DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 013   SO 005 740

AUTHCR   Dupuis, Mary M., Ed.; Mitzel, Harold E., Ed.
TITLE   The Place of Anthropology in a National Institute of
                Education. Report of a Planning Conference for the
                NIE Planning Unit.
INSTITUTION   National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
                Planning Unit.
REPORT NO   R-C105
BUREAU NO   BR-1-7059
PUB DATE   [73]
GRANT   OEG-0-71-3636(515)
NOTE   8p.; Report of a Planning Conference for the NIE
                Planning Unit

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Anthropology; *Comparative Education; Conference
                Reports; Cross Cultural Studies; *Educational
                Anthropology; Educational Development; *Educational
                Improvement; Educational Planning; Educational
                Problems; *Educational Research; Foundations of
                Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Social
                Sciences
ICENTIFIERS   Ethnography; *National Institute of Education;
                Nonformal Education

ABSTRACT
              The conference report recommends that NIE promote and
support ethnographic studies of education in cultures without schools
and in those where western schooling is being introduced. Since the
values of formal education are now in question and alternative
systems are being suggested, it is offered that non-formal
educational processes be examined by anthropologists who can guide
and carry out educational research. Informal interviews,
determination of the usages of languages and behavior unique to the
community, and other methods are advocated. By systematically
studying ethnographic materials we notice systems different from our
own in which skills, knowledge, and values are transmitted without
schools. It is also suggested that ethnographic research take place
in the classroom to explore social interaction in the school systems,
examining the administrative structure and the relationship between
school and community. Other topics briefly touched upon are: 1) a
suggestion for a post-doctoral NIE fellowship; 2) a listing of
special fields of anthropology most relevant to education; and 3) a
need for the development of a cross-cultural data bank on education
which would permit the cross-cultural testing of established ideas.
Appendices list human relations area file member institutions and
representatives who maintain ethnographic materials on societies.
Related documents are ED 047 167, SO 005 438, and SO 005 739.
(SJM)

Report No. C105

THE PLACE OF ANTHROPOLOGY

IN A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Report of a Planning Conference
for the NIE Planning Unit

Jacquetta H. Burnett, University of Illinois
Claudia M. Kernan, Harvard University
John Roberts, University of Pittsburgh
A. Kimball Romney, University of California, Irvine
Anthony F. D. Wallace, University of Pennsylvania
John W. M. Whiting (Chairman), Harvard University

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
Planning Unit

THE PLACE OF ANTHROPOLOGY
IN A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

The value of our present type of formal education in schools and colleges is no longer being unquestionably accepted. There is today in the United States considerable dissatisfaction with the educational system, both by parent and pupil. It is at the time of such dissatisfaction that research is most valuable, and it behooves social scientists to take some responsibility for helping to guide and carry out such research rather than leaving it solely to the professional educators.

THE STUDY OF EDUCATION IN
CULTURES WITHOUT SCHOOLS

If far-reaching innovations are to be made in our educational system, it is useful to review the evidence concerning the process of education on societies with school systems that differ markedly from our own and more particularly those in which the skills, knowledge and values of the culture are transmitted without schools. Since anthropologists have for the most part studied non-western cultures, a large body of ethnographic materials already exists on cultures that have no schools at all or in which the only formal education is provided by *rites de passage* or "bush schools." A casual glance at these data suggests that much of what is expected of the schools can be done as effectively, and sometimes more so, without them. The assignment of tasks such as fetching firewood and water, weeding the garden, herding cattle, preparing food and cooking, or sweeping the house and yard teach not only technology but also responsibility to family and community. The particular tasks assigned depend, of course, upon the basic economy of the culture, but in most non-school cultures, children of primary school age spend their classroom hours performing some task or chore that clearly contributes to the welfare of the whole family.

Caring for younger siblings is an almost universal task for the pre-adolescent child in non-school cultures. It is doubtful whether the most effective course in "social studies" could provide these children as good training in social responsibility and sensitivity to others.

