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.

Willcockson, 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,

and that, rather than there being an essential conflict between the two, properly conceived they reinforce each other. In the postwar period there has been some tendency, along with the forces in American society moving toward greater equalization and greater concern with group interaction, to go too far in the direction of group participation, and not enough recognition has been given to the importance of individual thought and individual activity. There are two kinds of coercion: the coercion imposed by the individual on the group and the coercion of the group upon the individual. We've become increasingly sensitive to the coercion of the individual on the group, but I don't think we are sufficiently sensitive to the factor of the coercion of the group upon the individual and the danger of increasing conformity in Western culture, in America particularly, to group pressure. But the whole individual-in-group interaction is the major emphasis which is found in most educational thinking at the present time.

Most people in professional education think of education as desirable changes in the behavior of the individual; and in this sense, the family is probably the most important single educational institution. Peer group participation and various other factors are also very important in education. The school as an institution is a deliberately devised environment to produce changes in behavior in a particular direction. The kinds of behavior changes that are thought to be desirable cannot be determined without a consideration of the cultural setting in which the individual is living and in which the school exists, a consideration of the core values of the culture, and the nature of individual growth and development. Educational problems tend to be concerned with an interaction between four basic factors, all of which are closely interrelated: (1) the individual learner; (2) the general cultural setting; (3) the core values of the culture; and (4) the school itself as an institution, including the various participants in the school, the roles and statuses of the participants, etc. In thinking of the over-all function of the school, it seems to me that the essential function of a publicly supported school system is to perpetuate the culture of which it is a part. This is done by perpetuating the core values and by developing in the learner the kinds of behavior which will enable him to participate in the cultural setting as it is and as it is developing, so as to maintain the essential core values that the members of the culture want to maintain. The essence of education, as I see it, from the cultural point of view is cultural perpetuation, including cultural transmission, socialization, and enculturation.

We get our educational objectives by trying to identify the kinds of behavior that are necessary to perpetuate desired values within the kind of cultural setting in which the individual is participating, and of which he and the school are a part. Objectives represent, then, a behavioral description of the kind of individual we are seeking to develop. This statement of educational objectives involves two things: value perception—perceptions of what is felt to be desirable—and cultural selection, that is, selecting from the total range of possible behavior representing the culture that which it is thought desirable to perpetuate. There is another dimension introduced here by the factor of cultural heterogeneity and cultural change. In a changing culture the desirable behavioral patterns may not remain stable, and it is necessary to think of the responsibility of the individual in relation to cultural change.

Following the identification of objectives in the development of the school program, there is the problem of selecting and organizing content and materials. This selection of content and materials is again a selection from the total range of possibilities in the culture. Generally speaking, the problem of selecting and organizing content is to select the content and materials that offer the greatest possibilities for getting the changes in behavior that are desired, and then organizing them effectively so as to take into consideration the needs and basic motivations of the individual and our knowledge of maturation.

In addition to the selection of content and materials, there is the problem of method. This involves directing the child to experiences with the content and the materials in such ways that the desired changes in behavior occur. The problem of method is essentially the problem of creating a situation where the individual learner can have the experiences with the content and materials that present the greatest possibility for him to change his behavior, and then in directing him with regard to his basic feelings, his needs and potentialities, his maturation, and the like, so that the maximum development of the desired changes in behavior is produced.

The next factor in the development of an educational program is the question of appraisal, the determination of the extent to which you have secured the desired changes in behavior. The selection of content, the development of method, and appraisal, all involve the factor of individual differences. This factor feeds back into the biology and psychology of the child and the heterogeneity of the various subcultures from which the children, teachers, and administrators come. All of these things take place in a variety of interrelated cultural settings: a classroom, a school, a neighborhood, a local community, and a larger cultural and social setting, including the county, state, nation, and the whole world. All of these interrelated cultural settings affect the educative process and what happens to the individual learner in terms of changes in behavior.

