DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 610 24 SP 004 561

AUTHOR Gearing, Frederick O.
TITLE Training Anthropolcgists for Educational Research. Final Report.
INSTITUTICN State Univ. of New York, Albany. Research Foundation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO ER-9-0498
PUB DATE Nov 70
GRANT OEG-0-9-42098-4434(010)
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.00
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology, Attitudes, Community Attitudes, Cross Cultural Studies, *Educational Research, *Educational Researchers, Ethnology, *Professional Training, Research, *Researchers, Research Needs, School Personnel

ABSTRACT

Four regional teams, each consisting of anthropolcgists involved in educational research and other educational researchers, were constituted in Chicago, San Francisco, the District cf Columbia, and Buffalo. Throughout the 1969-70 academic year the teams joined in a planning effort to identify the most important factors for anthropologists to consider in performing research in educational settings. The four groups concluded that researchers, school personnel, and members of the community all have different pricrity systems, the critical contrast being the long-term theoretical interests of researchers and the short-term pragmatic interests of the schools and the ccmmunity. They suggested that direct ethnographic observation would be a research focus of interest to all groups. They also recommended that educational researchers be trained in anthrcpological methods and that anthropologists be trained in educational research methods. (Included are the working papers of the four groups and a bibliography of studies in the anthropolcgy cf education.) (RT)

Final Report

Project No. 9-0498

Grant No. OEG-0-9-420498-4434 (010)

Training Anthropologists for Educational Research

Frederick O. Gearing
State University of New York at Buffalo

Amherst, New York 14226

November 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY

Four regional teams, each consisting of anthropologists involved in educational research and other educational researchers, were constituted in Chicago, San Francisco, Washington, and Buffalo (staff). Through the 1969-70 academic year the teams joined in a planning effort, meeting in their respective locales, and in the spring, representatives from each team met in a culminating conference in Chicago. The question, as defined in course, was: what strategic considerations are critically entailed for anthropologists in the selection, design, and performance of research in educational settings? The answers are here reported:

(1) Besides the research community, two other publics, the schools and segments of the wider society, are necessarily involved;

(2) these three publics entertain three contrasting priority systems, the critical contrast being the long-term theoretical interests of the research community and the short-term pragmatic interests of the schools and wider society;

(3) from these contrasting priorities contrasting arrays of potential activities were drawn; and

(4) strategic considerations were addressed, attending generally the problem of resolving inherent tensions as among the contrasting priorities.

Three modes of partial resolution were noted, as seem to apply to the social sciences generally. For anthropology specifically, a fourth and more fundamental mode

was noted: the re-emphasis of direct ethnographic observation, seen both as the traditional sound basis of theoretical research in anthropology and as information of significant potential utility to the personnel of the schools and to members of the wider society.

II. INTRODUCTION

Among anthropologists, a minor tradition of educational research reaches back to Maria Montessori, and perhaps further. The planning activity here reported was responsive to a recent and most substantial stir of interest, among American anthropologists nationally, in the prospects of new anthropological research in school settings. In furtherance of such interest a new professional group was formed in 1968, the Council on Anthropology and Education. The question arose: Given this stir of interest, could anything be done to assist anthropologists who would newly be entering this realm of inquiry? anything which would allow them to enter school settings with minimal wasted effort and with maximum chances of good return for research energies invested? Thus, this planning effort was undertaken.

The planning purpose, as initially phrased in an early working paper (see Addendum A), was "to develop long-term plans for training anthropologists for educational research and for training educational researchers to participate in and to use the results of such anthropological research efforts."

Four regional planning teams were formed, each consisting of anthropologists and educational researchers, and discussions began. It soon became apparent that focus of purpose was fundamentally distracting. Two basic assumptions, both compelling, came to inform the planning efforts, and in doing so happily altered the planning focus.

In respect to the training of anthropologists for educational research, the explicit assumption, soon arrived at, was that, beyond the fundamental training in method and theory required of students preparing for anthropological research in any setting, special training essentially resides in the doing of guided research in these educational settings. In respect to the training of educational researchers in the use of anthropological methods and findings, the assumption, which remained implicit but which is in retrospect evident, was that anthropologists should, in the main, simply get busy and show significant results.

Thus, by these two assumptions, the central focus shifted to matters of strategic consideration entailed for anthropologists in selecting, designing, and mounting research having implication for the work of the schools, such research programs seen as the main vehicles for training anthropologists for educational research and the results of such research being the main first steps toward the training of other educational researchers in the utilization of anthropology.

Beyond this, as thinking centered on real research tasks, the initial focus was found to be doubly distracting in that it had too narrowly defined the involved populations.

Thus arose a pivotal ingredient in the planning activity: the implications of the obvious fact that researchers, in doing any research in educational institutions, will be involved with not only the research community but with at least the two other publics, the personnel of the schools and members of the wider society, whose interests and needs must also be served, out of strategic necessity as well as humane concern.

The planning efforts came, then, to address the question: Keeping in mind all three publics, what kinds of considerations must one entertain in designing research and research-training activities in school settings?

The thinking of the participants, thus focused, fell into three interconnected areas: priority considerations, implied potential activities, and entailed strategic considerations.

First, the planning activity recognized three contrasting priority systems, deriving respectively from: the purposes of the anthropological research community, the needs of educational institutions, and the interests of various segments of the society at large.

Second, the planning discussions identified four categories of useful tasks seen from the vantage of the research community: research proper, special dimensions of research training, the pooling of knowledge, and identifying human and institutional resources. An array of promising activities in these four realms was assembled, as examples. From the vantage of the two other publics, these activities seemed generally to enjoy very low priority, and other research activities appeared more significant.

The planning activity contained, third, a discussion of strategic considerations as to how activities of priority interest in the research communities could best be brought to serve also the immediate, recognized needs of educational institutions and of segments of the society at large.

Four teams, consisting of anthropologists involved in educational research and of other educational researchers, participated. These persons were:

Buffalo (staff team)

Frederick Gearing, State University of New York at Buffalo
Kurt Johnson, SUNYAB
Ernestine Kyle, SUNYAB
Eigil Mørch, SUNYAB
Hanne Mørch, SUNYAB

Chicago

Frederick Erickson, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
William King, UICC
Diane Michelsky, UICC
Donald Moore, UICC
Stephen Schensul, Illinois State Psychiatric Institute

San Francisco

Barry L. Cobb, University of California, Berkeley
William Ekhoff, UCB
Theodore Parsons, UCB
Alan Tindall, UCB

Washington

Sam Goodman, Montgomery County (Maryland) Board of Education
Albert Jenny III, Montgomery County (Maryland) Board of Education
Elliot Liebow, Mental Health Center, Adelphi, Maryland
Nancy Modiano, Education Study Center
Priscilla Reining, Catholic University
Allen Schmieder, Office of Education, HEW (to February 1970)

One organizational change, external to the project, affected the direction of planning efforts. The initial proposal was prepared, in the winter of 1969, by the office of the Executive Secretary of the Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE). In November 1969, the CAE Steering Committee for considered reasons acted to decentralize its organization, which reorganization entailed, among other things, the elimination of the office of Executive Secretary and the general dispersal, to a series of standing committees, of most of the then-centralized functions of the group. This impinged on the planning activities of this project in two ways. Organizationally, the CAE Steering Committee could not usefully play a direct role in the planning activity as originally envisaged; it became, instead, the body to which the results of these efforts would be submitted and through which these results would be disseminated, as useful, to the CAE membership severally, and to others. Second, before decentralization, the planning activity might have yielded plans for national efforts coordinated by or through CAE; after the decentralization, planning for any such coordinated effort would have been pointless. Thus the audience which was held in mind in these planning efforts is the array of individual anthropologists in the variety of their local circumstance who are inclined to move in these research directions.

The product here reported is a set of planning considerations which, in our judgments, are critical and will prove helpful as anthropologists, individually and in local groups, select, design, and mount research and research-training efforts.

This final report derives from the thinking of the members of the teams, who have participated through the year. The project staff has attempted to include a good sample of the many good ideas offered. Beyond that, the staff has, in this final summary, further organized and sometimes built upon those thoughts. Thus the project staff is to be held solely responsible for the content of the final version as embodied in this report.

III. PLANNING PROCEDURES

The planning activities unfolded chronologically as follows:

The project began July 1, 1969. During the summer months there was preliminary organizational preparation including the move of the project director and his office from Washington, D. C. to new offices at State University of New York at Buffalo. In October 1969 the planning coordinators, Hanne and Eigil Mørch, joined the project. During the remaining weeks of October and the first weeks of November 1969, the regional planning teams of anthropologists and other educational researchers were established, and the planning coordinators prepared a working paper (Addendum A). The paper with selected articles from the literature* was distributed to the regional teams. During the next five months the teams met periodically: the project coordinators worked with the teams mainly through relaying the ideas generated by each team to the other teams.

On May 13-14, 1970, a final planning conference, consisting of the project staff and representatives from each team, was held in Chicago. Here the materials and thoughts developed in the teams were pooled, discussed, and modified, and a listing of priorities, potential activities, and possible strategies was developed in outline.

During the period May 15 to June 30, 1970, the planning coordinators in consultation with the program director prepared a preliminary organization of the thinking about priorities, potential activities, and strategies. This document was in turn sent to the teams for their review, comments, and suggestions. A final document, this report, was then prepared by staff in Buffalo.

---

*These items were:

Sherwood Washburn, "On the Importance of the Study of Primate Behavior for Anthropologists"

Jules Henry, "A Cross-Cultural Outline of Education"

Theodore W. Parsons, "Psycho-Cultural Determinants of Teaching Behavior: a Southwestern Example"

There follows a transcript of selected items from the culminating Chicago conference. These, as here reported, are edited for clarity, sorted topically (out of temporal sequence), and numbered. The numbering will permit reference in section IV below.

Orientation

1. One word as to what we are about. As you know, there are evidences around the country of kinds of long-run interest and curiosity among anthropologists in the general direction of development and research activities in the schools, and we are simply responding to that. The general thought about a year ago this time was: Given all this amorphous movement of mind, would it be worthwhile to attempt something during this year that would make it a little easier for people to articulate to educational research with less wasted efforts, going down fewer blind alleys, and so on, than might otherwise be? It was a question. The teams have been asking the question. You are here in Chicago to answer it--if possible.

The Problems of Priorities

2. What can the anthropologist uniquely bring to the school situation? I mean . . . is he the change agent? Is he the information provider? Is he the facilitator? If he's one of those things, then maybe a priority of what he could do would become clearer . . . .

