9 Anthropology Applied to Education

Nancy P. Greenman

Introduction

Anthropology applied to education constitutes a very broad and rich domain, especially when one remembers that schooling is just one of the places where education takes place. Anthropologists always have included at least some education in their ethnographic cultural studies. Enculturation, or the acquisition of culture, is a fundamental anthropological construct. How children learn to become successful adults participating in their culture is a question that concerns most ethnographers, and it is a question that leads to many approaches in the anthropological study of education (e.g., Pitman, Eisikovits, and Dobbert 1989). Classic studies about the relationship between mothers and their children explore how children are taught what is expected of them within their culture. This relationship can be seen, for example, in Elsie Clews Parsons's essays about Pueblo mothers and their children (collected in Babcock 1991), Margaret Mead's films, *Bathing Babies in Three Cultures* (1954) and *Four Families* (1960), and Martha Ward's *Them Children: A Study in Language Learning* (1986).

Educational anthropologists seek to understand education within its embedded cultural contexts. In this quest for understanding, epistemological questions, such as "What is considered important knowledge in this culture?," may become questions of curriculum and its importance in enculturation. Other questions, from the pedagogical to the political, illuminate various anthropological dimensions: How do children learn? How are they

taught? Where do they learn? Who are their teachers? How does change occur in education? What happens when children receive mixed messages from multiple cultures? Arenas, or domains of concern and interest, emerge from these larger questions.

Literacy, considered essential in educational circles, is a good example of an issue given depth through anthropology. Literacy is defined and redefined by anthropologists. Anthropologists, such as Bloomfield (1964), Bull (1964), Hymes (1964), and Lee (1976), have addressed the essence of literacy, what one must know of the implicit and explicit verbal and nonverbal dimensions of a language to be considered literate in a particular culture and of the use of vernacular language in education. Dell Hymes (1964) investigated the relationship between child-rearing philosophy and language learning and queried what linguistic ability must be acquired to become a competent member of society. Concha Delgado-Gaitan (1990) explored the relationship between literacy and empowerment. Marietta Saravia-Shore and Steven Arvizu (1992) questioned and rejected E. D. Hirsch's limited notion of "cultural literacy,"[1] and Dorothy Lee (1976) questioned the impact of literacy on a culture and its members.

My aim in this chapter is to provide an overview of anthropology and education and a feel for its complexity. I discuss what it is and briefly survey its history. I discuss the embeddedness of application in anthropology and education and the ambivalent attitudes toward advocacy and direct application. I then look at some areas of concern to educational anthropologists, drawing heavily from narratives of professionals who are currently practicing in the field.[2] In the chapter, there are embedded case studies and career trajectories of three prominent educational anthropologists. Anthropologists' relationships with the following topics of concern are discussed: (1) educational change; (2) cultural acquisition, social capital, and empowerment of culturally diverse parents; (3) equity, empowerment, and social justice in school systems and communities; (4) the impact on education for culturally and linguistically diverse populations; and finally, (5) application of anthropological methods to education, with examples of how practicing anthropologists use them. Ethnographic evaluation is included in this section about methods.

What Is Anthropology and Education?

The domain of anthropology applied to education is referred to variously as anthropology and education, anthropology of education, educational anthropology, and education in anthropology. Anthropologists generally prefer anthropology and education, but they do use the term educational anthropology as well. Anthropology and education includes the study of

anthropology in educational settings at all levels. Anthropology of education describes the anthropological study of education, but it implies a hierarchical relationship. For our purposes, I use the term anthropology and education and the term educational anthropology interchangeably. A great deal of applied educational anthropology currently addresses education in schools and classrooms, but some of the central tenets of all anthropology and education are context, education as enculturation (or acquisition of culture), and the intertwining of formal, nonformal, and informal education.

Exploration of parameters for these types of education might constitute part of the anthropology and education domain. Formal education is what we recognize as schooling. It is systematic and organized, with its procedures, rules, curriculum, and activities developed and imposed from outside the immediate educational context. Accountability in formal education also is imposed by an external authority. Nonformal education, according to Thomas La Belle, "refers to organized out-of-school educational programs designed to provide specific learning experiences for specific target populations" (1984, 80). This might include anything from English lessons for new immigrants to sailing lessons for new boat owners. Informal education is the lifelong acquisition of knowledge, skills, insights, attitudes, and experiences accumulated through a person's interaction with personal, social, cultural, and physical environments. Informal education can take place in formal educational environments if, noted Walter Precourt, "the rules governing educational activities and processes are generated from *within* the immediate context" (1982, 447).