In relation to the general cultural setting, I've already mentioned some of the factors that I think are particularly significant today. One basic factor is the shift in America from a rural-handicraft to an industrial-urban culture. We have not only had this shift from a rural-handicraft to an industrial-urban culture, but we also have a new kind of industrialization and a new kind of urbanization; an industrialization that is shifting from the specialist to the generalist, from individual semiskilled and skilled laborer to automatic production controlled by electronic devices under the direction of the professional manager and engineer, and an urbanization that is changing from the metropolis to the metropolitan area, with the typical area of urban living being suburbia. Hence, we not only have to think of the shift from a rural-handicraft to an industrial-urban culture, but we also have to think of the basic changes that are occurring in industrial-urban culture itself. Many of these changes are tremendously important for education. Not enough thought is being given at the present time to the effects of the participation of the individual child in the suburban setting on his personality development, and the consequences of these effects for the school.

The rapidity of change is also a tremendously important factor, including inco-ordination in change, the receptivity to material change, the opposition to social and value changes, and the increasing centralization of

power in our culture and the changes in the power structure. In my judgment, human beings are gaining greater insight into their problems and are making fewer mistakes proportionately, but at the same time there is greater opportunity to make mistakes, and the consequences of the mistakes are much more threatening than earlier because of the tremendously increased power and the concentration of power. Perhaps most important in our culture is that underlying these factors is an intensification of value conflict, along with the inco-ordination of change, the problems of tension that come from value conflict, and increasing anxiety and fear, producing an essentially antirationalist atmosphere, which is basically antieducational in terms of the Western tradition in education.

Briefly then, this is my conception of education, with the various factors and problems involved in it, and I think that you can see the interrelationship between these and the kinds of problems in which anthropologists are interested.

Along with the developments I have mentioned, there has been a change in the conception of the relationship of the social sciences to education. In the first place, the concept of educational sociology has been broadened and the term itself is decreasing in current use. The term "social foundations" is being more and more used because it is recognized that education should depend not just on sociology but upon all of the social sciences, and very heavily upon social philosophy and anthropology. In addition to the development of the concept of social foundations, there is very recently a great interest in certain institutions in the interdisciplinary approach to educational problems. At Harvard, Yale, Teachers College, the University of Chicago, Stanford, the University of Oregon, and elsewhere, there are now teams of social scientists working with professional educators in an attempt to identify and help solve educational problems.

In the various interdisciplinary approaches and in the development of the social foundations of education, more and more content is being drawn from the field of anthropology. Educators are reading more anthropological literature and using more anthropological concepts and content. However, only a few anthropologists have become directly interested in education. At Stanford, George Spindler has a joint appointment in education and anthropology, and the holding of this conference is an indication of the increased interest in this field. I have the feeling, which is supported by George's paper, that the interest of the educator in anthropological content has not been entirely reciprocated by the anthropologists. What is needed is a more systematic attempt on the part of anthropologists to try to identify the existing knowledge that can be helpful in dealing with educational problems, and also to encourage the development of research that would add to such knowledge. Perhaps because of the profession I am in, as I look at the over-all cultural situation I can't think of anything that is more important than the education of our children and youth, and I personally have great hopes for our deliberations here and what may come from them in the general improvement of professional education and in making a direct contribution to our cultural well-being.

Prospectus

Spindler: I think Dean Quillen has given us a lead, and a projection, almost a propulsion, into what we want to deal with.

I want to say a word about the papers. It has been extremely interesting to me to see them come in. My own reaction has varied, not only from paper to paper, but from day to day as I reread them. And as I began to talk to educators and anthropologists about them I found that this experience was shared by others. I think that this is promising; I think it suggests that people have different positions and therefore different perceptions, and I think it suggests that they will be able to make these positions explicit as they discuss the papers and the topical areas to which the papers lead us.

I think that one of the primary difficulties in communication may be that the anthropologists will tend to look at processes, concepts, and data from the viewpoint of research and theory-building. I think that the educators may be more inclined to look at the same things from the viewpoint of "what can be done now to improve education?" But I think that both groups have the ultimate improvement of society in mind. The anthropologist's goal of ultimate improvement is somewhat more delayed. But it is sometimes difficult for us to communicate, because the anthropologists are talking in the direction of *understanding* at the theoretical level, while the educator will be saying, "Well, so what?" This may not actually happen. If it doesn't, it is because we have a particularly deviant group of anthropologists and educators here.