3. Are the priorities going to be based on social needs? On the need of the profession to develop itself? On funding priorities? In terms of what's scientifically do-able and what's not?

4. It does make some difference down the line whether your topmost priority is the development of professionals as researchers to is any of those other . . . things. You generate a priority system accordingly.

5. Am I going to respond as a citizen who is concerned about the state the country is in . . . ? Is that my primary means

for moving myself? If so, I am going to respond in choosing the research area that has the greatest social need. If I am interested in developing the anthropological profession, I am saying, "Where is the biggest hole that we have in our theory? Therefore, what area do we really have to know more about before we can go further in the anthropology of education?" In that case that's where I am going to start working tomorrow . . . .

6. More and more ethnic groups in the U. S. are saying to anthropologists, "Get off our backs and leave us alone. You have been poking around and asking all kinds of questions of us and about us for a long time, and what have we gotten for it? So now just leave us alone--we don't want you around." Schools, I think, have not done this--yet.

7. Implicit in what one of our team members was saying, figuratively (not to the first five researchers but to the next fifty perhaps) is, "If you don't have utility, maybe we don't want you poking around." Or, "How can we use it? If we can't use it, it is obviously worthless."

8. Two examples of actual school problems in our area: There was the widespread myth that all adolescents were great pot-smokers, and there was the sense of horror that their teachers had about pot-smoking. A member of our team, a school administrator, was presenting his staff at the time our team was meeting with a study on the use of drugs in the county schools, and the fallaciousness of the stereotype was shown. Nevertheless, there's the myth, and school people often live with it. Second, the county is quite heterogeneous; it has small rural schools where teachers, either black or white, are not of the rural environment; there is another section of the county which is almost exclusively upper middle class, professional, and there are

the teachers who are, shall we say, on that kind of the ladder. So here are examples of conflict. And the school administrator was saying, "Help us. Give us solutions." Some educators would say, "Give us the solution--so we will not have any more problems . . . . "

9. There are certain kinds of more basic researches that must be done if we are going to broaden our field and go deeper into what anthropologists are doing . . . . It is a matter of building our discipline . . . .

Potential Activities

10. Another thing that anthropology has to offer is "being in the field" . . . .

11. There unfortunately exists a sort of mindless research; it can be terribly "hard" science, but it is bereft of any kind of either behavioral science significance or pragmatic utility . . . . We will make mistakes but we won't make that mistake.

12. We do not really know, now, what goes on in classrooms; we don't really know what goes on in the school. We've got a lot of sociological surveys, as to what people think, but the kinds of direct observation and research that anthropologists have traditionally done in small-scale societies has not been done in the school systems. That kind of knowledge is needed to develop sound strategies for implementing changes . . . .

13. In our local situation a field research station is needed, with a phased development . . . . First we would send in so-called graduated, skilled researchers for a year or whatever. Then we would begin to attach students, then university personnel who have special skills, maybe a quantitative data specialist.

14. We felt that if it were possible to set up a field station, we should do so . . . .

15. Training comes in actual research--through whole professional careers. The researcher should alternate: work far afield then back home, back "out there" and then home, and so on.

16. How much more we would understand about our own minority-majority relation if we would take a look at the situation in urban Japan, as an example . . . .

17. . . . if you think about research far away and research at home, it would be an altogether plausible stand to take as an anthropologist to say--in effect, "All anthropologists that are American anthropologists should be going 'over there,' and from there we get other anthropologists to do this 'at home' research." We would have dialogues going . . . .

18. Cross-cultural research should be team research: the same group of people in the same project disperse to two or three areas of the world . . . .

19. Anthropologists have been charting differences all this time, you know. We talk about similarities in mankind on a theoretical level, but we don't do it on any kind of a descriptive level . . . . We must . . . .

20. We are working with lower-class blacks, and one of the areas of problems that we come against all the time is that while some people may acknowledge that there is a distinctive culture which has its historic roots and it's an ethnic culture, yet most of the time people's behavior is explained solely on economic grounds. . . . . Therefore, according to such people lower-class blacks as a group should behave

exactly as lower-class Puerto Ricans behave and exactly the way lower-class Mexicans behave and so on and so forth in the urban setting. We know this isn't so.

21. I want to talk then with two school systems in mind. One is urban, the other is suburban, the latter with a great variety of different types of schools; these were the ones that we had most in mind at the time we were meeting. However, I think that there was relatively little difference between that particular setting and other parts of the country. There are many socioeconomic and ethnic groups that come together in school houses. Very often they don't understand each other, they have great difficulties in communicating with each other. Very often the problem lies in the teacher being of one group and the children of another . . . . While there is potential for great learning, there is also potential for great conflict. Avoidance of these conflicts--some sort of harmonious living and working together and making the school more a learning situation and less a hostile one: this was one research problem that we had continually in mind. Now if you get down to specifics, take settings where the schools are almost exclusively peopled by lower-class black children and almost exclusively taught by middle-class black or white teachers who either do not know or completely reject 90 per cent of the culture of the children. That's one example . . . .

22. There are other areas in which comparative work is being done--though not as much: for instance, linguistics, cognitive and developmental psychology . . . .

23. People are synthesizing primate studies and studies of cognition; this kind of thing I think is also going to be important.

24. Our team is totally committed to the fact that we need a very broad kind of basic research training program . . . .

25. One of the things educational researchers have lacked is that kind of holistic perspective that, hopefully, anthropologists have. Anthropologists have used more broadly integrative theories than most educators have . . . . On the other hand, reciprocally, until recently at Cal, Berkeley, the graduate students in the department of anthropology had not been asked to learn methods that are absolutely necessary for handling large quantities of data; the students knew nothing about quantification of qualitative data; they knew nothing about formulating statistical designs . . . . This training is critical.

26. Frequently, students get into a situation: they are highly trained, but they can't look . . . .

27. I think it is quite common that in most departments of anthropology and of sociology, students are never taught how to study human behavior, and they are never provided with any actual experience in doing that. My belief is that what is important is acquiring appropriate research methodologies and having some practical experience in actually carrying out a piece of empirical research . . . . I read ethnography after ethnography after ethnography, but that does not help me to acquire any skills . . . .

28. If anthropologists are going to be involved in the schools, they must have some sense of the child's maturation and what theories are about how this is effected and influenced in school systems . . . .

29. In attacking this problem we thought in terms of taking the anthropology student (who has already had one set of experiences with educational institutions, namely his own childhood) and inducting him again into the other culture of the schools by actually inducting him into becoming a

classroom teacher, both by having at least a mini-course in how to be a teacher and then getting into the classroom and working . . . .

30. Take a Polish student: if he is researching in an urban black ghetto, he also ought to spend some time in an urban Polish ghetto . . . . The person has to confront the diversity of his own complex society before he tries to go into another complex society.

31. It is not only a matter of here and abroad: you have enormous personal investment in schools, as against another research context in which you have less personal investment . . . .

32. I think we have to deal with our own hang-ups about hating this thing we are studying. Maybe Evans-Pritchard hated the Nuer but he managed to get his job done. I am not sure, but perhaps many of us remember hating some of the things that happened to us and project that onto what we see going on on in ghetto schools or in any school.

33. I think that everything that is recognizably social science as of now will be totally obsolete in 15 years, and I have two reasons for thinking so. One is that all of social science in its various ways builds on terribly primitive notions of learning--they are all "black box" notions of learning . . . . Two: within the next 10 to 15 years I think it's virtually certain that we will be looking biochemically at learning and we will be looking at learned human behavior--at learning processes--in the way a few of the very best are looking now, of those who are calling themselves behavioral geneticists. This has implications for training--now.

34. The Smithsonian is preparing a computerized international directory of anthropologists; there are now data on 4,000-plus anthropologists, and the index programs, already in the computer . . . . This could be extended to anthropologists in education.

35. We should be trying to put forward some list or index of people who are capable of making high quality discrimination as among proposed projects . . . as a service for school administrators or whoever . . . .

Strategic consideration

36. We know most perhaps about ethnic minorities; so, in terms of developing theory, that might be the last area to move into. But in terms of answering social needs that's the first area to move into . . . .

37. If I were to talk about, not my personal priorities, but what I would like to say to OE . . . there are two major foci that need research. The one, which OE will go at much faster, is research in response to pressing social needs, and the other is research to further our area of study . . . .

38. There is the problem of budgets . . . to attract funds . . . . This is basic to the functioning of research.

39. There are pressing "here and now" crisis-like problems. That's not news--but why can't we slough it out of our minds strategically? Well, for one reason, we'll soon run out of access to the very scene that we want to have for research, unless by some sort of fairly close time table we begin to deliver the goods in ways in which the schools people recognize. They could not care less about our theory.

40. Given the fact that people in schools are faced with real problems every day that they have to deal with, one of the questions arising is, "I have them [the problems]--what do I do about them?" Well, I think anthropologists could help people do something about these problems by doing certain kinds of research, and I think that the kind of research that must be done is the kind anthropologists would most like to do; that is to say, there are certain kinds of things that go on in schools that have to be put into some kind of cultural perspective. Let's say, for example, that you are faced with the problem of drugs in the school. Now that you have the problem, the question is, "What can the administrator do about it?" Once he has defined his problem, he will have to figure out the parameters within which he is going to work, what he can do and what he can't do; this is going to involve not only looking at the school's social system but also looking at the relationship between the people in the schools and those outside it and what kinds of constraints he is being forced to consider in developing any kind of strategy to solve the problem. I would think that because anthropologists have a broader perspective than people who are concerned with very narrow empirical problems, they could help do this kind of research involving the relations between school and community, for example . . . . And this is the kind of research that anthropologists rather than psychologists would be inclined to pursue . . . .

41. Teachers, like everyone, have to construct meanings, a culture, but teacher culture develops unlike other kinds of cultures that have to meet a biological test of survival: teacher culture and teacher social order survive without getting feedback from the environment. This is a practical problem and a theoretical problem.

42. One of the things that strikes me as I have consulted with various school systems is that one possible role, as a change agent, which I think is perfectly legitimate is simply one who provides information to an institution of a kind they may not be able to get because institutional behavior requires a certain amount of acting without reflecting; it might be useful to have some people around who could both act and reflect and this is a way of feeding this information into the system or into the complex of interacting systems. Perhaps the information would be useful to people, and change could thereby result. The main role of the change agent would be to provide information that can be assimilated by the various publics he is communicating with. This role is much preferred to their looking at him as somebody who actually tries to answer the question, "What do I do with classrooms 1 and 2 when we think the building is going to blow up tomorrow?" The publics, of course, have to deal with that problem. One role of the change agent is simply to provide some data to those competing publics, so that they can better press their case . . . . That may be a kind of passive role, but I think it's worth considering.

