is that it does not suffice to throw some standard anthropology courses at the teacher-in-training. By the time he is preparing to be a professional educator, or is improving his already established proficiency, he should have had an introduction to the materials of at least cultural anthropology as a part of his general education. The anthropology he gets in his *pro-*

professional education should be integrated with the other foundational offerings and used to solve problems in analysis of educative process. Otherwise we are asking him to provide this integration and this application; and most students—in education or otherwise—simply cannot.

There are other parts of the structure of professional education that need, or at least can use, some anthropological help: curriculum construction, for instance, once largely psychology-based, is now beginning to be socioculturally based as well. Elementary school curricula are being reorganized with direct attention to culture content, universal human activities, cultural values, and sequences of culturally patterned experience (Hanna, 1954). The emphasis on intergroup relations and utilization of community resources in the development of social education curricula in elementary schools likewise indicates this shift (Taba, 1950; Willcockson, 1950).

Other relevant interests in education are represented in the problems of educational administration, and the training of professional educational administrators. Cultural awareness is perhaps even more important for the administrator, since he manipulates the setting in which the teacher interacts with students and parents. He must not only have cultural awareness but must also understand the mechanics of culture change, the cultural expectations affecting the leader's role, the concrete as well as idealistic meaning of cultural values, and the social system of the school in the setting of the encompassing community and national social structure. Anthropology has a clear potential utility on the first three scores. In the latter instance sociology supplies more materials perhaps, but does so through community study approaches that are at least claimed to be partly an anthropological invention.

Up to this point the discussion of fields and interests in education relevant to the problem of education-anthropology articulation has centered mainly upon the training and manipulative side of professional education. But education as a professional field is not only concerned with teacher training, teaching, curriculum design, and administration of schools; it has a research base. Probably no social or behavioral science has as great a backlog of research nor encompasses such a high degree of variability of quality of research. The reason for the first is obvious. The reason for the second is partly that education crosscuts every phase of human activity and it is impossible to do good research without a high degree of specialization in the science or discipline treating with selected dimensions within this range. This is very difficult when so much has to be done all at once.

Be that as it may, there are many phases of research within the framework of education that call for anthropological attention. There has been an incorporation of anthropologically based concepts and methods in the studies of social class influences on learning (Davis, 1952), social class and community structures in relation to the social organization of the school and educational opportunities (Warner, Loeb, *et al.*, 1944), and problems of adolescence (Havighurst and Taba, 1949), in the extensive study of the

relationships between intelligence and cultural differences by the Chicago group (Eells *et al.*, 1951), and in the studies of social class differences in socialization with their implications for education (Davis and Havighurst, 1947). This interest in social class and learning, and social class and school organization, has been the main stream of influence on research directly relevant to education and stemming from anything that can be regarded as an anthropological source. The main contribution of anthropology, other than in the form of some of the personnel involved, has been in the notion of cultural relativity, and in a functional total-community approach. As for methodology, it is doubtful that many clear claims to contributions can be made by anthropology, other than in a devotion to informants and informal participant observation.

Thus a definite and extensive contribution to research on educational problems, in American society at least, has yet to be made. This is a reflection of the fact that anthropologists have not been very interested in our own society until quite recently. Their proper object of study has been the nonliterate peoples, in their pure or reconstructed form, or as they have struggled for existence under the impact of the industrial-based civilizations.

Anthropologists have been interested and involved with the problem of education in dependent, trust, and colonial territories, and Indian reservations, where nonliterate indigenes have been exposed to a Western-mediated education. But the involvement has been largely in terms of an applied anthropology, in various administrative and consultative capacities, and actual research reports on the processes involved are quite scarce. Felix Keesing has described some of the interesting problems that arise in these contexts in a summary of the content of a seminar conference including educators, anthropologists, sociologists, and government officials on the problems of education in Pacific countries (Keesing, 1937). Margaret Mead has provided a provocative analysis of the feasible educational objectives and the major factors to be taken into account in the twentieth-century education of dependent peoples (1946).