I would like to say a word concerning the audience we are addressing. As I understand it, we are oriented primarily toward the teachers of teachers. And I think that we have to count on the ideas and hypotheses and the concepts that are developed in the conference being transmitted to the educational community through the teachers of teachers. I define the audience this way because I believe that we are more interested, for purposes of this conference, in formulation than we are in execution; that we are more interested in theory than we are in method, although the two tend to go hand in hand.

And now I think that I ought to indicate what our program will be, so that you will have some idea of where we're going. We're proceeding from the general to the specific and back to the general. This afternoon we are dealing with the overview papers written by Jim Quillen and myself, and I hope that we may be able to discuss a paper that we just received, written by Sol Kimball. Then I hope we can proceed to the paper by Bernard Siegel, because this provides us with a good frame of reference; and from there to John Gillin's paper, because in a sense John's paper fills in some of the concrete material to which Bernard Siegel's models refer. Then we can go on to Cora DuBois' paper on intercultural understanding, since we find that there are some leads developed in the first two papers that will provide a good transition. And from that to Steve Hart's paper on pre- and postpubertal education. This will be an interesting session because I am sure there will be questions raised by both the anthropologists and the educators. And then finally to what I would regard as specializations of interest, that is, the papers by Dorothy Lee and by Jules Henry. The other papers tend in one way or another to take in a rather

broad scope of material. These two papers have broad implications, but they deal with specific kinds of problems and are relatively more specialized, and it seems to me that we may best be able to discuss them after we have based some groundwork on the others. Then we should come back to the general; that is, we should attempt to integrate and conceptualize what we have been over. As I see it, there are two phases in this; one of the phases I think will be expedited by using Theodore Brameld's paper as a springboard. This is a paper on a high level of abstraction but one which marshals a great deal of concrete material. In the second phase of this, there will be a session devoted entirely to the purposes of summary, where we will try to obtain some kind of closure on what we have done. This will be under the leadership of Margaret Mead, and should occur on Sunday morning. Then having achieved a sense of closure, hopefully—at least perhaps a sense of closure about not having a sense of closure—we should try to break ourselves loose, raise more questions, and leave in a hopeful state of mind. And I think that the discussion to be organized by Solon T. Kimball on the segregation issue will serve that last purpose. That will bring us up to 4:30 on Sunday afternoon and the end of the conference.

And, last, I wish to say that we are here together because, as Jim Quillen pointed out, our culture is changing; the educator is faced, like any other person caught up in the cultural process at this stage, with some nearly unsolvable kinds of problems. The anthropologist is aware of these problems, is interested in them, is caught up also in the cultural process, and is bringing to the discussion of these problems his knowledge and point of view gained from cross-cultural experience and research. This means that our purpose is to explore approaches to the understanding of the educative process in a changing society. We are exploring with educational and anthropological tools. In doing so, this being exploratory, we are interested in defining new problem areas, developing hypotheses, indicating needed research developments, and hopefully we will help consolidate an emergent application of one social science to the solution of problems in this particular institutionalized part of our own social process—the educational system.

I think that with this it is time to turn the proceedings over to the chairman for the afternoon, who will be Cora DuBois.

OPEN DISCUSSION

What Was Left Out of the Overview?

Mead, Keesing, DuBois (Chairman)

DuBois: I judge that everyone has read these papers. I feel that we are now ready to discuss the matter informally and get the conference moving. I was told by George (Spindler) that at least four people have already commented to him previously on the two papers which are now under consideration: James Quillen's and George Spindler's. Of those who have commented, may I call first on you, Margaret (Mead)?