43. There is a real danger in assuming that we have enough skills in our infant science to be able to analyze a situation and then prescribe . . . . A change agent may be more effective in the long run if he can train his clients to ask him not for answers but for data or for ways of looking, themselves, for heuristics. That may be a weaning process.

44. I would even go so far as to put a priority on the other publics as being the foremost recipients of the data, and the anthropologists being the second. You know, "the anthropological data bank in the sky" being a secondary thing . . . .

45. I don't like to put the practitioner and the researcher into two separate bags. I realize that there is a difference in focus on the kinds of things they do on a day-by-day basis, but I do think that the change agent has to possess both kinds of understandings . . . .

46. One of the ways . . . and it may be a general principle, might be to get not only academic institutions, but maybe the school system or maybe the community or maybe some kind of body other than the university, to be initiator.

47. I think there is a kind of basic research that is very much needed if one is to begin to resolve some of the minority-majority relationship problems: it is understanding perceptions, styles of thinking and the like of minority children. But that is very seldom recognized by the schools as a problem . . . .

48. We anthropologists have another problem. Educators have been taught to respect tightly controlled experimental research. They have to learn to respect ours as equally valid approaches to research. They don't at this point: it's soft, it's case study, and it's anecdotal.

49. We might want to develop some kinds of criteria for administrators to use in discriminating against research projects as those that aren't properly theoretically oriented, and those that lack real prospect for developing something that is useful.

50. This is a list of problems which our team actually came back to over and over again:

    --the schools as change agent: should they be? how? whom should they change?

--how can schools be changed?

--the roles of change agents, their training

--education staff development

--evaluation of educational goals

--response of schools to changing populations

--ethnographies of educational institutions

--dynamics of interaction within the schools

--what educators and clients conceive as good education

--the relations between the schools and their clients

--the relations between the schools and the pluralistic society

--community control

--the low status of teachers

--training of educators in anthropological research

--schools as societies: interaction

--how parents and children feel about schools

--response to community pressures

--group personality of the class, school, and campus

--application of anthropological methodology to educational problems

--problems faced by anthropologists in the field of education.

51. There is a question that is not on the above list that I think should be on it, as an additional question: What are the differences between the mythology espoused by educators as to what they think they are doing in the classrooms and why, and realities of what does go on in the classroom?

IV. FINDINGS

A. Priorities

Strategies necessarily require choices among potential activities. Potential activities, in turn, have some place in and are reflections of priority systems. Priority systems, finally, are functions of social positions. For any persons mindful of possible educational research activities by anthropologists, at least three priority systems are germane. The needs of educational institutions generate one kind of priority system, the interests of the society at large generate a second priority system, and the fundamental, common purposes of the anthropological research community generate a third type of priority system.

These priority systems are of course not wholly congruent with one another (2, 3, 4).* If one is an anthropological researcher in education, one must necessarily exploit energies of and command attention in this research community. Thus the priority system of this research community must be known and served. But--by necessity--one is also involved with two other publics (segments of the society at large, and the personnel of educational institutions), thus their two priority systems must also be known and adequately served. Questions of strategy are implied, and to these we will turn later.

The general nature of these contrasting priorities is reasonably clear. The personnel of the schools, both teachers and administrators, seek help, often desperately (7, 8, 12, 21, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47). This means that, to this public, research activities which have early realizable utility rank high; other activities with only long-range utility rank much lower and activities without recognizable utility rank very low and are seen, realistically, as mere encumbrance. These things are so for

---

*Arabic numerals in parentheses, here and to follow, refer to quoted items from the selective transcript in Section III preceding.

well-recognized reasons which here need not be repeated. Similarly, various segments of the community place high priority on research activity having short-term utility. However, the various segments of the community, mainly as the community divides by social class and ethnic group, are unevenly served by the schools and the society is in the throes of social change (5, 6, 20, 21, 36, 37, 47). Thus what may be to some parents a matter of imperative necessity might seem to the personnel of the schools to be disruptive of a tenuous stability. Finally, the commonly shared overriding purpose of the anthropological research community (however individual anthropologists may vary in these respects) is the assembling of new data and the generation of new method and new theory; this research community clearly places lesser value on utility, nor is it especially mindful of time (3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 30, 41, 47).

In short, the interests of the schools and of the wider community would indicate the investment of scarce energies into realms of the already-known or the readily-discoverable, while the interests of the research community would indicate investment in the not-yet-known and not-easily-discoverable.

B. Potential Activities

To members of the anthropological research community a very large array of potential activity comes rather easily to mind in the general area of anthropological research in education. Such activities fall into four large categories: expanding the knowledge base, research training critical to these research endeavors, pooling knowledge, and the mobilization of human and institutional resources.

1. Expanding the knowledge base: joint or reciprocal research by anthropologists and other educational researchers, joined by others as appropriate, seem both timely and significant in the following areas, taken as examples.

   a. genetics and behavior (33)
      biochemistry and learning (33)
      primate evolution (23)

b. linguistics (22)
child growth and development (28)
cognitive psychology (22, 23, 33, 47)
communication (8, 21, 42)

c. role theory and transactional analysis (16, 41)

d. political anthropology (40)
urban problems (8, 16, 20, 21, 30, 40, 42, 47)

e. schools as social and cultural systems (8, 12, 21, 23, 40, 41)
the special nature of "teacher culture" (8, 12, 21, 23, 40, 41)

f. schools in other cultural settings, and schools near at hand as bicultural systems (8, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 30, 47)

Other activities leading toward long-term research objectives would, for example, include:

g. the organization of cross-cultural research in educational institutions by American anthropological-cum-educational researchers in, for example, Japan, and reciprocal research in the U.S. by their Japanese counterparts (17)

h. a summer "think tank" for educational researchers and anthropologists to meet together before or after undertaking research.

2. Research training: fundamental training in basic behavioral science theory and method, should underlie all research in this as all the social sciences (24). Research training requirements at this basic level are well-treated in a working paper prepared by the Berkeley team; this is attached (Addendum B). Further, the training of researchers essentially resides in the pursuit

of guided research (15). Beyond these, special training seems useful in several areas. In general, where practical, field research stations, located in the schools or in the neighboring community, seems the most effective locus for these training activities (13, 14). As follows:

a. the preparation and evaluation of research designs (25)

b. training and practice in ethnographic and other field research methods with special attention to the problems of research in urban settings (25, 26, 27, 29, 30)

c. practicums for training anthropologists in teaching, including teaching assignments at primary, intermediate, and secondary levels, which training will permit participant observation as field technique, where appropriate (28, 29)

d. special training of change agents or action researchers (39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45)

Of somewhat longer-term significance, the following activities, to facilitate future research training, seem especially needed:

e. joint seminars, among anthropologists and educational researchers to examine the educational and social goals of anthropology and of educational research with special attention to implicit goals (6, 7, 8, 9, etc.)

f. joint seminars to examine the politics of anthropological and educational research, including the structures of funding

g. joint seminars to examine the special problems of value and personal involvement in schools research (29, 30, 31, 32)

h. joint seminars to examine the structures of graduate training, required changes in those structures, and institutional barriers to such changes.

i. a summer institute to be established for the joint training of anthropologists and educational researchers.

3. Pooling knowledge. Social science research is notoriously redundant. In an emergent research area, as an anthropology of education, anthropological researchers stand in special danger of discovering things long known and well understood, and worse, stand in special peril of working in unnecessary ignorance. This is a matter of communication. The matter is, in this report, merely raised with one observation. Organizations like the American Educational Research Association and like the Council on Anthropology and Education serve inherently as "hinge" institutions and their publications are the channels through which information most readily can flow, as between anthropologists and other educational researchers.

4. Identifying human and institutional resources. The simple identification of anthropologists currently involved in educational research and development, few as these may be, is today impossible, quite literally. The computer of course makes it technically possible and economically feasible to establish processes for gathering information as to researchers and their areas of research competence, storing and ordering such information, and for disseminating the information so that that in turn evokes from recipients more information which corrects and extends the information at hand. Fortunately, as one pertinent example, the Center for the

Study of Man, of the Smithsonian Institution, is in the process of creating such a system for the international anthropological community (34). There is no known technical reason or policy consideration which would prevent making anthropological researchers in education and in areas directly impinging one subset within that system. In this fashion, or like manner, the following seems highly desirable:

a. establishing a process for identifying anthropologists with research competence bearing on educational research, according to their area of research competence

b. locating or creating an analogous process to find educational researchers with special interests in anthropological theory and method

One by-product of special interest from such information would be

c. an index of university departments of anthropology and departments or schools of education with formal programs or special interests in anthropology and education and in urban anthropology and other directly relevant areas.

Finally, such information being readily available to school systems nationally, inquiries and other responses from the schools would permit a reciprocal process:

d. a process for identifying schools with special needs and inclinations in the research areas at issue.

If, we said, one is an anthropological or other educational researcher wishing to exploit the energies in these research communities, the priorities of the members of those communities must be served. Probably most members of those research communities would find in the above listing many items which appear significant, interesting, and do-able. However, researchers in the schools would necessarily be involved, we also said, with these other publics, each with its own priorities, and these, too, must be known and adequately served.

It will probably be evident that few personnel of the schools will find many of the activities above listed of more than idle interest, and to many schools personnel many of those activities--long-term, theoretically oriented--would seem so wasteful of energies as to be virtually immoral. Similarly inclined would be members of various segments of the society at large, especially activist members on both the right and left.

Examples of potential research activities which might appear worthy to these two publics--school personnel and segments of the society at large--are:

studies in race relations insofar as early results promise to reduce racial tensions in the schools (20, 21)

studies of drug use and drug prevention insofar as early results promise to reduce drug abuse (8,40)

studies of the subcultures in the schools insofar as early results promise to increase teacher sensitivity to various behavioral expressions of the cultures present in the schools (8, 21)

studies of schools in the wider social structure insofar as early results promise to better articulate parents and teachers in respect to the problems of the schools (21, 40, 42)

Two things should be noted: first, all have pragmatic implication and are imagined to be short term; second, most ask more of researchers than can be delivered.

C. Strategies

A tension permeated discussions through the year, within the teams and among the teams in Chicago. This tension is evident in the preceding transcript, and in the brief discussion of priorities and the listing of potential activities. The general nature of the tension is evident. The fundamental collective interests of the research community are theoretical. In terms of theoretical interests, "relevance" is measured by fit with other theory; in terms of those research interests, long-term efforts into unknown realms is valued; and excellent theoretical results, when finally achieved, do not necessarily admit of application in the world of affairs. More than this, science is always in movement, and the interests of the research community require even more remote concerns, as research training in anticipation of the reasonably predictable state of affairs a decade or two into the future. In contrast, the interests of the schools and of the wider society in its many segments are equally real, and these demand short-term results of recognizable utility.