There are many areas of potential application of anthropologically based concepts and methods in educational research in our own society to which attention may some day be given. The roles of teacher and school administrator in American society call for treatment from a cultural point of view that will call attention to some of the excruciating paradoxes projected in the role expectations. The effect of culturally-based values upon teacher perceptions of behavior and personal qualities of students needs to be explicated in a way that the positionally-oriented social class studies have not yet developed. The informal transmission of value orientations and covert culture by teachers and in peer groups has received only preliminary attention. New approaches to the study of the school as a social system need to be devised—perhaps in the manner of the factory system studies that were in part anthropologically inspired. American culture as a specific context of the goals, expectations, and functions of education needs exploration—possibly in the vein of national character approaches.

The conceptual categories and symbolic referents of speech in communication between teacher and child call for a meta-linguistic, language-in-culture application.

Particularly appropriate to traditional anthropological interests is the need for cross-cultural research in education that illuminates the process in our own society indirectly but powerfully. This must be distinguished, as indicated, from primarily psychologically oriented interests in socialization. The educative process—the who, what, when, where, and how of common-human and culturally variable cultural transmission—furnishes understanding of not only basic processes of education but also cultural dynamics, for education thus broadly conceived is culture in motion. Culture is idealized in the educative process. Every teacher, whether mother's brother or Miss Humboldt of Peavey Falls, re-enacts and defends the cultural drama as experienced. As the culture is passed on from one generation to the next in the hands of the teacher, it assumes a patent and rationalized shape. The whole world view is somehow encapsulated in each gesture, admonition, indoctrination, or explanation. And this seems equally true whether physics or sacred dreamtime truths are being taught.

Some of these possibilities are elaborated in various ways in the papers of this conference. Many of them will stay in the state of possibility only. But other approaches and avenues not seen as yet will be opened, perhaps as a result of this conference.

The Routes of Diffusion

Anthropological routes.—Some of the routes of diffusion of concepts and knowledge between education and anthropology have been described. The community structure—educational system stream of influence has been most important. Montessori's influence is another, and of longer standing (1913). Her principal assumptions have been integrated into the framework of modern progressive education. She saw clearly the need for stressing the "organic" relation of the whole child to the environment, emphasized the developmental process so that the child was not seen as a "diminutive adult," anticipated the problem of the differential meaning of school experience to children from various social classes and ethnic groups in her concept of a "regional ethnology" and study of local conditions, called for respect for individual differences in growth and function, demanded that a "scientific pedagogy" concern itself with normal individuals primarily, and developed a "biographical chart" that took the place of the report card and included "antecedents"—vocation of parents, their aesthetic culture, their morality and sentiments and care of children—as well as reports of physical and psychological examinations and on-going observations in the form of "diaries."

Education may contest the characterization of this as an anthropological influence, since Montessori is so clearly a part of the educationist's heritage, but she called her approach a "Pedagogical Anthropology," and

used what were regarded, in Italy at least, as anthropological concepts, methods, techniques, and data. Though her cultural anthropology is guilty of what today would be regarded as certain racist errors, and her physical anthropology is now outmoded, her farsighted anticipation of much of the best of the contemporary art and science of education is impressive. Whether this is true because she had genius or because she had an anthropological orientation cannot be divined. She had both.

A history of anthropology-to-education diffusion cannot omit the early contributions of Edgar L. Hewett (1904, 1905). His articles "Anthropology and Education" (1904) and "Ethnic Factors in Education" (1905) in the *American Anthropologist* were the first and almost the last contributions of their kind in that journal. He argued for an "enrichment of the course of study of every public school in the land" through the incorporation of ethnological materials, particularly on culture history not confined to the Western world; called for joint meetings of the national education and anthropology societies to discuss mutual problems; scored culture historians for misuse and lack of use of ethnological data; claimed the clear relevance of an "ethnic psychology" that would contribute to the teacher's understanding of the fact that ". . . Italian and Bohemian, Celt and Hebrew, Anglo-Saxon and African, look upon questions of honor, morality, and decency out of separate ethnic minds . . ."; asked educators to realize that "a civilization imposed from without is usually harmful, often destructive, always undesirable," because the "development of a race must be from within"; and suggested that for all these reasons "normal schools and other institutions for the training of teachers should give a prominent place to the anthropological sciences." The fact that none of his calls was implemented reflects partly an ethnocentrism of American culture, partly the peculiar conservatism of American public education, and particularly the fact that American anthropologists did not have time for much of anything but ethnographic and culture history salvage until the 1930's.