Mead: I was impressed in reading this overview with the discontinuity that has existed in the interrelationship between education and anthropology, and how much the interplay has been dependent upon personalities rather than upon any on-going institutionalized process of any sort. Perhaps the most striking instance of this is the nonappearance in this overview of all the interdisciplinary contacts between education and anthropology and other sciences, instituted by the General Education Board in the mid-thirties, which were complex and elaborate. This morning I asked Mr. Frank, who was the instigator of the program, what he thought it cost, and he said probably half a million dollars. It dealt with virtually every aspect that is being discussed here: there was a plan for an anthropological study of a school system which Morris Opler undertook to do in Bronxville; there was a plan for the study of the culture and ethos of a particular school which Jeannette Mirsky was to do at Fieldstone; there was a plan to send an anthropologist out to a primitive society to study the induction of youth into the values of that society, which Bernard Mishkin started out to do in Guinea; there was the integration of anthropologists on committees working with teachers of secondary schools; there was the Hanover group, where a whole group of people got together to prepare materials on human relations in the secondary schools; and there was Alice Keliher's big commission to take all these things and put them into shape to be used in the schools. The plan just about covers all the different roles of the anthropologist either in research or as consultant or in interdisciplinary work. Of course, it is represented here, in a way, in the fact that some of us are present at all; in an article Morris Opler wrote fourteen years later; and so forth. But any explicit trace is missing, because these interrelationships were sporadic, sometimes very highly motivated, but they had no place to go afterward. Books were written, people's points of view changed, and undoubtedly we couldn't be doing the sort of thing we are doing today without it. But it looks to me as if we could now aim at a much clearer institutionalization of the relationship between anthropology and education, so that we could depend upon orderly processes; for example, when a particular teachers' college loses an anthropologist it will get another; or if it doesn't have one yet, it will feel it ought to have one. We should institute such processes as more explicit attention to education in the content of courses in the departments of anthropology. If what we do here is not to be lost, not to become one single dramatic effort that has taken a lot of people's thought and time and planning and then goes back

into a main stream where you can hardly find it again, such institutionalization is necessary.

Keesing: Much the same as what Margaret (Mead) has said applies in the case of studies of overseas education. We ran a conference in Hawaii of educators and anthropologists in 1936. It was quite a major event, lasting for six weeks and bringing together a group that even included Africanists. The individuals still correspond; the literature still comes out; there have also been efforts to have a follow-up conference, without its being done yet. But it has represented sporadic efforts, not continuous activity; the materials just went back into the general stream of anthropology.

DuBois: We seem to be reviewing right now all of the factors in our favor for making a more organized impact as the result of this conference. I would also assume that we could add the growing sophistication in interdisciplinary inquiries.

Anthropology and the Anthropologist in Teacher Education

Lee, Siegel, Taba, Henry, Spindler, Mead, Frank, Kimball

Lee: What I liked very much about Spindler's paper was his bringing out ways in which a conference such as this could make a definite impact in a teachers' college, for example. He is showing the specific ways in which what we are doing now could be implemented. He describes what he's doing at Stanford, and we know what Sol Kimball, for example, is doing at Columbia. But a number of anthropologists are terrified at the thought of teaching anthropology to people who will not be anthropologists; I think it will be a help if we can see what kinds of things can be taught there. George (Spindler) and Mr. Quillen suggest that the teacher who is passing on culture not only consciously and deliberately but unconsciously and with every gesture that she makes will be helped if she can be aware of what she is passing on. Now, do you just want anthropologists to show her what she is doing, and teach her to be aware? How would you suggest that we do that?

Siegel: One thing that occurs to me in terms of getting things across is simply that we cannot be too concerned about getting across content. The core social sciences, if I may speak of them as such—anthropology, sociology, psychology—almost represent ways of life; they represent ways of looking at wide varieties of phenomena. There is a certain amount of what DuBois has spoken of as affective learning, as opposed to cognitive learning, that I'm afraid would have to come a little late in life if we are concerned with the teacher-training level, but it necessarily would have to come in by way of processing and selecting and interpreting all kinds of events and occurrences that might be termed cultural-anthropological. Exactly how this is to be accomplished I'm not too sure; one thing I'm quite sure of is that it cannot be done in a formal way in the classroom. If there were something analogous in the teacher-training schools to the

clinical rounds in the hospitals, it would be a nice way to incorporate the social scientist of one persuasion or another—anthropologist, psychologist, etc.—in a manner which would be meaningful in interpreting things that the student has to come up against all the time.