This tension is not special to anthropology: The same tension is easily recognized in the discussions and in the very organization of the American Educational Research Association, the U. S. Office of Education, and elsewhere. Nor are several partial solutions, readily evident, special to anthropology. These partial solutions essentially imply three strategies in the design of research efforts in the schools.

> First, there are areas of considerable knowledge, wherein additional research is possible, which research is not without at least minor theoretical implication and which research does admit of early practical application; the linguistic analysis of the grammar of "non-standard" English dialects comes to mind as example. The strategic stance here implied is for the researcher purposefully to seek out such areas of knowledge and to invest his energies there. This might be called a strategy of finding areas of natural overlap of priorities as among the research community and the other publics necessarily involved.
>
> Second, there are areas of considerable knowledge wherein additional research is possible, which research is not without theoretical

significance, which research, by itself, would not admit, however, of practical application, but which with additional effort could be made to admit of such application. For example, the social class bias of testing for achievement and intelligence is now known and further knowledge in this realm is not without theoretical interest to students of social structure, for example; but "applications" of such knowledge are trivial to date and promise to remain trivial. Thus further research, joined with additional efforts (probably based on theories of role enactment and transaction) to bring such knowledge effectively to bear in the behavior of school bureaucracies, would seem strategically implied. This might be termed a strategy of adaptation, the modification of research effort, not naturally within an area of overlapping interest, so as simultaneously to serve the interests of the research community and the other school and community publics necessarily involved.

Third, the researcher might adopt a simple strategy of quid pro quo: in exchange for research access to the schools and wider community, he simply undertakes to provide some service, which service has no theoretical significance.

It seems evident that, in the planning efforts through the year, impulses ran as among these alternatives strongly to the first. It seems also evident that all these are at best compromise solutions, that they may serve as resolutions for individual researchers in some numbers, and may be recommended in those terms; these, however, do not really address the underlying tension.

There are fundamental dangers in such resolutions. The danger in the above strategic stances, in purely pragmatic terms, is that all needs of the schools and wider society are not "felt" needs. Even the examples used above--the linguistic analysis of English dialects, the social class bias of testing--grew importantly out of theoretical concerns in the first instance, not solely out of utilitarian demands from the non-research publics. Analogously, these publics do not seem to "know" that culturally patterned contrasting cognitive styles exist among the populations of the schools, and that many learning problems reside there (47). Etc.

Among the planners, impulse ran most strongly in still another direction, this last specific to the very nature

of anthropology as a discipline. Anthropology, among social science disciplines, bases its research in unique degree on ethnography. Ethnography, irrespective of long-term theoretical outcomes, is typically useful. In that fact appears to lie the fundamental resolution for anthropologists in educational research.

Ethnography is always based in substantial part on direct observation of naturally occurring events in broad context. Ethnography is typically reported in concrete, behavioral terms. Done well, ethnography provides the reader with the vicarious experience of living or reliving the events themselves. More, through ethnography, that vicarious experience is pointed, so that patterns of behavior which are normally implicit often become explicit and may require of the reader confrontation with himself.

It is one thing to be shown through attitudinal testing that a population of which one is a member is in compelling frequency "prejudiced." It is quite another thing to relive in meticulous detail the thousand-and-one everyday behaviors through which, for example, in a school the caste system of the larger society is replicated and reenacted and is thereby daily recreated.

In the planning activity here reported impulse ran strongly toward resolution of the underlying tension by re-emphasizing ethnography (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 40, 41, 42, 43. 44).

In the planning activity here reported, impulse ran more specifically toward resolution in terms of ethnography which was explicitly comparative in nature, such ethnographic research to unfold abroad and in multicultural schools and communities at home(15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 47).

Such ethnography serves in anthropology as the basis for theoretically-oriented research. But such ethnography appears frequently to have potential utility to the personnel of the schools and to members of the wider society. All that seems here implied, as special effort by anthropologists, is to get the ethnography done as soon as possible (not waiting for the more time-consuming theoretical analysis). Two publication series dealing specifically with ethnography in the schools exist (under the editorships of Solon Kimball and of George and Louise Spindler) and these provide ready channels for dissemination.

One participant in these planning efforts provided a selective bibliography of recent anthropological and anthropology-inspired research in education (Addendum C). A review of those entries reveals the same impulse toward re-emphasizing ethnography: virtually all the items contain or grow directly out of such ethnography, excepting the Jensen report, included perhaps as a conspicuous example of the perils of research totally removed from such an ethnographic base.

The utility of ethnography is, however, not automatic. Good ethnography is typically disturbing and typically evokes the obvious defense mechanisms. A point frequently raised in the planning effort merits repetition: we deal with publics and they are frequently competing. It is a typical experience that a single ethnography raises defenses and is simply dismissed by one public, while it generates powerful insight and is embraced by another, according to their contrasting positions. It follows that the utilities here hoped for are likely to be realized to the degree that ethnography reaches many publics, affecting thereby the terms of contention among them.

Working Paper:

TOWARD AN OPTIMUM ARTICULATION BETWEEN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY AND THE COMMUNITY OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS

The purpose of this project is to develop long-term plans for training anthropologists for educational research and for training educational researchers to participate in and to use the resultsof such anthropological research efforts. This working paper is drawn to help open conversation among a national group of selected anthropologists and selected educational researchers: four regional teams of anthropologists and educational researchers, joined by the Steering Committee of the Council on Anthropology and Education, assisted by the staff of the CAE national office in Buffalo. If a viable plan is to emerge, it will be the product of the thinking of this group. A strategy or plan for the training of anthropologists and educational researchers must necessarily embrace at least five questions:

I. What are the reciprocal profits, for anthropological research and for educational research?

We open this dialogue with only one strong bias: it is not the purpose of the project to develop a new anthropological research specialty, nor a new anthropological specialty in educational research, nor a new interdisciplinary specialty. Rather, we hope to take a close look at some of the answers to the following questions:

> What of theoretical and methodological profit can anthropology expect from educational research?

For instance, one might expect anthropological concepts of role, and thus social structure, to be transformed and further developed in the course of research by anthropologists in education settings, which is to say that insofar as the anthropological comparative research base

is broadened to include fully complex urban institutions one hopes for increased power in theory and method.

> What can educational research reciprocally expect from anthropology?

Educational research method might undergo change as more participant observation is utilized; educational research theory which by and large has been partitive might undergo change as some of the broadly integrative theories of anthropology are more generally addressed.

> And, equally important, what can anthropology and educational research not expect from each other?

II. What are the training needs for researchers in order for anthropological research and educational research to realize these profits?

Of all imaginable answers to this question some might point to predoctoral training needs, some for the graduate student in anthropology, some for the graduate student in educational research, and some for both. Perhaps of more immediate need and long-term significance are opportunities for postdoctoral training for anthropologists and educational researchers working jointly. The following list of training activities are clearly implied, though others less evident will emerge.

A. Predoctoral training activities for educational researchers:
   1. studies in general anthropological theory, especially theories of social and cultural integration.
   2. studies in anthropological field methods, especially in participant observation.
   3. broadly comparative behavioral studies, within the species and beyond.
   4. studies of primate evolution.

B. Predoctoral training activities for anthropologists:
   1. studies in social psychology and physiology.
   2. special studies in participant observation.
   3. special studies in anthropological research in fully complex societies.

C. Postdoctoral training activities for educational researchers and anthropologists jointly:
   1. establishing a summer institute where people (national and international) might work on activities as the

following: joint seminars and training in social change in large-scale institutions, in innovation, the planning of change, and change strategies; joint seminars and training in intervention research, in the role of the researcher as a change agent; joint seminars in growth and development in childhood, in adolescence.

2. a summer "think tank" for teams of educational researchers and anthropologists to meet prior to undertaking joint research and after that research.

The training activities outlined under A and B should not necessarily be thought of as being the normal course or usual report-and-discussion type of training, but rather as an opportunity for experiment with more experience-based learning, and as occasion for more creative and realistic thinking.

III. What are the background strengths and weaknesses in traditional anthropological research and traditional educational research?

The methods and theories of anthropology are mainly precipitates of a traditional work in small-scale societies and most anthropologists come from direct experience in such societies. Perhaps anthropologists bring, in virtue of that, a measure of "fresh vision" to the educational task. On the other hand for him to work in teaching-learning systems means working in the relatively "strange," fully complex urban societies and their large-scale institutions, and the traditions of method and theory are probably inappropriate, in specific, identifiable respects.

The educational researcher is already living in the culture of the teaching-learning system, he works with its culture, changes its culture and may often feel confident in his understanding of the cultural phenomena of the system. Perhaps his strengths and weaknesses are the obverse of the anthropologist's.

IV. What are the involved styles of research purpose?

It strongly appears that discussion cannot run usefully in the frequently employed terms of "hard" and "soft" science. There are perhaps three main styles of research, all of which are now pursued in some mix in anthropological research, and in some different mix in educational research. Too simply, no doubt: ethnography, the generation and testing of general hypotheses, and application. (It is possible to view these as

three phases of a single research career: poking around for the question, posing and answering the question, applying the answer.) Anthropology has done a lot of the first, less of the second, and still less of the third; educational research has done very little of the first, a great deal of the second, and it turns over to others--rather than does--the third. Perhaps in these simplistic terms the large bulk of anthropological and educational research efforts are grossly accounted for.

The matter is more complex, of course. Action research (rather than ethnography) may be the mode of initial entry; a striving for particularized precision (rather than general hypothesis) may follow, as with much of ethno-science; and design of feedback systems (rather than straight application) may be the final concern. Further these three pairs of research effort vary independently, at least in principle.

If one party is squeezing oranges and another unknowingly pressing apples, the resulting juice can be a shock to both.

V. What are the institutionalized resistances to change?

The educational tasks outlined above cannot be accomplished merely by working on men's minds without actions which affect actual changes in institutions. Anthropology and educational research are two open systems with its components of men, organizations, traditions, biases, and goals; it is clear that interdisciplinary educational activities will have to identify and overcome institutionalized hindrances and resistance within each system. Included is the institutionalized nature of graduate education within which channels must be found or made through which interdisciplinary educational tasks might move: a close look at existing curricula might reveal where these new concerns might fit. Changes in organization, curricula, etc., will affect the numbers of students and others who will be interested. Last, but not least, there are matters of economic support for these changes.

