INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

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 1880'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 end 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 is 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 and various conditions, the motivations 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 achieved 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 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 cultural setting in 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, is 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 change 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: values and perceptions of what is felt to be desirable—and cultural selection, that is, selecting from the total range of possible behavior representing the culture 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 method of selecting and organizing content and materials is one way of selecting 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 society.

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 method of directing the child to experiences with the content and the materials in such ways that the desired changes in behavior occurs is produced. The next factor in the development of an educational program is the question of appraisal, the determination of the extent to which one has 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 child, parents, 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 are significant today. One basic factor is the shift in America from a rural-handicraft to an urban-industrial culture. We have not only had this shift from a rural-handicraft to an urban-industrial 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, and 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-industrial culture, but we also have to think of the basic changes that are occurring in industrial-industrial suburbia 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 urban 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 socio-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 they were. I would say, then, that the present increased power and the concentration of power. Perhaps the most important in our culture is that underlying these factors is an intensification of social conflict, along with the inco-ordination of change, the problems of tension that come from social conflict, and increasing anxiety and fear, producing an essentially antiintellectual atmosphere, which is basically antihumanistic, 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 social sciences and 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 in 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 effort 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 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 educational 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 pull, into what we want to deal with. I will 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 readem 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 see 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 I think it is not so difficult for us to understand that 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 in execution; that is, we are more interested in the general 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, which 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, which I think 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 educational education and in making a direct contribution to our cultural well-being.
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 Branneld’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.
Anthropology and the Anthropologist in Teacher Education

Lee, Siegel, Tabo, 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 Sot 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 long time before 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 science...and the people in 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, 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 discovering how the teacher can become aware 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 put the student with a vicarious kind of experience and usually that seems to come best from one's own field of cultural study but 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, 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 actors; you try to analyze the whole case in a personal context that is partially ethnological. (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 makes a man or a woman what he or she 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 that, we relate the behavior 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 things that are particularly fit to do something like this is an educational context, and I think that the kind of thing that he has to do 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...
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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 only on one. And if 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 something of course they 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 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 elements in the situation are in the midst of it. They learn to work with a cultural analysis instead of taking it pat.

Tamb: 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. The professional needs to be done over a longer period of time and there is 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 exercises 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 training discipline participants.

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 Diamond referred to as a total 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 educational context, and I think that the kind of thing that he has to do is in a course.
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 then 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 students; if you 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 course. 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, 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 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 does 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 skel-
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 con-
ference. There I discovered that the problems discussed centered pri-
marily 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 work-
ing 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 ex-
perience. 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 con-
sidered.

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, Conoley

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 communi-
cating 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 tre-
mendously 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 be-
cause 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 anthro-
pologists 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 under-
standing 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 they
understand 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 pro-
fessional movement like education, I think would be to deny the whole in-
trinsic style of professional groups.

Conoley: It seems to me that we ought to quit talking at this conference
about whether we're educationists or anthropologists. Whatever our back-
grounds 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 educa-
tion," 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
time discipline or whether education is a discipline, which I frankly don't
believe it is.