Taba: Your remarks would indicate that, in the line of practical implementation of this attempt at mutual exploration and integration, an anthropologist in education might be only one and maybe a minor solution. If anthropology has a method of understanding a way of life, then giving teachers one or two courses would be insufficient. Reinterpretation of many other things would be needed, as, for instance, how to diagnose children's behavior, how to select methods of teaching by cultural patterns. Introduction of courses in anthropology would create new barriers and a new task in education of integrating the newly disintegrated.

Shaftel: We've heard how hard it is for anthropologists to get outside of their own culture when studying another. How are we going to help the teacher as a person to get outside of herself, to see what it is she is doing and how much her own cultural orientation determines the choices she makes?

Henry: I think that what Siegel had in mind is just this sort of thing, and I would like to give an example out of my own experience in working in a school system. I used to have lunch with the teacher and chat with her, and our conversation was geared to what had happened in the classroom ten minutes ago. Now it isn't always possible to have anthropologists doing that, but Siegel's observations suggested to me the idea of the presentation of a case in the school—let us say, once a week—which would be discussed, with the rest of the school staff, by somebody skilled in the social sciences. This person would attempt to show, in terms of social science frames of reference, how the case related to social and cultural situations and points of view. I think that such a method, in which the social scientist simply made his contribution along with the rest of the group, in an intensive study of particular cases, would help to make the school staff aware of the significance of their own problems with the children in terms of social science perspectives.

Lee: But I don't want to give up the course in the teachers' training college either. I don't think it has to be a lecture course, but it should be possible to structure a course where the teachers will go through such an experience of another culture, perhaps where certain values, concepts, ways of doing things, approaches, attitudes, will become pointed up but will remain at the same time concrete and embedded in a whole way of life, and will serve as a springboard for discussion to help the teacher to awareness of her own way of life. That would be perhaps changing the teacher as a person to some extent if this course is well presented. I don't think it has to be a course of lectures *about* something.

Spindler: I second your motion, Dorothy (Lee), in the sense that I think there is a role—a very important kind of role—for the anthropologist in the educational context as a teacher. I think I've made the point clear in the overview paper that I don't believe that he teaches anthropology; he teaches *from* anthropology to an educational situation of some kind.

There are three kinds of things that I find seem to produce the most effects in teachers in terms of the goal of cultural awareness. (1) The culture case study; this of course is a traditional approach in anthropology. You provide the student with a vicarious kind of experience and usually that seems to come best from one's own field work because one is able to relate a kind of personality in this foreign setting to a kind of personality the student knows about. This approach seems to help, but it is only a first step; it doesn't do very much good because this material can be so easily externalized. It can be left at an intellectual level and it can be rationalized in or out of any particular problem situation as the student wishes. (2) The type of case treatment where an educator, an anthropologist, and, in our particular case at Stanford,[1] a psychiatrist, go into a school system, take a classroom, a teacher, a whole school, and study the role of the teacher, the culture context that the teacher is working from, the cultural position of the children, the selective perception by the teacher of the different cultural positions of the children, and so on. And you report these data to your students; you analyze the whole case in a perspective that is only partially anthropological. (3) The formal course approach—at Stanford we have a psychological foundations course and one in social foundations. I have taught both and found that in the psychological foundations course the thing that I was after was *self*-awareness; I found that in the other course it was *cultural* awareness. I'll try to explain very briefly what I mean by this. I mean simply that in the case of self-awareness I try to deal with the kinds of emotional conflicts that are within the person, the kinds of emotionalized perceptions that will affect everything that he does. The material is highly personalized through use of group TAT's, among other techniques, and the person gets to the point where he can objectify himself so that he says, "I have hostility toward authority figures"; "I have strong dependency needs"; "I will reject certain kinds of children and accept others." I found this kind of awareness extremely difficult to achieve and found that students could become quite disturbed. By the other kind of awareness, *cultural* awareness, I mean simply this: that the person is aware of the value matrix in which he is caught up. And I found that there were ways of achieving this; that is, rather than simply talking about values, I took some value expressions from students, using such simple devices as open-ended statements: "The individual is . . .; nudity is . . .; popular people are . . .; all men are born . . ." I have a little test of some twenty-five items that I administer and then ask students to do things like describing the ideal American boy and describing the ideal American girl. Then the whole class does a thematic "value" analysis of this material. Having done that, we relate the derived values to what this means in respect to how the teacher will behave when faced with a particular kind of child in a particular kind of social setting. This leads to an expanded cultural awareness. I think that one of the people who is particularly fit to do something like this is an anthropologist, and I think that the place he has to do that is in a course.