SELECTED TEAM MEMORANDA

These memoranda were generated in discussions within regional teams and were circulated among the teams, before or during the May Conference in Chicago.

CHICAGO TEAM

Anthropology and Education
First Meeting

Major Points

Question One: What can anthropology do for education?

I. Can communicate strategies for change, applying anthropological knowledge.

King — A. Teaching teachers (external change model)

Erickson — B. Analysis of the specifics of the school/community interface (down to the microethnographic level)

Schensul — C. Change agent (internal change model)
1. information doesn't necessarily change system
2. change agent can negotiate his information--apply it to the specific situation of a school or school system
3. doing real fieldwork in the school, not shooting from the hip out in academia

Michalski — D. Applied anthropology has experience which can be used to teach techniques in defining and practicing community involvement

Erickson — E. Doing ethnography on "conventional wisdom," or "teacher subculture" of schools could be a valuable information input by change agent described in C above
1. teacher "folk social science"--explanation, prediction, valuing

Schensul — F. Teachers want to do well; failure is frustrating. Teachers don't want general principles. Chance agent can help them by providing an empirical answer to what's happening with kid outside school

King — G. Information on communication style could be useful--eye contact, timing, etc.

Question Two: What can studying schools do for anthropologists?

King — I. Politics in developing countries making access difficult. May be necessary to turn to our own society for pragmatic reasons.
A. First anthropological study of youth/drug culture

Schensul — II. The conduct of "contracted" urban anthropology (applied anthropology)--educational institutions usually become a focus of research.
A. People in communities perceive schools as a major concern
1. if they make your research decisions for you, if you go where they tell you to go, you'll find yourself in schools

III. Methods in urban ethnography.

Schensul — A. School an institution which clearly defines and codifies "appropriate" behavior within it and clearly defines a community around it

Erickson — B. Situational frame--the school contains many
1. problem of unit definition in urban anthropology. what is a definable unit?
2. situational frame (E.T. Hall & Erickson)
a. defined by time, space, social role or participants, activity, perceptions of participants

C. Urban school conveys ideal American culture to real urban ethnics

Michalski — D. Traditional parochial school a total process of ethos indoctrination. Can study this process in detail.

Erickson E. Non-parochial independent schools.
1. transmitting either emergent "counter-culture" or bicultural transmission of black/white-Latin/Anglo cultures
2. define a significant community, members invest a big chunk of self, offer up kids, parents have lots of ego involvement

Schensul F. Model of school and neighborhood.
Elementary school community = village. This can be the starting point for network analysis. The resulting sample of 2500-300 kids and parents is a workable sized sample of households, stratified loosely by age of the adult couple (within child-rearing age)

King G. Studying cultural change and social conflict. Schools at all levels will be focal point of social conflict over next few years.

Schensul H. Ethnography of whole society (cognitive maps).
1. can look at cognitions of people in your school sample, who are simultaneously "locals" and part of the total society

Question Three: How to train anthropology students for ethnography of schools?

King, Michalski, Erickson, Schensul } I. Have them do real fieldwork.

Erickson II. Work explicitly on development of "ethnographer's view."
A. When doing ethnography of our society, this involves making the familiar strange to them.

Schensul III. Exposure to different subcultures can give experience in "anthropological strangeness."
A. New York kids in Northern Minnesota.

Education Study Center
711 Fourteenth St., N.W., Suite 919 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-5350

WASHINGTON TEAM

January 15, 1970

Memo to Members of the Anthropology-Education Task Force

Re: Minutes of Meeting, January 8, 1970

Discussion opened with an overview of current applications of anthropological research to education, the principle areas being the schooling of Indians and, more recently, lower-class Negroes, also studies of educational processes and the teaching of anthropology.

Educational problems of concern to the group included the low status of education as a profession and the poor quality of students attracted to the field. One comment: "Teachers are like cops; they get it in the neck from everybody."

Suggested applications of anthropological research to education include:

1. Problems of change, and helping teachers change their behavior.
2. Clarification of educational objectives in terms of their underlying dynamics.
3. How to deal with a pluralistic culture.
4. Role of education in the broader society.

Suggested topics of discussion for the next meeting:

1. Review of the above
2. Priorities
3. Strengths and weaknesses of anthropological research in education
4. Training of anthropological-educational researchers

Memo

Re: Next Meeting

Our next meeting will be held Tuesday, February 10, 1970, noon to 2 P.M. at Hogate's Sea Food Restaurant, Maine Avenue & 9th Street, S.W.

Again this will be a no host luncheon in the Main Dining Room on the second floor.

Here's looking forward to another highly productive discussion.

Best wishes,

Nancy Modiano, Ph.D.
Task Force Coordinator

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Schmeider
Mr. Moerch

Education Study Center
711 Fourteenth St., N.W., Suite 919 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-5350

February 27, 1970

Memo to: Members of the Anthropology Education Task Force

Re: Minutes of Meeting, February 10, 1970

Discussion opened with a review of the previous session. Areas of study and the application of an anthropological research to education to be stated for the first time or to be reiterated from the previous meeting included:

1. Schools as societies, with special attention to the dynamics of interaction.

2. The dynamics of bureaucracies.

3. How parents and children feel about the schools and their concepts of good education.

4. Response to community pressures (i.e. community control).

5. Changing school populations (and changes within school populations).

6. Group personality of class, school, campus.

7. The schools as change agents; should they be? how? to whom?

8. How can schools be changed?

9. Application of anthropological methodology to educational problems.

10. Staff development

11. Educational goals.

12. Problems faced by the anthropologist in the field. It was pointed out that the Committee on Human Development at the University of Chicago concerned itself with just such problems some 20-25 years ago, and that the work of persons such as Bill Henry, Caroline Tryon, and Lloyd Warner should be consulted.

The group began to examine strategies for implementing the above. Dr. Goodman urged that an overall model, or research design, be created. This would require not only careful planning but also substantial funding.

Dr. Sam Goodman, Director
Department of Research
Montgomery County Board of Education
Washington Center
850 North Washington Street
Rockville, Md. 20850
(telephone: PO2-5000)

Mr. Albert Jenny, III
Department of Research
Montgomery County Board of Education
Washington Center
850 North Washington Street
Rockville, Md. 20850
(telephone: PO2-5000)

Dr. Elliot Liebow
Mental Health Center
2340 University Blvd. East
Adelphi, Md. 20783
(telephone: 422-1281)

Dr. Priscilla Reining
Center for the Study of Man
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, DC 20560
(telephone: 628-1810)

Dr. Nancy Modiano, Task Force Coordinator
Education Study Center
711 Fourteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
(telephone: 783-5350)

(Revised 1-14-70)

Education Study Center
711 Fourteenth St., N.W., Suite 919 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-5350

February 27, 1970

Memo

Re: Next Meeting

Our next meeting will be held Tuesday, March 10, 1970, noon to 2 P.M. at Montgomery County Public Schools Educational Services Center, 650 North Washington Street, Rockville, Maryland in the lobby (ask for Mr. Jerry, ext. 462).

Again this will be a no host luncheon.

Here's looking foward to another highly productive discussion.

Best wishes,

Nancy/jld

Nancy Modiano, Ph.D.
Task Force Coordinator

cc: Dr. Schmeider
Mr. Moerch

NM/jld

Less attention was paid to the limitations of anthropological research in education, although it became apparent to some members of the group that the perrenial gulf between theoretical (pure) research and its applications, especially in the multivariable would of reality, exists as much in education as in the other behavioral sciences. Theoretical research will always stride far ahead of its practical applications, in all fields; education is always crying for practical and workable solutions to its multitudinous problems.

Comments on the above (N.M.):

Although the group did not address itself directly to priorities, when the minutes of the last meeting are compared to those of the above certain major areas of concern do stand out:

1. Change, the dynamics of change, roles and training of change agents; under this can be subsumed such school-related problems as staff development, evaluation of goals, response of schools to changing populations, etc.

2. Ethnographies of educational institutions, the dynamics of interaction within the schools, how educators and clients conceive good education and evaluate their schools.

3. Role of education in the broader society, relations between schools and their clients, relations between schools and a pluralistic society, community control, low status of teachers,

4. Training of educators in anthropological research methodology, so that they can apply it in solving educational problems.

Suggested areas for discussion at the next meeting:

Review of priorities

Review of strengths and weaknesses of anthropological research in education

Training of anthropological-educational researchers

Education Study Center
711 Fourteenth St. N.W. Suite 919 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 783-5350

March 23, 1970

Memo to Members of the Anthropology Education Task Force

1. Minutes of Meeting, March 10, 1970

The major accomplishment of the meeting was the assignment of priorities to previously discussed areas of concern in which anthropological insights could be of help, and came up with the following rankings:

1. Change, especially in two areas:
   a. Why do similar approaches to teaching create widely varying results among different ethnic groups
   b. An anthropological evaluation of the Jensen article and similar works
   c. Pseudo-change vs deep structural changes in educational institutions, their practices and their effect on the wider community
2. How can schools best deal with pluralistic cultures? (Of course, it was recognized that this relates closely to the first area.) This subsumes community-school relations.
3. What are the schools? How do they function? What are their expectations of themselves and others' expectations of them?
4. How can the training of anthropologists be better related to the above?

2. Next meeting

Our next meeting will concern itself primarily with the last of the above questions.

We will meet on Wednesday, April 8, at O'Donnell's Restaurant, 8301 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda; this appears to be about half way to everyone's. Again, this will be a no-host lunch.

Here's looking forward to another very productive meeting.

Best wishes,

Nancy

Nancy Modiano
Task Force Coordinator

NM/jld

Education Study Center
711 Fourteenth St. NW Suite 919 Washington, D C 20005 (202) 783-5350

April 23, 1970

Memo to Members of the Anthropology in Education Task Force

Our final local meeting was held on April 8; the principle topic of discussion was the training of anthropologists to work in education. The two modifications urged in the traditional training of anthropologists were:

1. That anthropologists participate in at least part of a formal teacher-training program.

2. That they undertake an early childhood, elementary or secondary teaching assignment, for at least half a year full-time, or part-time for a full year.

Beyond this, it was felt that a major portion of the students' field work assignments be undertaken in educational institutions or closely related settings.

I would like to thank you all for your loyal and very helpful participation in the task force. I think we have come up with a thorough exploration of the problems involved in the anthropology of education, and some excellent approaches to the field.

Next on the agenda is a meeting for representatives of all four Task Forces from New York to California; the work of the four committees will be integrated and a final document outlined.