Educational anthropologists apply anthropological constructs and methods to education in all of its contexts. Anthropologists generally consider educational anthropology as inherently applied, perhaps because education is such a complex institution, with its schooling dimension largely anchored in psychology, and because most educational anthropologists, even those in academe, are employed in educational rather than anthropological settings. Thus, educational anthropologists may be considered applied anthropologists simply by virtue of *being* educational anthropologists (Schensul, Borrero, and Garcia 1985). Harry Wolcott affirmed this status in his reflection on the field: "I guess I have never (or seldom, at least) thought of myself as an applied anthropologist. My anthropological colleagues do, of course, but my educator ones see my work as basic, except when I take on a specific assignment, and even there my work is summative" (2002a). John van Willigen provided the field with a broad definition in the statement, "applied anthropology is anthropology put to use" (2002, 7). He delineated domains of application as including information: raw data to general theory (providing information, making recommendations); policy (usually

providing information to policymakers); and action (interventions carried out by anthropologists) (11). Given this breadth of definition, anthropology and education is inherently an applied field.

Educational anthropology has made a great deal of progress as a field of anthropology. Its importance is recognized, at the very least, for a focus on recontextualization of education and on the importance of culture, yet it still struggles with aspects of the same issues it did in its early history.

Historical Perspective

The historical roots of anthropology and education reach back to the late nineteenth century: "It was then that the potential contributions of anthropology to pedagogy, the school curriculum, and an understanding of the culture of childhood were first recognized" (Eddy 1985, 83–4). In 1898, an article by Nina Vandewalker was published in *The American Journal of Sociology* stressing the significance of anthropology for education and the importance of creating a linkage between them (cited in Ford 1997, 27–8). At the turn of the twentieth century, according to Ford, anthropologist Edgar Hewett and educator/physician/anthropologist Maria Montessori also were advocates for connecting anthropology and education. Areas of focus were pedagogy and cultural influence on learning styles. Montessori, a professor of anthropology at the University of Rome, developed the concept of *pedagogical anthropology*. Pedagogy involves the science of teaching. Drawing from the contextual learning of children in their cultural milieu, she developed the Montessori method, advocating teaching through modeling and using planned interactive environments to foster learning by hands-on exploration and imitation. Montessori also initiated teaching lower-class children the cultural and social capital necessary to integrate into society. At the same time, philosopher and educator John Dewey was playing with some of these same concepts in American education.

Historically, when educational issues were considered and teachers were trained, culture and context were relegated to the periphery by the grounding of education in psychology. In 1957, Theodore Brameld noted:

> Educational sociology, philosophy, and similar fields are still regarded as of subordinate importance [to psychology in teacher training] if they are studied directly at all. . . . Without question, the new field of educational anthropology is ignored by a still larger number. One may doubt whether the average prospective teacher, through no fault of his own, could clearly define anthropology, much less demonstrate familiarity with its subject matter or its significance for his professional work. (Cited in Ford 1997, 38)

In the years between 1925 and 1954, anthropologists such as Bronislaw Malinowski, A. R. Radcliff-Brown, Jules Henry, Solon Kimball, and Margaret Mead applied anthropology to developing educational policy and administration as well as to finding solutions for other educational problems, especially where indigenous populations were colonized or oppressed by a dominant culture. The psychological orientation of the culture and personality movement in anthropology and, later, in cognitive anthropology appeared to have direct relevance to educational issues and child development, or at least to find kindred spirits in educational psychology. This opened another door for applied anthropology.

Each time the eugenics movement surfaced, anthropologists entered the debates about the nature of intelligence, the relationship of nature and nurture, and how children learn and develop, all of which have important implications for education, policy development, and attention to diversity in education. Eugenics is the practice of controlling human reproduction with the intent to refine and strengthen hereditary factors deemed desirable. It is informed by the belief that the human race would improve if some people were prohibited from mating and others were encouraged to do so. Sterilization of people having physical and character traits considered undesirable is justified by purported altruistic concern for humanity. It perpetuates racism, prejudice, and sexism under the guise of science. Early twentieth century intelligence testing and pseudoscientific experiments differentiating mental capacities of "races" and genders arose in response to the great influx of immigrants at the turn of the century. Franz Boas presented policy research in efforts to dispel the racist sentiments embedded in and proliferated by this pseudoscience.