Mead: I've experimented for five years in a course at Teachers College that was called "Anthropology and Educational Methods"; and in that

[1] Under the leadership of Dr. Robert N. Bush in the Stanford Consultation Service.

all the students did a project in which they actually analyzed material comparatively (I think perhaps we haven't emphasized so far the importance of comparison). In my course no one was allowed to do a project that didn't compare something with something—either two periods in the same culture, or two cultures; no one was allowed to focus on only one. And they analyzed all sorts of things: television shows and radio shows; they compared *Punch* and *The New Yorker*, or French and American textbooks in elementary education, in a very wide range of materials which were accessible to them, where they had to identify the cultural differences, identify and document. Now I think one reason they did it so well, and a great deal better than most professional anthropology students would (which was quite striking, as they were all Teachers College students, of various degrees of age and sophistication)—one reason it seemed to me that they did such good work was because I taught them about 50 percent of the time by having people who were wrestling with comparable problems (and *hadn't* solved them) come in and give interim reports. They got a sense of work in process, something of course one could give them when talking about his own field work too; one can say, "and I couldn't make any sense of this at all, so I did this and I did this to try and solve this." They were given a chance at an apprenticeship identification with people who were doing the sort of thing they were trying to do. It will depend a little bit on the community or city as to how many people one can find who are in the midst of research, but students must be given a chance to see other people who have not completed the understanding of the cultural element in the situation, but are in the middle of it. They learn to *work with* a cultural analysis instead of taking it pat.

Taba: Now let's not let this obscure the impact that seems to be important to keep in mind. When you talk about changing people—their central values or their cultural values—you're talking about learnings that change slowly and painfully. It's a more profound learning than a new idea, and therefore needs to be done over a longer period of time and in a greater variety of contexts, if it is to get home at all. That means that whatever is taught by way of outside courses needs to be supplemented by similar experiences and similar ideas and similar training in other contexts. There might be a concentrated course such as you have been describing, but in addition there ought to be some re-emphasis of the same idea in making curricula, in teaching, and in treating discipline problems.

There is also the need for a developmental program which places learning experiences in a sequence of maturation. (There are certain things that come first and other things that come later.) This is what Cora DuBois referred to as a total trajectory of learning. In other words, one needs to have a developmental program rather than one short program. A short program, no matter how good, is not enough.

But there is another kind of sequence here which comes from the fact that this learning is both emotional and intellectual. That's one thing that has been discovered research-wise, that experimentation in the intergroup programs in schools brought out very clearly. When I started in 1945, the major idea was that you rammed down concepts, you rammed at prejudice directly. Soon people realized that when you attacked people's emotions and feelings you created defenses and therefore made education

more difficult. When we actually started playing with groups of children on this level, it became very evident that you have to combine and alternate the materials with designs and then follow with some conceptualization, and then create new feelings again and follow with new conceptualization, and that the curriculum had to be made up of that kind of rotation.

Lee: It seems to me, however, that the course which Margaret (Mead) described had something in it which produced in the student, if I understood it correctly, a certain ability to get a feed-back, introducing the student to awareness in such a way that awareness itself could be used to make for increased awareness rather than have to be replenished by another course.