Even history and philosophy can be transmitted informally. In many societies the old men retired from active life sit around the fire or under a shade tree recounting tales of the past—the oral history of their culture—or reciting myths and folktales with moral messages imbedded in them, and children are often found sitting on the outskirts of such groups. Western-type education may destroy this process. For example, an anthropologist studying the myths and oral history of a tribal group discovered that only men over fifty knew this material. Western education had been introduced forty years before. The better educated of the younger men knew the stories of the Bible, the Odyssey, the Battle of Hastings, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada, but not the folk history of their own culture.

Another striking thing about the educational process in non-school cultures is that learning occurs in context. A child learns to cope with his natural and social environment primarily by watching and imitating older children and adults and through trial and error while he is playing or performing tasks not intended to be educational. Little formal education occurs. By contrast, in the traditional American classroom the "real" world is shut out and information is piped in through symbolic packages. This indirect learning presents a much more difficult task for both the teacher and the pupil.

For the above reasons, therefore, a systematic study of the ethnographic materials already extant, together with new field work on the educational process in non-school cultures, should provide useful material to guide the modification and improvement of modern schooling. A collection of the ethnographic materials presently available on some 200 societies exists in the form of the Human Relations Area Files, copies of which are available at twenty different institutions (See Appendix B).

Cultures that are in the process of adopting schooling provide another invaluable source of information. They make it possible to compare children of the same age, sex, and cultural background who have and have not attended school. Recent studies that have taken advantage of this opportunity indicate its promise. The effects of schooling on cognitive styles is particularly illuminating. For example, Cole, *et al.* (1971) has shown that unschooled Kpelle from Liberia have a narrative style of remembering things, whereas our school system presumes that a taxonomy is the most effective mnemonic device. Bright Kpelle children were not doing well in school for this reason. Perhaps some of our ethnic minorities are not doing as well as they might

in school for similar reasons. We believe that NIE should promote and support ethnographic studies of education both in cultures without schools and in those where western schooling is being introduced.

USE OF ETHNOGRAPHIC METHOD

Random sampling procedures, test construction, control groups, reliability, and validity of measurement have been the stock in trade of educational research. These methods have been contributed by the disciplines of psychology and sociology. Partly because most anthropological research has been done in far away places and partly because anthropologists have not been explicit in formulating and describing their methods, the ethnographic method until recently has seldom been used in educational research. We believe that this is unfortunate, since there are certain questions that can best be answered by ethnographic techniques.

The continuous monitoring of the events that take place in a face-to-face community over a period of a year or more, the use of informant rather than respondent interviews, and the determination of the usages and meanings of words and behaviors that are unique to the community by observing their use in context are the most characteristic features of the ethnographic method. Also, since the anthropologist usually lives in the community that he is studying and participates in the life of its members, he is aware of the whole range of activities that take place. He is as interested in the daily routine of family life as with the sacred rituals. He watches mothers caring for their infants and fathers supervising their older sons in hunting, gardening, or herding. He probes the philosophy of the old and listens to the dreams of the young. It is a tenet of anthropological research that a reasonable knowledge of the total fabric of beliefs, values, and practices must be obtained before one can properly undertake the investigation of a special problem. We believe that research on the educational process in our society would profit from more frequent and more explicit use of the ethnographic method.

ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF THE CLASSROOM

Although achievement tests, teacher ratings, and learning experiments provide useful information, they do not tell us the nature of the social interaction that takes place in the classroom and which we believe must be known if one is to fully understand the learning process. This can only be done by attending class

meetings day after day and noting the interaction of the teacher with each of her pupils and the pupils with each other. Simply to observe interaction in the classroom, however, gives a very limited picture of the daily life of the participants. The ethnographic method would require the investigator to discover what the children and teacher were doing when they were not attending the class; what cliques and networks they belonged to; their ethnic, religious, and social affiliations; their recreational activities; their relationships to their families. In particular, the teacher should be treated as a friend, colleague, and ethnographic informant.

The ethnographic study of classroom groups that include children from multi-ethnic backgrounds should be particularly fruitful. The work of such scholars as Lebov and Kernan shows the importance of discovering the metaphors and styles of communication that are unique to each group. These styles are much more easily observed in the free social interaction of the playground than in the constraint of the classroom itself. It is not unlikely that the teacher also has her own style that may not be exact standard English. Failures of communication based upon such differences often interfere with the learning process and should be a part of the ethnographic record.