Again, many thanks for all your help.

Best wishes,

Nancy

Nancy Modiano, Ph.D.
Task Force Coordinator

NM/jld

BERKELEY TEAM

Toward An Optimum Articulation Between the Anthropological Research Community and the Community of Educational Researchers

by

C. William Ekhoff, Barry L. Cobb and B. Allan Tindall

University of California,
Berkeley

A paper presented at the Conference on Anthropology and Education

Chicago, April 13 and 14, 1970

I. The Berkeley group takes the position that schools in our society are highly complex, dynamic institutions in which one finds a multiplicity of systems of behavior which are integrated and patterned. We believe that our task ought to be to consider the appropriate strategies for researching these integrated patterns of behavior in schools in our own society as well as in societies of different types. Furthermore, we believe that there is a logical fallacy in the orienting statement to which we have been asked to address ourselves in that the statement contains an implicit assumption that there are specific disciplinary bounds and methods which are appropriate to studying specific aspects of behavior in the contemporary school setting. Our orientation leads us to conclude that traditional disciplinary boundaries are irrelevant and dysfunctional when devising strategies for researching particular educational problems.

A. In the light of this orientation we believe that the articulation between the anthropological research community and the community of educational researchers ought to be redefined in terms of:

1. A development of a structure of theoretical propositions which can help us to understand the nature of and systemic interrelationships between socio-cultural and psycho-cultural phenomena in educational institutions in complex societies.

2. The establishment of criteria by which one selects theories to guide the research of specific problems.

3. The appropriate kinds of research methodologies for studying social phenomena in the school in light of the relevant theories.

B. Defining the articulation between the two research communities in the preceding manner has a number of implications for the development of a program to train students to do research in educational settings and for the specific kinds of knowledge which all good researchers must possess. The Berkeley group believes that the requisite understandings for both research training program directors and students are likely to arise out of a careful consideration of a few questions which relate to the most critical issues. We have attempted to delineate a few of these more significant questions and provide tentative and brief answers to each. They are as follows:

1. What is the nature of theoretical systems and what are the criteria for good theory and method?

2. What theories are we forced to consider due to the complexity of urban educational institutions, and how does one apply the criteria for good theory in the selection or formulation of an appropriate theory to guide the research of a particular problem?

3. What considerations must be made in the selection of specific methods in the light of the rigorous application of the established criteria for good methodology?

4. What kind of training experience is requisite to prepare researchers to investigate complex psycho-cultural/socio-cultural phenomena in educational institutions? How should the training experience be sequenced?

C. Since we have based the redefinition of the orienting statement on our belief that modern schools are highly complex, dynamic institutions, we think that the above questions are important for several basic reasons. In order to develop a structure of theoretical propositions which can adequately explain and interrelate the multiplicity of systems of behavior, the researcher must possess a knowledge of the nature of theoretical systems. Second, there must be a sound

basis for selection, synthesis, and/or development of relevant theories to explain the observed phenomenon. Third, in addition to knowing how to select or develop a structure of theoretical propositions, the researcher must be aware of the criteria for the selection of appropriate methodologies because the methods selected provide the tie between the empirical and theoretical worlds. The fourth question is based on the realization that if the researcher is to have the ability to perform the tasks outlined above, he must have the proper, rigorous training.

II. What is the nature of theoretical systems and what are the criteria for good theory and method?

Adequate explication of the logic of inquiry, the manner in which theoretical systems are created, and other such relevant issues are beyond the scope of this working paper. What is pertinent, most relevant, and within the scope of this discussion is a brief consideration of the nature of theory, how one differentiates among the various "levels" of theory, and the criteria for good theory and good methodology.

A. For purposes of this working paper theory may be defined as a logical structure of propositions which are systemically interrelated. Propositions are conceived of as statements about the relationships between variables. This definition of theory like most others will not satisfy everyone, but this broader definition has one advantage in that it encompasses meta level theoretical formulations, such as Talcott Parsons' pattern-variable schemes, as well as the tightknit, rigorous, logico-deductive schemes to which George Homans restricts his definition of theory. Thus, theory so defined may refer to a low level theoretical construction, that is, it may be well tied to empirical data, contain few variables and propositions, and hence attempt to account for a

limited range of phenomena, or it may refer to a meta level one which is highly abstract and attempts to integrate and explain a multiplicity of phenomena.

Although theoretical propositions are frequently recognized as the building blocks of theory, they actually result from a basic conceptualization process in which the investigator begins by making some descriptive statements about the things or phenomena observed. Descriptions of the observed phenomena lead the researcher to group or classify the phenomena according to some specified commonalities to form concepts. When concepts become clearly defined one may formulate a theoretic term or statement which specifies the presumed relationships between the concepts. Such statements are theoretical propositions.

Once a small body of concepts has been defined, logical statements made about the probable relationships among the concepts, and one or more of these propositions have been empirically tested, a low level theory has been developed. Such a theoretical structure is a low level theory because the range of phenomena which it attempts to explain are limited, i.e. the structure contains few variables and propositions, and a relatively high proportion of the theoretical propositions have been "grounded" or empirically tested.

Theories which are comprised of a greater number of variables and propositions and which are sufficiently abstract to deal with specific spheres of behavior have been termed middle range or middle level by a number of social scientists. Although these theoretical structures are more abstract they do constitute relatively tightknit systems in that the key portions of the logical structure are grounded, they attempt to account for a limited range of phenomena, the concepts are relatively well defined, and they contain limited sets of assumptions from which empirically testable hypotheses may be derived. Because middle range theories are restricted in their scope and are more tightknit, their explanatory and predictive powers are much greater than meta level or more

highly abstract theoretical formulations. For this latter reason Robert Merton, among others, has expended a considerable amount of this intellectual energies trying to convince students in the social sciences to restrict the scope of their theoretical formulations to the middle range.

Meta level theories, or theories which are highly abstract and attempt to explain a broad range of phenomena, are removed from the data by several levels of inferencing. Theories at a high level of abstraction contain a large number of concepts and they as well as the hypothesized relationships among them often are ill defined or fuzzy. Meta level theory is valid to the extent to which the underlying conceptual model is internally logical and the extent to which key parts of that structure are grounded. It is of critical importance for the student to understand that the utility of meta level theory is not in its precise explanatory or predictive powers; rather, its utility rests in its ability to integrate a multiplicity of phenomena into an understandable complex and provide one with a theoretical orientation for looking at the "empirical world."

B. While it is critically important for the student training to do research in large scale educational institutions to understand the relationships between the research question, which specifies the range of phenomena to be investigated, and the requisite level of theory, it is equally essential that all researchers recognize that there are standard criteria for all good theory. As indicated in the definition of theory, the propositions in all theoretical structures must be logically interrelated. In so far as more abstract theories are concerned, one essential criteria is that the relationships between the grounded key points within the conceptual model and the other points not yet grounded be logical.

All good theory is heuristic. The provocative and stimulating nature of a heuristic theory leads to further theoretical elaborations either directly through logical processes or indirectly by suggesting research of a number of

empirically grounded phenomena which leads you to extend your theoretical propositions in the analysis of those phenomena. Heuristic theory, at what we have termed the meta level, leads one to investigate more limited research problems out of which you develop a more elaborated middle level theory.

Finally, a good theory is explanatory of the observed phenomena. Theories do vary in the extent to which they are valid explanations of the observed phenomena. The degree of validity of each theory is a function of the weight of the evidence, that is the extent to which it has been empirically grounded, and the logicalness of the argument.

The adequacy of explanation in social science has been a perplexing problem of interest to a number of prominent theorists over the years. The positions taken on the issue range the entire spectrum from George Homans' insistence that all adequate explanations of social phenomena must be reduced to psychologistic ones to the assertions of Durkheim that psychological explanations of certain social phenomena are inadequate due to the external, observable nature of social facts, and that the cause, for example, in the increase in suicide rates is a function of varying social conditions. A thorough review of the nature and adequacy of explanation, while beyond the purview of this paper, is another key issue to which social scientists in training must be exposed.

C. The Criteria for Good Methodology

Methodology can be broadly defined as the total research process, or more narrowly defined in terms of the techniques used to collect data for a specific research project. It is this latter, more narrow definition, to which we should like to address ourselves.

Among the essential criteria for good methodology is the articulation of the particular techniques selected with the theoretical framework guiding the project. Since, as we have indicated, theories vary in the range of phenomena

which they seek to account for, the methods employed must be a function of that range. In addition, methods selected must be appropriate to the size and complexity of the population and/or phenomena observed. Consideration of these basic criteria will lead to the collection of data that is analyzable in terms of the theoretical model directing the research endeavor. In addition, the selection of appropriate methodological strategies should lead to the production of data which is powerful enough to suggest, or perhaps demand, reformulation, redefinition or refinement of the theory guiding the project.

The second criteria for good methodology is objectivity. The term objectivity as used has absolutely nothing to do with the type of data gathered, the techniques used, or its applicability for statistical analysis. Rather, objectivity must be seen in terms of stipulated methodologies which can be used to replicate results. For instance, quantitative interview data, which is coded and catagorized, is of quality, and is objective in that the results can be independently replicated. As indicated, criteria for objectivity does not rest on the applicability of the results for either parametric or non-parametric statistical analysis. For instance, it is conceivable that library research and limited amounts of interview data might be utilized for the construction of a survey instrument. The first two methodologies are objective in their adherence to stipulated procedures which can produce independent replication of results, but neither is applicable for statistical analysis. We have conceptualized as subjective results which are expressed as constellations of empirical generalizations based on the researchers' "intuitive feel" for the phenomena observed, rather than generalizations based upon a body of data obtained by formalized research procedures. A thorough understanding of the implications of carefully

controlled research procedures and of the implications for the appropriate selection of methodologies will lead to the collection of high quality data that is most relevant to the research problem and which is appropriate to the theories utilized to guide the research.

III. What theories are we forced to consider due to the complexity of urban educational institutions, and how does one apply the criteria for good theory in the selection or formulation of an appropriate theory to guide the research of a particular problem?