Franz Boas, the dean of American anthropology, clearly saw the relevance of anthropological and educational interests. In his *Anthropology and Modern Life* (1928) he devotes one whole chapter to these interests. He points out that "anthropological research offers, therefore, a means of determining what may be expected of children of different ages, and this knowledge is of considerable value for regulating educational methods." He talks of "normative data for development," sex differences, ethnic differences, and differences in environmental conditions that should be taken into account. He treats of some of the problems of cultural transmission, and points out that "our public schools are hardly conscious of the conflict" between democratic ideas of freedom and flexibility, and coercion; "they instill automatic reactions to symbols by means of patriotic ceremonial, in many cases by indirect religious appeal, and too often through the automatic reactions to the behavior of the teacher that is imitated." He suggests that tradition-based transmission of values and ethics is particularly strong among intellectuals and that the "masses"

respond "more quickly and energetically to the demands of the hour than the educated classes . . ."

The writings of Montessori, Hewett, and Boas on anthropology and education have been discussed in some detail because an examination of what anthropologists have written since then reveals that, with some notable exceptions, not much more has been said, and a critical examination of the implementation of their suggestions indicates that no more than a beginning has actually been accomplished.

Articles by anthropologists on this subject have turned up persistently in educational journals and elsewhere for the past twenty-five years. The place of anthropology in a college education, the contributions of anthropology to the training of teachers, the place of primitive education in the history of education are the favorite themes. The articles add to what their forerunners spelled out, but few of them produce clear innovations. Exceptions to this general rule include Mead's suggestive article on education in the perspective of primitive cultures (1943) and her Inglis Lectures, under the title, *The School in American Culture* (1950); Kluckhohn's comments in *Mirror for Man* (1949); Opler's "Cultural Alternatives and Educational Theory" (1947); Goldenweiser's "Culture and Education" (1939); and Herskovits' stimulating discussion in his text, *Man and His Works* (1948). The whole issue of the *American Journal of Sociology* (1943) devoted to "Education and Cultural Dynamics," including articles by Johnson, Redfield, Malinowski, Mekeel, Benedict, Herskovits, Powdermaker, and Embree is an especially outstanding contribution.

It seems clear, upon examination of what has been done, that anthropologists have not been able to say much more than was said fifty years ago by Hewett when they talk about the general relevance of anthropology to general education. This is primarily because there is not much else to say. When the anthropologists have either analyzed their own intimately understood cross-cultural data in the perspective of education in modern society, or vice versa, or have moved over into a direct analysis of the educative process in our society with few methodological or conceptual binders, they have made a definite contribution. But the capital available in these activities has just begun to be utilized.

Educational routes.—Irrespective of the worthy attentions by anthropologists to education, the educators have gone ahead on their own to search out and utilize what seemed relevant to them of the anthropological products. An examination of representative and substantial texts in the psychological, sociocultural, philosophical, and comparative-historical foundations of education used in professional teacher-training institutions about the country reveals a clear shift toward appropriation of social and cultural concepts and data produced by anthropologists.

In educational psychology, for example, the text by Pressey and Robinson (1944) mentions no anthropological references, and uses no cross-cultural data for illustrative purposes. The text edited by Skinner, revised twice, shows an increase of anthropological citations in the last revision (1950). Cole and Bruce, in their 1950 edition, take a strong culture-