Mead: I think that there is a point here that we may not want to go into, but it should at least be mentioned. I do not assume that cultural learning is painful, and my experience with students has not been, on the whole, that they have found it painful; instead, in many instances they found it exceedingly releasing. I think we have overdone the analogy from class consciousness, which as taught in this country is almost always painful and produces a high degree of hostility, and from some of the problems of personality insight, which again have been painful. But in a very large number of cases, recognition of one's own culture and the cultures of other people is something that is sufficiently releasing so that it can go on and on without this mobilized resistance about which Dr. Taba talks, which certainly will come up with certain applications of the social class analysis and some types of personality analyzing.

Martin: In this connection I am aware of some inadequacies on my own part in being a nonanthropologist but trying to introduce cross-cultural material into my own courses. I find—I admit that this is a failure on my part—that the students say, "Oh, isn't this interesting that other people do things differently, bring up their youngsters differently, train and educate them differently. But, so what? They do it their way, and we do it our way." And where do you go from there?

DuBois: While we're on this point—are their degrees of resistance in self- and cultural awareness? Is one as easy and adequate as another? I think Margaret (Mead) has raised an interesting point there. On the other hand, as you indicated, George (Spindler), it can remain on a very intellectual and externalized level, this cultural case history usage. Now, where do we stand on all this?

Mead: One of the basic assumptions that anthropologists have worked with has been that you treat each culture as dignified in itself; it's a kind of theoretical democracy among cultures—granting that the Eskimo did things very simply and the Peruvians did them very complicatedly. Nevertheless, we regarded each culture as having dignity so that one doesn't introduce a hierarchical superordination-subordination set of values.

I always have my students do a long case history back as far as they can go; if they can go four and five generations back, that's fine. Most of them represent many ethnic strains; some of these strains they have not been quite sure about; on the whole, they thought maybe they were skele-

tons to be kept in the closet. We've experimented with this in high schools, working with adolescents in child care, where we wanted to go back and see what their mothers and their grandmothers did. And we put together European migrants and rural people with the general statement that the whole world was changed from the way it once was. Then we combined that with slides of the way people work in primitive societies. Girls have gone back and interviewed their grandmothers and in the course of this have reaccepted the way in which they were brought up, which before they had been ashamed of. Their pasts had been given dignity. It's not intellectual learning; on the whole, it can be very emotional.

Lee: I had that experience in teaching about primitive groups. One time I did it so badly, or perhaps so well, that they practically needed a psychiatrist. They became so identified with the society they were studying that they resisted everything else; they were going the next term to take another course with another teacher and they hated her, they hated her culture, and I had to work with them to bring them back to themselves. Then later I never did it so extremely; but what I found was what Margaret (Mead) found, that in the beginning they would say, "Oh, how good the Tikopia and the Trobrianders are"; then after a while they would say, "But our culture also has this and this . . . our culture has something good too"; and eventually, instead of feeling pained about their own culture, they would feel good about it.

Spindler: I think then we can say that we wish to move away from mere intellectualization of cultural materials, but this requires, first, an emotional identification of some kind, and then a reobjectification. That is, in order for a person to deal either with himself or with a value system, it has to be objectified so that it becomes a part of the environment. But in order for this to happen, the person first has to become somehow emotionally involved with the process of doing this very thing. So there are several stages in the achievement of this kind of cultural awareness. My original point with respect to the difference between self- and cultural awareness is that it's simply harder to make the self a part of the environment than it is to make a cultural value system a part of the environment.

Quillen: In relation to the aims which you stated, George (Spindler), we not only need to have this feeling of identification plus objectivity, but we also need to get teacher conceptualization. If we're teaching teachers to work with people in the school situation, the teachers themselves not only have to become emotionally identified and objective about their relationships, but they also have to be able to conceptualize their experiences and to find ways to communicate them to pupils in the classroom.

Kimball: I think I might be able to point up this discussion by presenting a case report of my own experiences in the field of education. I am now completing my first year as an anthropologist on the staff at Teachers College in the Department of Social Foundations. In the original interviews for this position better than a year ago, I made very explicit that I was uninformed in the area of professional education. I quickly learned that the interest in my employment related to my skills as an anthropologist and in my ability to bring to educators the principles of anthropology. I found no difficulty in accepting the principle that those who work in pro-

fessional schools should do so within the objectives of the school with which they associate.

