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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 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 non-school 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 Sabre-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 the 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.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

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, 1935) 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-
cution 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 etiological 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 contravent 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.
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 descripti-
ve 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—tradi-
tional 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 various
"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 im-
mediately clear. Change and stability must be mediated by what is trans-
mittet 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 "dy-
namic" 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. Anthropo-
logists have done little systematizing here. Herskovics 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, Taha, 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 do-
main 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 po-
tential or emergent articularizations with education is reversed. More is
known about how the educative process is affected by social class and
community structure in Jonesville and Elmton than in the nonliterate
societies which are the accused 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, edu-
cative 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 be-
gin 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 ShafteI in a memora-
dum circulated to the participants in this conference. The discussion
will approach some of these same problems from a different perspective
and describe certain interests and fields in education in which these prob-
lems 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 educa-
tion 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 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, sociodynamic, 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 education 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. While the educative process is the focus of Education, particularly in our 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-
relationships between intelligence and cultural differences by the Chicago group (Leilis 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 civilization.

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, 1957). 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 exculpating 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 explored 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.
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 outdated, 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; stressed the value of an "ethnology" that would contribute to the teacher's understanding of the facts 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 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 social 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 insist upon automatic responses in 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 Lecture, under the title, The School in American Culture (1949), which contains the forerunner to her later (1954) book, Mind, Culture, and Activity. Mead's work is paralleled by Hoc'dor'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 (1940). The whole issue of the American Journal of Sociology (1943) devoted to "Education and Cultural Dynamics," including articles by Johnson, Redfield, Malinowski, Meked, 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 to say. When 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 hindrances, 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 Preaczy 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 Culture," "Diverse Cultures with Their Contrasting Life Styles," "The Culture as Definer of Perceptions, Beliefs, and Behaviors," "The Teacher—an Agent of Culture"; use Samoan, Zulu, Kwakiutl data as culture case-study materials; and cite extensively literature by Benedict, Davis, Dennis, Kardiner and Linton, Linton alone, Mead, R. Redfield, Whiting, and Kluckhohn. In his second edition, his book (1954) deals with the teacher, 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 Stender'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, Tepozteco Zapotecos, 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 frequently 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 makes extensive reference to cultural data on the Navaho, Australian tribes, Zulu, 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. Brown made one of the strongest arguments for a culture bias in educational philosophy (1950), but he even 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-
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 often 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 educational 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 categories 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 nodal 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 alternative 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 intermediate 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.
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 Zambezi 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 naiveté 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.

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 as 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.
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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 1880s 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 1900s, there emerged a field of study known as educational sociology. It was never pure sociology; it drew from the social sciences as a whole, 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 1920s and 1930s 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 end of World War II, there has been a reafmiration 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 is not the individual on 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.