oriented position, using section headings like "Life Styles as the Product of Cultures," "Diverse Cultures with Their Contrasting Life Styles," "The Culture as Definer of Perceptions, Beliefs, and Behaviors," "The Teacher—an Agent of Culture"; use Samoa, Zuni, Kwakiutl data as culture case-study materials; and cite extensively literature by Benedict, Davis, Dennis, Kardiner and Linton, Linton alone, Mead, Redfield, Whiting, and Kluckhohn. Cronbach, in his sparkling new 1954 model for educational psychology texts, draws upon Mead, Davis, Warner, Benedict, and Kluckhohn, among others, and makes considerable reference to cultural pressures, different cultural settings influencing personality development and learning, and formation of social attitudes and values. Martin and Stendler's new text, *Child Development*, intended for use by educators and non-educators both, and already used widely in elementary education and other professional education courses, places a very heavy emphasis on culture-personality relationships. Culture case data are cited for the Alorese, Balinese, Comanche, Japanese, Kwoma, Mentowie, Navaho, Samoans, Sioux, Tanala, Tepeotecans, Yurok, Zuni, and others. Cultural relativism has found its way into the heart of this book.

In educational sociology—a field that is rapidly being expanded into a sociocultural foundation of education—a like trend is occurring. Cook's book (1950, revised edition), a text of long standing and wide use in educational sociology and social foundations, cites cross-cultural materials infrequently but draws much from the anthropologically influenced community studies on Middletown, St. Denis, Yankee City, and Plainsville. Robbins' *Educational Sociology* (1953) uses many of the same references and refers to writings by Mead, Benedict, Murdock, and Linton for the notion of cultural relativity. Brown's 1954 edition of *Educational Sociology* uses extensive reference to cultural data on the Navaho, Australian tribes, Zuni, and the Acoma Pueblo, and cites anthropological pieces—by Gillin, Kluckhohn, Wagley, Herskovits, Goldfrank, Redfield, Tylor, Stirling, Warner, Rivers, Linton, Hewett, Mead, Powdermaker, Benedict, and Montague—approximately twice as often as in the 1947 edition.

The trend is not as noticeable in the philosophical and comparative foundations of education—in so far as the limits of the sample of texts permit generalizations. The tendency in these fields has apparently been to utilize highly generalized and Western-limited concepts of culture as an important part of the frame of reference, but to draw relatively little from any of the work by anthropologists in cross-cultural contexts. Bra-meld has made one of the strongest arguments for a culture base for educational philosophy (1950), but even he cites only a few anthropological works—namely, some by Davis, Kluckhohn, Benedict, Warner, and Herskovits. He is currently engaged in an appraisal of the implications of anthropological concepts and works for educational theory—an activity reflected directly in his paper for this conference.

An over-all summation of the anthropological concepts and data utilized in the contemporary texts in the foundations of education reveals certain general trends. Quite clear is the fact that educators interested in child-

hood education, elementary curriculum, school-community interrelations, and all of the social and behavioral foundations of education have arrived at the point where an anthropological point of view and, particularly, cross-cultural materials have a positive value for them. They indicate an awareness of culture concepts and cultural data produced by anthropologists by fairly extensive documentations with appropriate literature. They include anthropological references in their recommended reading lists. They consider it desirable to qualify generalizations about learning, cultural transmission, human nature, the functions of education, child growth and development, by invoking the notion of cultural relativity. Some of them incorporate a cultural perspective into their thinking—beyond using cultural relativity as a valued checkative.

The number of concepts relating to culture and culture process is impressive. Anthropologists have no copyright but certainly some possessory rights over them. Values, acculturation, cultural normalcy, cultural diffusion, cultural change, cultural transmission, subcultures, peer culture, folk culture, and even that rather new term—enculturation—ring with authentic familiarity to the anthropologist as they are used by the educationist authors.

But it is also clear that the range of materials being diffused via educationist channels from anthropological sources is in actuality quite limited. The same names and same references keep turning up constantly. A frequency-of-citation chart for the literature examined reveals that Kluckhohn, Mead, Benedict, Davis, West (Carl Withers), and Warner are cited in great disproportion to all others. This suggests that the purveyance of anthropological thinking to education has at most two main disciplinary vehicles—personality and culture, and community studies—and that the mediation of data and concepts is inevitably given an indelible impress by these particular workers. Particularly significant is the fact that it is the relatively most popularized works of these contributors that are cited most frequently. These two tendencies indicate that however useful the contributions and however able the contributors, the educators are not getting a fair and substantial diet of anthropological materials. This will only change when the educators take the next step and get their hands dirty with some of the dust-laden monographs back in the stacks, and when anthropologists exhume their portfolios of esoteria and put them into more publicly usable form. The educators and anthropologists who have respectively done these things already are due some applause.