My first introduction to educators in a group was the fall faculty conference. There I discovered that the problems discussed centered primarily around such current issues as student enrollment, graduate student load, and requirements, with the exception of a stimulating discussion on Bestors' recent attack on education. Afterward, I realized that educators have so thoroughly internalized their basic principles that any extended discussion would have been elementary and repetitious for most.

My real initiation into problems of education arose from actually working with others on current issues. One of these relates to the content of a foundations course in social science, where the objective is to relate basic social and cultural principles to education. The discussion of programs and thesis topics for graduate students provided another valuable learning experience. Through these I began to have a clearer understanding of the distinctive points of view which characterize educators.

Another experience that proved very helpful was the occasion when I served as a consultant to an on-going educational research problem. One of the divisions was re-examining methods and concepts, and there was a receptive situation for looking at methods of various disciplines in terms of specific educational problems. It was at this point that anthropological principles could be introduced in terms of the specific problems being considered.

Taba: That was also perhaps the point at which educators began to learn what anthropologists can do.

Do Anthropologists Know Professional Education?

Bush, Siegel, Mead, Hart, Kimball, Cowley

Bush: Sol (Kimball), did you find that there were things that you didn't know anything about? As you said in the beginning, and as I've heard Spindler say many times, "I don't know anything about education." I'd be interested in why you say this. Apparently we are not communicating very well, because I think the educator's idea of the anthropologist is that he has many very important insights about the educative process.

Siegel: I think that what we mean is simply that we don't know what goes on in educational institutions very much; since we haven't been in them we've forgotten what the school looks like, in a sense.

Kimball: And more than that, we don't know the historical depth of all the things that have gone to build education as it is now—its philosophy, the internal divisions, all these kinds of subtle differences which are tremendously important, in seeing why some people do some things one way and some people do them another.

Mead: We don't speak the language. I'm not speaking for myself because I come from a long line of professional educators; maybe it's one reason I'm in this picture. But words like "Montessori," for instance, which I've known ever since I could talk, may be totally strange or at least

not value-laden to an anthropologist; and all the fighting jargon that exists in any profession that is in the process of change is all strange; you don't know what the word "integration" means, or you think you do and it means something quite different.

Hart: There's another sense, though, in which the statement that we don't know anything about education is perfectly silly. I would have thought most anthropologists spend a lot of their time educating students in anthropology, and most of this division between educators and anthropologists seems to be phony. Anthropologists spend a lot of their time trying to teach anthropology in an ideal setting—in universities, where they can do as they like in their own anthropology courses to impart this wonderful thing called the anthropological point of view. I hope that somewhere in this conference the anthropologists will be put on the spot as to how they do it. I don't think we're doing a very good job of it.

Kimball: There's a difference between teaching techniques and understanding the historical depth and the assumptions and theories of a whole professional movement. That's what I was trying to say.

Mead: I think the social sciences have suffered for years from the fact that lay people have always thought they understood the whole point. We've always said that the natural sciences have an easier time because the layman doesn't think he understands biology or physics; but when you talk about human beings and social relationships, everybody thinks he understands them. And to think that, because one is an academic professor in a university, one understands the structure, the ethos, the eidos, the language, the functioning, the personality, and everything else about a professional movement like education, I think would be to deny the whole intrinsic style of professional groups.

Cowley: It seems to me that we ought to quit talking at this conference about whether we're educationists or anthropologists. Whatever our backgrounds may be, I'm reminded again and again in discussions of this sort of Jacques Loeb's response to the question whether he was a chemist or a bacteriologist: he didn't know; he studied problems. Now we have a whole series of problems; I should like to see us identify what the educationist has to contribute and what the anthropologist has to contribute. This is the only fruitful way we can attack this, instead of going back and forth and saying, "I'm an anthropologist, I don't know anything about education," or vice versa. These papers bring out certain problems, and it's about the problems that I'd like to talk rather than about whether we're in this discipline, or whether education is a discipline, which I frankly don't believe it is.