Such a study of a group of multi-ethnic children in a classroom should specify differences in the speech styles of members of the different ethnic groups represented so that the ability of a child speaking a dialect divergent from standard English can be properly judged. Traditional testing procedures are not designed to take account of such differences. Dialect differences have often been interpreted as language deficiencies. More appropriate methods of evaluating children should be possible if careful socio-linguistic studies of divergent dialects are carried out.

ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The school or school system rather than the classroom can provide another focus for ethnographic research. In this case, the administrative structure of the school would come under scrutiny. The relationship between the school and the community as illustrated by the constituency and policy of the school board and the PTA should be investigated. For such a study, it would be important for the ethnographer to attend and observe board meetings and to interview students, faculty, administration, and parents on matters of school policy and procedures.

The extracurricular activities of the students are another appropriate focus for an ethnographic study. Athletic teams, the dramatic club, the band, and sororities and fraternities should be studied not only as to their internal structure and function but also as to the educational effect of belonging to such groups. A sensitive observer should be able to report what a student has to learn to be a successful football or basketball player, and this report should include social as well as technical skills.

The ethnographic study of a community focusing on the educational process in its broadest sense is also worthy of study. In this case the focus would be upon the interaction between the school and other socializing agencies, such as the family, church, peer group gangs, and other sodalities such as the Girl and Boy Scouts, youth groups, etc.

With experimental educational programs appearing with increasing frequency, it is important to develop more efficient and valid methods of evaluating them. The ethnographic method has recently been used for program evaluation with some apparent success, but the exact procedures have not yet been formulated nor has this method of evaluation itself been evaluated. We believe that NIE should support research on procedures of evaluation which would include the ethnographic method.

A POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM FOR NIE

Since successful innovations often come from the creative imaginations of individuals who are freed from their routine responsibilities, we suggest that a post-doctoral fellowship program be instituted. This should be aimed at young behavioral scientists interested in educational problems. It should provide them with enough funds to excuse them from part of their teaching load and provide a small amount to cover research expenses. Applications for such a fellowship should consist of a simple statement of purpose. We recommend that NIE consider instituting such a program.

SPECIAL FIELDS OF ANTHROPOLOGY MOST RELEVANT TO EDUCATION

Like most disciplines, anthropology is divided into a number of fields of interest. Some of these are closer to the interests of education than others. The following should be noted as potential resources for NIE.

1. Educational Anthropology. The growing interest in education by anthropologists is reflected by the formation in 1968 of a National Association of Educational Anthropologists. Dr. Jacquetta H. Burnett is the current president of this association.

2. Psychological Anthropology. This field, originally known as "culture and personality," has recently expanded to include cognitive anthropology (which is concerned with a comparison of the mode of thinking used by peoples of different cultures) and comparative child development (research on the socialization practices and the behavior of children in other cultures).

3. Economic Anthropology. This field studies the relation of economic systems to other aspects of culture. In many developing nations, the cost of education represents a large proportion of the national budget.

4. Biological Anthropology. Research on the effects of climate, nutrition, and disease on the physical growth and intellectual capacities of children in the non-Western world is a concern of this field of special importance to education.

5. Socio-linguistics. This is a new field which includes both linguists and anthropologists. There has been a growing interest among members of this subfield in how children of other cultures learn their language.

CREATION OF A CROSS-CULTURAL DATA BANK ON EDUCATION

A world-wide cross-cultural data bank on education (cultural transmission, socialization) can be created with economy and dispatch and made readily accessible to scientists—anthropologists and others—nationally. Such a data bank would permit the cross-cultural testing of established basic ideas about educational processes, the social functions of educational institutions, etc. Many of these ideas, untested cross-culturally, now serve as foundations for educational theory and practice. The technical procedures for creating such a data bank are established, and close projections as to costs and time are possible. The bank would incorporate and refine materials from the Human Relations Area Files, the Ethnographic Atlas and the Cumulative Cross-Cultural Coding Center. To these it would add freshly coded material on several dozen variables related to educational research.