The Roles of the Anthropologist in the Educational Context

One clear implication in this overview has been that if anthropology is actually going to contribute to education, the anthropologists will have to act at least more than occasionally within the setting of professional education. This is no argument that all anthropologists should. The discipline has many dimensions and interests, and nothing should be permitted to happen in relations with other fields that draws many anthropologists

away from the central obligation to do basic research. But anthropologists have always been marked with a certain versatility. If there is a job to do in education some anthropologists will, for one reason or another, be bound to do it. Therefore an explication of some of the roles possible in the context of professional education is in order.

The anthropologist may act as a consultant. Ideally, he should be able to contribute ideas to every division of educational specialization—elementary, secondary, higher education, health, guidance, administration. He contributes, ideally, a widened perspective on human behavior. He sees the educative process as a cultural process, and thus not bounded by formalized, or ritualized lines of specialization or conceptual compartmentalization. He devotes some of his attention to breaking down ethnocentric biases. He is, ideally, not time-bound. He provides objectification of cultural values and, if he is successful, brings educational objectives into appropriate congruence with them. He contributes some useful analytic-descriptive categories, the foremost of which is culture, followed by a train of constructs like cultural transmission, enculturation, role and status, and social organization. To do these things he has to act as a participating member of the groups for which he acts as a consultant, for it is necessary for him to grasp the point of view and problems of those with whom he is consulting. He has already had experience in doing this within a somewhat different setting in his field research.

The anthropologist may do research in education or act as a consulting member of a team that is doing research. He does so with the same perspectives and capabilities that have been outlined above, and in attacks upon problems that fall into areas described previously in this paper. His major contribution lies in the molar approach that characterizes anthropological method. His greatest problem is one of relevance. His problems, definitions, and research values cannot remain exactly the same as they would if he were doing anthropological field research in a nonliterate, or even an acculturating community. He must understand what it is that educators need to know in order both to build a better educational theory and to solve problems of immediate applied relevance. In the research team developed at Stanford under the direction of Robert Bush and known as the Stanford Consultation Service, it was found that a good *modus operandi* was achieved when the educator, psychiatrist, and anthropologist exchanged roles for a time so that each could achieve insight into the other's problems. In this project also, a unique combination of ameliorative case consultation goals and pure research goals has been achieved, so that neither end-point of the value pendulum in educational research is lost. There are frustrations inherent in this procedure, to be sure.

The anthropologist need not necessarily work strictly within the framework of immediate education interests in his cross-disciplinary research. He may elect to confine himself to his own cross-cultural field, chasing down questions on educative process in non-Western societies. Possibly the most significant contributions of anthropology to education via research channels actually lie here.

The anthropologist may act as a teacher in the setting of professional education. Certain propositions concerning this role have already been explicated. His obligation lies mainly in making explicit the cultural assumptions and values that are a substratum of every move in educational action or theorizing. His contribution is particularly critical because education is a sensitive part of the total cultural process, and because in its very nature as an art and science of human cultivation it is loaded with a heavy burden of values. To achieve this contribution he goes to cross-cultural variability first, then turns to our own cultural modes as they bear directly upon the educative process—from the viewpoint of both the learner and the teacher. His aim is to create cultural awareness, which is perhaps even more important than self-awareness in the teacher's sphere of activity and which is pedagogically much more attainable.

Limitations and Reservations

The list of particulars for the roles the anthropologist may assume in the context of professional education is stated in ideal terms. No one anthropologist could do all of these things equally well. Choices have to be made on the basis of personal inclination and necessity.

But other limitations on his functions call for statement. One danger is that the "study of man" can sometimes seem so total that it becomes *the* study of man. One ethnocentrism is substituted for another. The anthropologist's comments seem to glitter like gold—to him at least—because for a time they are new and fresh. He becomes a kind of cultural oracle. But when his stock of illuminating asides on the Upper Pukapuka on the Lower Zambesi runs low he will be forced to take another stance. Then he may be reduced to making broad, conjectural statements that he may confuse as final judgments or substantial generalizations rather than a potential source of hypotheses. He may fool some of the educators some of the time, but he can't fool them all.