A. Although our central task at this point is to delineate and explicate the basic conceptual frameworks of a few theories which are appropriate to researching educational problems, a comment is warranted about a few less desireable practices that are all too common among students participating in research training programs. Schools in our society today are beset with one crisis after another ranging from inadequate financing to the perceived threats of violence by militant students espousing a variety of causes. These pressing, and frequently emotional, issues account for, in part, the preference on the part of many students to spend much of their time cataloging currently popular research problems and then devising strategies for researching these problems. Now if one chooses to start at the level of problem analysis this is fine as long as one proceeds to a consideration and analysis of the research question on the basis of an understanding of the application of the criteria for good theory and methods for understanding behavior in complex institutions. All too often, though, the student is too poorly trained to understand that the ability to formulate good research questions is dependent upon a sound theoretical training, or that

if one simply selects a problem to research one must be able to select or synthesize a relevant theory to guide the investigation. Without extensive knowledge of the nature of theoretical systems or sufficient exposure to several important bodies of theory the student is less likely to fully comprehend what the problems really are. Furthermore, students with these training deficiencies are more likely to construe problems differently and define them on the basis of personalistic value laden opinions.

B. Before we launch into a consideration of a few of the more broadly integrative theories which can help to explain the dynamics and nature of the school as a system of behavior and how those systems of behavior relate to other systems within the society of which the school is a part, we must briefly sketch the characteristics of the school system. This sketch will provide one with an overview of the complexity of school systems and help to illustrate the complexity of the theories essential for the analysis of behavior in educational institutions.

School systems in most Western societies are large and in any large system organized for the expressed purpose of meeting a variety of diffuse and specific goals, one finds many differentiated and reasonably well defined roles. The extent to which people in the same or different roles transact with each other in the conduct of their daily activities vary but as a general rule two or more persons occupying the same or closely articulated roles transact with one another more frequently. The similarity of their experiences and the frequent communication between them permits a maximization of equivalence in perceptual orientations and results in certain patterned behaviors which are the phenomenological expression of this underlying psychological orientation. Although the specific role behaviors for each role are defined in the transactional process by persons within the school, the general guidelines for each role are defined in terms of the

shared beliefs, values, perceptions of organizational structure, etc. by transacting with one another in not only the school system but also in other interaction systems in the society at large. Thus administrators, teachers, students and other personnel bring with them to the school their own psycho-cultural orientations and we must be able to assess the impact of these cultural patterns carried into the school upon individuals in the interaction system of the school as a whole.

The above sketch of the nature of the school as a social system is very superficial but it does illustrate the point that the school is a complex interaction system that is integrated with other interactional systems in the society at large. With a comprehension of this complexity in mind we shall turn our attention to a very brief explication of three meta level theories that attempt to explain the systemic nature of human behavior and which focus specifically upon the relationships between personality, society, and culture. While it is our contention that the theories discussed meet the criteria established for good theory in section II and are complex enough to explain observable phenomena in large scale institutions, we do not take the position that these three theories are the only ones which provide an adequate conceptualization of a large social system or which are appropriate for guiding research of complex phenomena.

The framework for the Theory of Action, conceptualized nearly twenty years ago by Talcott Parsons and his colleagues, has undergone a number of refinements over the years. As we see it the chief utility of this theoretical model is that it differentiates among three levels of abstraction; the personality, the social system, and culture. Parsons examination of the nature of interaction has led him to conclude that the process of interaction can be seen as a microcosm of social systems. That is, interaction contains all of the elements of which social systems consist. The elements are shared systems of belief, systems of

value, and culturally established criteria of aesthetic, technical and moral evaluation. The interrelatedness of the individual personality involved in social interaction, the social system and culture are clearly established in Parsons conceptualization scheme. The individuals personality is comprised of a system of ideas, motives, beliefs and values which are internalized during socialization. The social system is conceived as a system of interrelated roles which are prescribed by the shared norms, beliefs and values of people in the social system. Culture is seen as the interrelated system of beliefs, values and symbols which is possessed by any collectivity. All three systems, each at a different level of abstraction, overlap and interact.

Systems theory, originally conceived by cyberneticians and others working in the biological sciences, views the socio-cultural system as a complex adaptive system which continually generates, elaborates and restructures patterns of meanings, actions and interactions. The basic interaction model places heavy emphasis upon communication and information interchange. Thus, the microprocesses of dyadic interpersonal relations are seen as fluid and permit individuals to alter meanings and patterns of behavior. Making the jump to large scale organizations, the morphogenetic or systems model assumes that at this level also socio-cultural structures will be maintained, changed or elaborated. Structural maintance is viewed as a function of the nature and the source of variety or alternative ways of behaving in the system, the amount of tension or conflict present, certain selection processes and the processes of perpetuation and transmission. Since the socio-cultural system manifests some degree of tension vis-a-vis its environment, a range of permissible alternatives relative to the directional movement of the system, a set of selective criteria and a means of preserving and

maintaining some of the stabilities, the social system is never homeostatic or in a state of equilibrium. Rather, the socio-cultural system is capable of generating alternatives which are selected by decision making units. Thus, the sociocultural structures, regardless of its level of complexity may be generated, elaborated or maintained.

Finally, we might mention transactional theories, or those theoretical orientations which view cultural system as being comprised of members possessing "patterns of equivalence" or similarities in meanings attached to symbols or behaviors. These "patterns of equivalence" reflect the similarities in individual mazeways or the cognitive maps of positive and negative goals, self, others, material objects and of their possible dynamic interrelations in process, which an individual maintains at a given time. These mazeway equivalents are seen as a function or consequence of people living together closely in time and space and the extent to which they communicate with one another.

The relevance of transactional theory for the study of behavior in complex educational institutions becomes particularly clear when more carefully examining the specific relationships between personality and culture. A particular educational research problem, for example, may call for the investigation of specific behaviors of a limited number of individuals or all of the personnel in the school and the range of behaviors to be observed may likewise vary from one to many. Regardless of the number of individuals or behavior categories investigated, the researcher may choose to focus upon the beliefs, values or behavior potentials, or both. The patterned beliefs, values, or behavior potentials, most frequently investigated with the aid of projective devices and other psychological testing instruments, constitute the psycho-cultural system. The patterned phenomenological expression of these behavior potentials constitute the socio-cultural system.

C. In the above section we discussed three examples of meta level theories which represent types of theories one is forced to consider due to the complexity of urban educational institutions. In this section we intend to demonstrate how one might apply the established criteria for good theory in the selection and refinement of a theoretical model to formulate and guide the research of a hypothetical problem.

In the United States a great deal of time and money is devoted to utilizing organized physical activities in community development projects. This devotion of resources is based on the problematic hypothesis that involvement in such activities will lead to the acquisition of specific value orientations by minority group members. Let us assume that we are to launch a multi-phasic research program in a Southwestern community to determine the extent to which participation by Mexican-Americans in an organized basketball league results in any significant change in the value orientations of the participants. As part of this study, guided by a meta level theoretical orientation, we might be interested in determining how the participants define the object "basketball." In order to do this we must develop a theoretical understanding of the process of definition of objects by individuals.

To begin we might integrate two theoretical approaches, both of which are based on empirical research and logical abstraction. For instance we might combine the symbolic interactionist approach of sociologist Herbert Blumer, and the approach of psychologist Martin Fishbein. Blumer's thesis is that an object is defined by the way in which the individual acts or is willing or prepared to act toward it. However, as Fishbein's thesis points out the terms "willingness" or

"preparedness" bear no direct relationship to actual behavior. In fact, as a result of extensive research, Fishbein points out that there are at least three dimensions involved in manifesting behavior toward an object. These dimensions are: (1) attitude (affect), (2) belief (cognition), and (3) behavioral intent (conation).

By integrating the basic premise provided by Blumer, that the individual defines the objects in his world by the way he acts or is prepared to act toward them, with the distinction between components effecting behavior provided by Fishbein, we can more clearly conceptualize the components of the definitional process. In this way we can construct our research design and be prepared to deal with the multiplicity of factors involved in determining how each of the participants in our study defines the object "basketball."

Thus, in our brief illustration as to how one selects and applies relevant theories in research we have used two theories which satisfy our criteria for good theory, and we have integrated parts of each so as to produce a refined theoretical model which is logical, heuristic and can explain the phenomena observed.

IV. What considerations must be made in the selection of specific methods in light of the rigorous application of the established criteria for good methodology?

Two major factors of concern in selecting methodological techniques are presented under the criteria outlined in II.B. above. The essential point of appropriateness is that the methods used must obtain data that is pertinent to the theoretical focus of the study. Also, the researcher must be aware of the character of the data that these methods are capable of obtaining. Another essential principle is that of objectivity. Objectivity has been defined in

terms of the utilization of stipulated procedures which can facilitate independent duplication of results. Additionally, a consideration of size critically influences the selection of appropriate research methods.

Groups which are small enough to permit utilization of data gathering procedures with all members, permit employment of intensive interview, observation, psychodynamic analysis, and similar methods. Objectivity may be obtained with such procedures if one maintains rigorous control over standard stimuli (e.g. interview schedule, apperception plates, etc.) or standard focus in the process of analysis. Utilization of a carefully designed and rigorously applied coding manual permits quantification and comparative analysis of those otherwise qualitative data.

When dealing with populations which are too large to allow collection of data on/or from all of the individuals, one must consider sampling techniques. This means that one must consider randomization procedures to be sure that the data he is collecting is representative of the group or class of people being investigated. A fundamental consideration is whether one is collecting data from a random sample of the entire population, or from a random sample of groups in the total population. This consideration hinges on whether or not the researcher is concerned about patterns of the population or concerned with patterns of behavior within groups of that population. No unique problems arise, in addition to randomization problems, if the researcher is interested in a sample of the entire population. However, if the research project is concerned with patterns of behavior within particular groups among the total population, then one must be able to delineate those groupings. Once the population has been catagorized properly and adequately, one must use random sampling techniques to obtain a

representative sample of those catagories. After this is accomplished the researcher may treat these samples as he would a small group, and apply the appropriate methodological techniques. Having accomplished randomization, parametric statistical techniques may be applied to the data to allow some generalization to the total population or the catagories within that population.

The utilization of statistical procedures has application to social science data in that those procedures can indicate means and variances, and facilitate types of variance or factor analysis. When dealing with data from whole populations, the computation of the mean and the variance is direct. However, when dealing with samples the population mean and variance must be infered from the sample mean and variance. Differentiation must be made between the applicability of parametric or non-parametric statistical analysis on the basis of random samples or non-random samples respectively. In order to use parametric statistics one must design his research methodology to include random sampling. If, however, random sampling techniques have not been used the researcher must use non-parametric methods based on the median unless he can demonstrate mathematically that his sample data is equivalent to data from a random sample.

Beyond the two principle criteria for the selection of good methodology we have been concerned with the variable of population size as a determiner of specific methodologies appropriate to a specific research project.

V. What kinds of training experiences are necessary for students who wish to conduct research in education institutions?

Several areas of knowledge to which students must be exposed have been delineated in earlier sections of this paper. In this section we propose to suggest some additional types of instruction and experiences which we feel merit

inclusion in a model training program, and how these experiences might best be structured and sequenced.