A conference should be called to examine closely the range of scientific utilities of such an undertaking for basic research in education.

APPENDIX A

THOUGHTS ON EDUCATION IN INSTITUTIONS OUTSIDE SCHOOLS

Jacquetta H. Burnett

Curiously, the question of education outside school settings very quickly led me to consider education in temporal terms as well as in "cross-sectional" terms. Certainly education is a lesser entity than learning but a greater entity than schooling. Moreover, education as an "entity" at any one point in time is not easy to conceptualize, except to think of individuals at certain points in their life cycles having experienced a certain amount of education, but anticipating more or less education during the rest of their life cycle. Indeed, there is probably no "whole entity" or unity "education" for a given culture, or even community, just as there is probably no unity of "learning" for a given culture or community.

In order to approach the logical distinctions among experience, learning, socialization, education, and schooling, one could put the relationships this way: experience > social experience, or there is always more learning than there is social experience; social experience > socialization, or there is always more social experience than there is socialization, i.e., role-relevant learning; socialization > education, or there is always more socialization, or role-relevant learning, than there is education, or deliberately-taught learning; and finally, education > schooling, or there is always more deliberately-taught learning in general than there is deliberately-taught learning within an organized set of relationships and activities that is a school. In other words, a school is an institution with the charter purpose of deliberately teaching certain specified semantic or cognitive domains of the culture (but with the qualification that not all that is deliberately taught is learned).

The question of nonschool education is concerned specifically with the last relationship, education > schooling, where education is the totality of what is to be deliberately taught. In its broadest sense, education includes anything that even one individual sets out to teach even to one other individual. While this is formal teaching in the broadest sense, it may seem far removed from the legally enacted curriculum at the other end of the continuum of formalism. We have trouble conceptualizing education in so far as we must depend upon the concept of formal vs. informal and purposive vs. nonpurposive behavior to define it. Yet at the moment I've no alternative to offer and I suggest that we go along for a time with a poor framework, rather than none at all, in order to get on with it.

Education is also commonly characterized by the examination of teacher role. There are at least three types of teacher roles. The first entails the identity relationship of teaching as a comparatively small part of the total status relationship; for example, mother, father, uncle, etc. The second teacher-type is a role that involves teaching as a large proportion of the identity relationships, and we could call them part-time instructors; for example, the dá zó of Vai bushschool in Africa. The full-time teacher specialist is one whose main occupational role is deliberate instruction. With the heavy focus on the teacher and the recognition of the diffuse nature of learning, the question of learning as an important part of role-identity relationships has not been well examined. Yet we should note well that in industrial state societies there are not only teacher-specialists but student-specialists as well, if we look at specialization within the framework or perspective of the life cycle.

Turning now explicitly to institutions other than schools that engage in deliberate instruction, one recognizes that from the family institution, to religious institutions, to economic institutions to what I would call communication (and entertainment) institutions, all engage in deliberate instruction to some degree. But in a complex industrial state, conceptualizing this wide dispersal of education is a difficult, indeed nearly impossible undertaking. One way to get a conceptual handle on it is to ask who teaches and who is taught. Thus, some "non-school" institutions engage in educating staff but not clients of the institution, for example, factories and industrial corporations. Some institutions engage in teaching clients but not staff, for example, churches (although religious systems often include school organizations as well as church organizations).

Who is Taught in Nonschool Institutions

Institution	Programmatic Deliberate Instruction		Apprenticeship Deliberate Instruction	
	Client	Staff	Client	Staff
Economic		X		X
Religious	X			X
Communication	X	(?)		X
Political	(?)			X

It is true that institutions other than schools engage in deliberate instruction by both the programmatic and apprenticeship methods. One is led to ask the question, how is the total educational task divided up? Actually, I find it so hard to conceive of the "total educational task" as an entity or unity that I think that question is unreal. Thus, the pious belief that all other institutions have turned over the greater part of their educational tasks to schools is merely a pious belief and not a realistic appraisal. Indeed, the total educational task in complex industrial societies has expanded at such a rapid rate that every institution's educational activities have been expanded, including educational, economic, communication, and religiou institutions. Not only family, but church and school have been sharing more and more of the tasks of deliberate instruction with other institutions.