Further, the anthropologist's experience with small and relatively integrated societies sometimes gives him an extraordinary naïveté about the complex relations in our own society—a society that he himself may have escaped from—into anthropology. He fails to see complications and looks for integrating features, consistencies, and values where there are none. And as a consequence he may make outlandish pronouncements as to what educators should or should not do.

Beyond this, the anthropologist is not always particularly sophisticated intellectually. He is often not sufficiently familiar with the social and intellectual histories of the great civilizations—including his own. He may have become an anthropologist in order to become an explorer (subconsciously, of course), or buried himself so thoroughly in ethnographies that he has no room in his head for other thoughts. If so, his suggestions to educators would fall short of the mark when he talks about cultural transmission, since he would not know the culture to be transmitted.

And there are limitations inherent in the culture concept. Though the utility of this construct cannot be denied, it is not a theory in itself. It is not sufficiently dynamic, or field-oriented, but tends to contain itself around patterning phenomena that provide form but not function as variables for analysis. This may in fact be part of the reason for the anthropologist's descriptive bias—a limitation that American anthropology is just now getting over. He will usually find in the educational context that he has to turn to other disciplines for concepts and methods in order to do adequate research on or even adequate talking about any single dynamic problem in education in our society. Then perhaps he ceases being an anthropologist and becomes a social scientist with a cross-cultural perspective, and a molar approach to problems.

Conclusion

This overview has been an attempt to present some of the actual and potential articulations between education and anthropology, and is designed to set the stage for the papers and discussions that follow. No attempt can be made to anticipate the many issues and rich content of the conference as a whole. The overview should serve to alert both educators and anthropologists to some of the problems in communication that will prevail. The anthropologists have been asked to do a very difficult thing—to address themselves to problems in a relatively unfamiliar context, using whatever tools and materials they find appropriate. The anthropological identity may be lost in the attempt, or the understandings intended may be lost because the identity is kept. In any event, the anthropologists must use certain criteria of relevance that presumably stem from within anthropology—yet be aware of the perceptual field of the educator audience. The educators must accept the necessity for internal relevance of anthropological material—and yet apply their own criteria for selection and modification of what is offered. This means that both anthropologists and educators must exercise a species of "double awareness" that is always necessary in interdisciplinary efforts but which is rarely exercised sufficiently. The conference is an experiment in this possibility.

References

- Boas, Franz. 1928. *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Brameld, Theodore. 1950. *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*. New York: World Book Co.
- Brown, Francis J. 1954. *Educational Sociology*. 2d ed. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bryson, Lyman. 1939. "Anthropology and Education," in D. D. Brand, Fred Harvey (eds.), *So Live the Works of Men*. Albuquerque, pp. 107-15.
- Cole, Lawrence E., and William F. Bruce. 1950. *Educational Psychology*. New York: World Book Co.
- Cook, Lloyd A., and Elaine F. Cook. 1950. *A Sociological Approach to Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