Instruction in the areas of knowledge discussed under sections II, III, and IV are what we believe to be the essential core of any satisfactory training program. Understanding the general nature of inquiry in the behavioral sciences, as we have indicated, can best assist researchers to formulate interesting and significant research questions. The research of the problems formulated will be guided by the development and utilization of theories and methodologies consistent with the established criteria. If one cannot assume that graduate students have been exposed to these more substantive theoretical and methodological considerations, then the initial instruction in a graduate training program must compensate for these deficiencies.

Another essential training experience is exposure to a broad range of research in the behavioral sciences. Of particular importance is research which relates to and/or attempts to explain social change in large scale institutions, change strategies and the planning of social change, the relationships between socialization practices and adult personality, among other related topics. During this phase of the student's intellectual development exposure to specific research problems or areas of interest, and the research literature available relating to these areas will help provide the student with a degree of mastery over the subject matter which in turn will afford the student a sound basis for formulating his own research in the same general subject areas.

One of the most critical tests of the adequacy of a training program is whether the graduate can formulate a research question and apply established criteria for good theory and method when developing a research design that can be used to guide the investigation of the problem and explain the results. A

common complaint among graduates of training programs in the social sciences is that their training experiences were void of any practical experiences in the application of their knowledge and insights gained during their graduate careers. Before a student can begin his own research, however, he must have the ability to synthesize from the wide range of theories an appropriate theoretical framework that can be used to guide the research of a specific problem. Furthermore, since the phenomena to be investigated within an educational institution are complex he must have control of a variety of appropriate methodological techniques.

After a student has demonstrated his knowledge of theory and methods, and his ability to "pull-together" theory into a cohesive theoretical framework, he might be asked to pose an educational research problem of limited scope, construct a research design, carry out the research, and finally write up the findings. This task might be followed by a critical analysis by the student, with the assistance of his peers and instructors, of the research question and the theoretical and methodological strengths and weaknesses of the design used to guide the research. This kind of training would prepare the student for a much more difficult task such as designing a research project broad enough in scope to deal with a wide range of complex social phenomena. At this point, the student might be encouraged to think in terms of planning a research project in an educational institution involving an interdisciplinary team of researchers, each with his own particular skills. Thus the student would be forced into the position of carefully conceptualizing the total research effort and to articulate the efforts of all those contributing to the project.

Other than the dissertation, the student should be encouraged to complete one other major task. Culminating his formal graduate training the student should

write a position paper in which he attempts to summerize and explain his own theoretical position based upon all of his previous training and experiences as a graduate student. This task has the virtue of requiring the student to look at all aspects of his training program and forcing him to form his own theoretical and methodological framework. A paper of this nature would be useful in pointing out gaps in knowledge and areas of weaknesses to the student that should be corrected, and in forming the foundation for the dissertation.

In short, the training program must provide a strong foundation in theory and method, and practical experience in the formulation of a research problem which the student investigates.

VI. In this final section of our paper, we address ourselves to the basic problem that served as an impetus for this paper and for this conference; what can be done to improve research in complex educational institutions. As we outlined in the above sections of this paper, we perceived the answer not in terms of an articulation between anthropology and education, but in terms of understanding the complexity of educational institutions, and the theoretical and methodological questions which all students must consider if they are to scientifically investigate that complexity.

It should be noted that we have not called for the creation of a new interdisciplinary department or school. Instead, we have stated that the individual researcher must be aware of various important areas that guide his research; the nature of theory, explanatory power of adequate theory, productive and appropriate methods, and the implication of the data in terms of theory. The researcher with proper training, who is aware of these issues will provide the significant answers to the problem of improving educational research. He will

do adequate research whether he is called an educational researcher or an anthropologist.

We feel, in fact, that our orientation leads us away from speaking of articulating different research communities. The realities are that fairly rigid institutional boundaries do exist and are likely to persist and that articulation often results in a "cut and paste" method of approaching the problem. Hence, the problem becomes one of developing strategies for the proper training of researchers who have an understanding of the questions and issues brought forth in this paper. The penetration of the existing institutional barriers, or "the articulation between the anthropological research community and the community of educational researchers" will then be completed.

STUDIES IN THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF EDUCATION

1967-1970

A Bibliography

by Nancy Modiano

Abrahams, Roger D.

1970 Positively black. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.

Bailey, Beryl L.

1969 Language and communicative styles of Afro-American children in the United States. Florida FL Reporter 7 (1): 46,†.

Bovet, M.

1968 Etudes interculturelles du developpement intellectuel et processus d'apprentissage. Revue Suisse de Psychologie 27.

Brameld, Theodore

1968 Japan: culture, education, and change in two communities. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Burnett, Jacquetta

1968 Event analysis in the micro-ethnography of urban classrooms. Urbana, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois. Mimeo.

1969 Toward a theoretical framework for conceptualizing the relation of schools to cultural context. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

in press Patterns and process in student life. New York, Teachers College Press.

Cazden, Courtney and V. John

1968 Learning in American Indian children. In Styles of learning among American Indians: an outline for research. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Cohen, Rosalie

1969 Conceptual styles, culture conflict, and non-verbal tests of intelligence. American Anthropologist 71: 828-856.

Dillard, J. L.

1967 Negro children's dialect in the inner city. Florida FL Reporter 5 (1).

1968 Non-standard Negro dialects--convergence or divergence. Florida FL Reporter (6)

1969 How to tell the bandits from the good guys, or what dialect to teach? Florida FL Reporter 7 (1): 84-85 .

Eddy, Elizabeth M.

1967 Walk the white line. Garden City, New York, Doubleday.

Fishman, Joshua

1967 Language loyalty in the United States. New York, Humanities Press.

1969 The breadth and depth of English in the United States. Florida FL Reporter 7 (1): 41-43, .

Freire, Paolo

1967 Educación como práctica de la libertad. Caracas, "Nuevo Orden" Edicion .

Fuchs, Estelle

1969 Teachers talk; views from the inside. Garden City, New York, Doubleday.

Gay, John and M. Cole

1967 The new mathematics in an old culture. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Glick, Joseph

1968 Cognitive style among the Kpelle of Liberia. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

1969 Thinking about thinking: aspects of conceptual organization among the Kpelle of Liberia. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

Greenfield, Patricia M.

in pro- gress Intellectual development of Zinicantecan children. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, School of Social Relations.

Gumperz, John J.

1969 Social differences in verbal strategies. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

Jackson, Phillip

1968 Life in classrooms. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Jensen, Arthur R.

1969 How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review 39: 1-123.

Jocano, F. Landa

1968 Malitbog: education in a Philippine barrio. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Keifer, Christie W.

1970 The psychological interdependence of family, school, and bureaucracy in Japan. American Anthropologist 72: 66-75.

King, A. Richard

1969 The school at Mopass; a problem of identity. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kochman, Thomas

1969 "Rapping" in the black ghetto. Transaction 6 (4): 26-34.

Labov, William

1969a The logic of non-standard English. In Georgetown Monograph Series on Languages. and Linguistics (22), J. Alatis, editor. Reprinted in the Florida FL Reporter 7 (1): 60-74 .

1969b The study of non-standard English. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Leacock, Eleanor

1969 Teaching and learning in city schools. New York, Basic Books.

Maccoby, Michael and N. Modiano

1969a Cognitive style in rural and urban Mexico. Human Development 12: 22-32.

1969b The intellectual style of Mexican peasant children. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Salt Lake City.

in press The relevancy of schooling in a Mexican peasant village. In Education and culture (Revised edition), G. D. Spindler, editor. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Modiano, Nancy

1968a Bilingual education for children of linguistic minorities. América Indígena 28: 405-414.

1968b National or mother language in beginning reading. Research in the Teaching of English 2: 32-43.

1969 The Whorfian hypothesis among the poor. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 39: 296-297.

in press Bilinguals and reading: the Indian schools of the Chiapas Highlands. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Modiano, Nancy and M. Maccoby

1968 Cultural and social factors relating to learning development. Cooperative Research Report 6-8636, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Moore, G. Alexander, Jr.

1967 Realities of the urban classroom. Garden City, New York, Doubleday.

Parmee, Edward A.

1968 Formal education and culture change: a modern Apache Indian community and government education programs. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.

Petit, Patrick F. and M. Wax

1969 The urban school that receives the Indian migrant. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

Rosenfeld, Gerry

1969 Ethnography of slum school failures. Research in progress at Hofstra University.

Sindell, Peter S.

1968 Some discontinuities in the enculturation of Mistassini Cree children. In Conflict in culture: problems of developmental change among the Cree, N. H. Chance, editor. Ottawa, Canadian Research Center for Anthropology.

Singleton, John

1969 Cross-cultural approaches to research on minority group education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

Smith, Louis M. and W. Geoffrey

1968 The complexities of an urban classroom. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Spindler, George D.

1969 Urbanization and education in a rural German village. Mimeo.

Stewart, William

1969a On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In Teaching black children to read, J. Baratz and R. Shuy, editors. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics, pp. 156-219.

1969b Sociopolitical issues in the linguistic treatment of Negro dialect. In Linguistics and the teaching of standard English to speakers of other languages and dialects, J. Alatis, editor. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 22, Washington, D. C., Georgetown University, School of Languages and Linguistics, pp. 215-223.

Talbert, Carol

1969 A sociolinguistic analysis of spoken Black-American English in a classroom, related to pupil patterns of centrality and peripherality. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.

Tucker, G. Richard and W. E. Lambert

1969 White and Negro listeners' reactions to various American-English dialects. Social Forces.

Voyat, Gilbert

1970 Sioux children: a study of their cognitive development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis.

Wax, Murray, R. Wax, and R. Dumont

1969 Formal education in an American Indian community. Social Problems.

Warren, Richard L.

1967 Education in Rebhausen, a German village. New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Whitten, Phillip and J. Kagan

1969 Jensen's dangerous half-truth. Psychology Today 3 (3): 8, 66-68.

Wintrob, Ronald M. and P. S. Sindell

1968 Education and identity conflict among Cree Indian youth. Ottawa, Rural Development Branch, Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

Wolcott, Harry F.

1967 Anthropology and education. Review of Educational Research 37: 82-95.

1969 The elementary school principal; notes from a field study. Eugene, CASEA, University of Oregon.

Wolfram, Walter A.

1969 A sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro speech. Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Young, Virginia Heyer

1970 Family and childhood in a Southern Negro community. American Anthropologist 72: 269-288