In addition to these questions of the complementary relationship of activities in deliberate instruction among institutions, the contingency relationship there very much needs to be clarified. For example, along with the belief that the family had turned more and more deliberate instruction over to the school, there developed the related belief that instructional activities of the school were less and less contingent on familiar instruction of a deliberate nature. Research related to Head-Start programs during the 1960's reversed social scientists' stand on this question. Yet during the same period, there was a growing dependence upon, and ideological belief in, the contingency relationship between school instruction and entry into economic institutions. But efforts to expand directly the economic opportunities of disadvantaged minorities have raised serious questions about whether the relationship is real or merely a convention.

In another relationship deliberate instruction regarding buying habits, carried on by the communication institutions, has resulted in far-reaching unintended consequences in the subsistence sphere, namely life styles very destructive of the environment in which we live. On the other hand, non-deliberate instruction, or socialization, via entertainment activities of communication institutions, seems to have outpaced the deliberate instruction of both family and church, increasing vastly the unintended consequences from socialization and education. The success of relatively limited efforts at deliberate instruction via mass communication industries should alert us to the near crisis in the need for studies of the socialization effects of mass communication institutions. I would recommend rather heavy support for a five-year period to ethnographic studies of the use, and effect, of the reception of communication from TV, radio, and other mass communication channels, on children, youth, and adults. Survey studies based on input-output designs have simply not proven to be conceptually productive in these areas. Natural history studies, of which ethnographies are one type, should very definitely be supported.

Overall, the greatest need is for better conceptual frameworks for thinking about education in nonschooling institutions and their relationships to schools. This need will not be fulfilled by limiting support to the validity-testing type of research. There shou'd be heavy support for research directed toward theory development and theory grounding (see Glaser and Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory). Moreover, to be well grounded the effort should be very much concerned with cross-cultural and cross-national, comparative approaches.

APPENDIX B

HUMAN RELATIONS AREA FILE
MEMBER INSTITUTIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES

University of Chicago
    Mr. Robert R. Levine
    Department of Anthropology

City University of New York
    Dr. Melvin Ember
    Graduate Center

University of Colorado
    Dr. Ralph E. Ellsworth
    Director, University Libraries

Cornell University
    Mr. Hendrik Edelman
    Assistant Director, University Library

Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études & Maison des Sciences
de l'Homme
    Dr. I. Chiva
    Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Sociale, Collège de
    France

Harvard University
    Dr. John W. M. Whiting
    Department of Anthropology

University of Hawaii
    Dr. William P. Lebra
    Director, Social Science Research Institute

University of Illinois
    Dr. Joseph B. Casagrande
    Department of Anthropology

Indiana University
    Dr. Harold E. Driver
    Department of Anthropology

State University of Iowa
    Dr. Harvey E. Goldberg
    Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Kyoto University
    Dr. Shinichi Ichimura
    Center for Southeast Asian Studies

University of Michigan
    Mr. Joseph Jorgensen
    Department of Anthropology

State University of New York at Buffalo
    Department of Anthropology
    Dr. Raoul Naroll

University of North Carolina
    Mr. Richard Rockwell
    Department of Sociology

University of Oklahoma
    Dr. Joseph W. Whitecotten
    Department of Anthropology

University of Pennsylvania
    Dr. Ward Goodenoug
    Department of Anthropology

University of Pittsburgh
    Dr. George Peter Murdock
    Department of Anthropology

Princeton University
    Dr. David W. Crabb
    Director, Program in Anthropology

Smithsonian Institution
    Dr. Gordon Gibson
    Office of Anthropology

University of Southern California
    Dr. Roy Kidman
    University Librarian

Southern Illinois University
    Dr. Walter W. Taylor
    Department of Anthropology

University of Utah
    Dr. Harold W. Bentley
    Dean of Extension Division

University of Washington
    Dr. Simon Ottenberg
    Department of Anthropology

Yale University
    Mr. Rutherford Rogers
    University Librarian

Honorary Director
    A. Irving Hallowell