- Cronbach, Lee J. 1954. *Educational Psychology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Davis, Allison. 1952. *Social Class Influences on Learning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Davis, Allison, and Robert J. Havighurst. 1947. *Father of the Man*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Eells, Kenneth, Allison Davis, Robert J. Havighurst, Virgil E. Herrick, and Ralph W. Tyler. 1951. *Intelligence and Cultural Differences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ehrich, Robert W. 1947. "The Place of Anthropology in a College Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, XVII, 57-61.
- Goldenweiser, Alexander. 1939. "Culture and Education," *Stanford Education Conference*. New York: Social Education.
- Hanna, Paul. 1954. "Needed Changes in Elementary Curriculum," paper before the AASA meeting, Atlantic City.
- Harvard Educational Review*. 1953. "Social Class Structure and American Education," Parts I and II; XXIII, 149-338.
- Havighurst, Robert J., and Hilda Taba. 1949. *Adolescent Character and Personality*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Herskovits, Melville J. 1943. "Education and Cultural Dynamics," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII, 109-21.
- . 1948. *Man and His Works*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Hewett, Edgar L. 1904. "Anthropology and Education," *American Anthropologist*, VI, 574-75.
- . 1905. "Ethnic Factors in Education," *American Anthropologist*, VII, 1-16.
- Howells, W. W. 1952. "The Study of Anthropology," *American Anthropologist*, LIV, 1-7.
- Johnson, Charles S. (ed.). 1943. "Education and the Cultural Process," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII, 1-136.
- Keesing, Felix M. 1937. *Education in Pacific Countries*. Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh.
- Klineberg, Otto. 1935. *Racial Differences*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- . 1947. "Racial Psychology," in Ralph Linton (ed.), *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1951. *Race and Psychology*. UNESCO.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. 1949. *Mirror for Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Kroeber, A. L. (ed.). 1953. *Anthropology Today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, William E., and Celia Stendler. 1953. *Child Development*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Mead, Margaret. 1943. "Our Educational Emphasis in Primitive Perspective," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII, 633-39.
- . 1946. "Professional Problems of Education in Dependent Countries," *The Journal of Negro Education*, XV, 346-57.
- . 1950. *The School in American Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Montessori, Maria. 1913. *Pedagogical Anthropology*. New York: Frederick Stokes.
- Opler, Morris. 1947. "Cultural Alternatives and Educational Theory," *Harvard Educational Review*, XVII, 28-44.
- Pettit, George A. 1946. "Primitive Education in North America," *University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology*, XLIII, 1-182.
- Pressey, Sidney, and Francis Robinson. 1944. *Psychology and the New Education*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Robbins, Florence G. 1953. *Educational Sociology*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Rosenstiel, Annette. 1954. "Educational Anthropology: A New Approach to Cultural Analysis," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXIV, 28-36.
- Skinner, Charles E. (ed.). 1950. *Elementary Educational Psychology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Spindler, G. D. 1946. "Anthropology May Be an Answer," *Journal of Education*, CXXIX, 130-31.
- Taba, Hilda, and staff. 1950. *Elementary Curriculum in Intergroup Relations*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

- Warner, W. Lloyd, et al. 1949. *Democracy in Jonesville*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb. 1944. *Who Shall Be Educated?* New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Whiting, John, and Irvin L. Child. 1953. *Child Training and Personality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Willcocks, Mary (ed.). 1950. *Social Education of Young Children*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, NEA.

FIRST SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE A CONCEPTION OF EDUCATION

I. JAMES QUILLEN

Quillen: I thought that I would express very briefly my point of view on education and its relationship to anthropology. I will not attempt to repeat what I said in the paper, but there will be some overlapping in my remarks and the material in the paper.

In the 1890's three interrelated forces converged which tended to place the problem of education in the field of the social sciences. These forces were: (1) the very drastic changes that came in American life in the post-Civil War period, with the development of the industrial-urban cultural pattern in the United States; (2) the development of the social sciences themselves; and (3) the increasing recognition of the social role of education, of the responsibility of education to develop effective citizens and to contribute to the improvement of social well-being. Educators began to stress the social role of education, and the statement was made that there was no true philosophy of education unless it was based on sociology. At the same time, people in the social sciences, particularly in the field of sociology, began to be interested in educational problems. Consequently, in the early 1900's, there emerged a field of study known as educational sociology. It was never pure sociology; it drew from the social sciences as a whole from the beginning, but the field was called educational sociology.

Educational sociology became a part of the teacher training program in most educational institutions. It tended to parallel educational psychology and educational philosophy. In the late 1920's and 1930's more and more interest developed in the child-centered approach to education; as a result both educational philosophy and sociology lost ground in teacher training institutions. But, since the beginning of World War II, there has been a reaffirmation of interest in the social role of education and in value factors in education. This interest, however, is from a new point of view. Most educators now recognize that there is no dichotomy between individual development and social development, that it's not the individual *or* the group, but it's the individual *in* the group, and individual development is produced to a very considerable extent by group interaction. There has emerged in education a personal-social approach, a recognition that the needs, the desires, the goals of the individual are both personal and social,