The racist theories spawned by dissemination of these skewed research study results often inspired well-meaning, though ill-informed, initiatives such as the 1930s and 1940s philanthropic American efforts in Africa to educate the "backward races" by exporting industrial and vocational education.[3] In addition to the work of Boas, applied anthropologists worked on many fronts to rectify damage done through these initiatives and to influence more enlightened foreign policy. Often there was controversy in anthropology as to whether this work effected support of colonial administrations or aided in ameliorating a bad situation (van Willigen 2002, 9). Through various governmental agencies, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), applied anthropologists consistently attempted to influence policy surrounding issues affecting indigenous and immigrant populations in America, especially with fluctuating political attitudes toward immigration and toward the rights and survival of indigenous nations. Depending on the larger historical contexts, anthropologists applied their specialized knowledge

and insight to various dimensions of educational issues and policy, defining the relationship of anthropology to education and loosely shaping the parameters of educational anthropology.

The post–World War II influx of diverse veterans into higher education sharpened a focus on culture and education. An apparent turning point in the development of anthropology and education as a professional field was the 1954 Stanford-Carmel Valley Conference, organized by George and Louise Spindler. This conference was a gathering of 22 scholars—anthropologists, educationists, sociologists, and psychologists—presenting and discussing papers about the benefits of anthropology and education. Four concerns emerged as themes of the conference: (1) the search for a rationale and encompassing philosophy for the anthropology and education relationship, (2) sociocultural contextualization of the learner, (3) education—teaching and learning—in relation to the life cycle, and (4) intercultural learning and understanding involving the affective as well as the cognitive realms (Spindler 1984, 4). These themes became strands in the fabric of the newly forged field of anthropology and education. Annette Rosenstiel, an anthropologist at the Stanford meeting, "not only proposed a linkage between the two fields but suggested that they be used as a new interdisciplinary approach in the analysis of culture. She called this approach educational anthropology and was the first to coin this term" (Ford 1997, 32). Educational philosopher Theodore Brameld, who also attended the Stanford symposium, published widely (including in the first Spindler *Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches* volume in 1963), urging recognition of the mutual benefits of collaboration between anthropology and education.

Another major turning point in educational anthropology was the formation, in 1968, of the Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE), which became a section of the American Anthropological Association (AAA). The evolution of its newsletter, initiated in 1970, into a scholarly journal contributed credibility to the field. John Singleton, the first editor of the newsletter, explained of the publication: "Originally a device for the encouragement of a network of anthropological interests in education, it has become a scholarly and, sometimes, respectable journal" (Singleton 1984, 11). The editorial focus changed through the years, but John Chilcott, the editor who brought the publication from a newsletter to the journal *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* (*AEQ*) emphasized that, at least from 1973 to 1976, the editorial focus "sought to meet the requirements of professionals in *both* anthropology and education" (Chilcott 1984, 69). That balance has shifted in various directions through the years—sometimes with controversy—as more educators have joined the CAE and more educational anthropologists have graduated from anthropology and education university programs.

The 1960s and 1970s brought a shift in approaches to anthropology and education. Identification of a "culture of poverty" and the subsequent funding for "War on Poverty" programs and research were buoyed by cultural and linguistic deprivation theories, identifying those who were different as being deficient in some way. The educational cure was perceived as a middle-class white education (Ward 1986, v). In 1964, Murray and Rosalie Wax and Robert Dumont Jr. published a critical ethnography revealing the insensitivity to an educational pluralism that could exist. In the reissue of this volume, Murray Wax stated:

In my observations and analysis, I pondered what might be authentic as education for the Oglala. . . . As I looked at the reservation schools, I saw them as preaching a single mythical and homogenized version of America, whereas the Sioux had every right to ask that their children be socialized into their own unique ethos. This is what gave to this report a cutting edge too often lacking in other ethnographic studies, and—to be honest—it is why the reviewer in the *American Anthropologist* perceived our report as "hysterical." (Wax, Wax, and Dumont 1989, x)

Alan Howard's 1970 ethnography, *Learning to be Rotuman*, was one of the first general ethnographies to have education at its core. Martha Ward's study (1986) in language learning in a rural African American community in 1971 looked outside the schools, focusing on learning in the home and community. Gerry Rosenfeld's 1971 ethnography focused on an inner-city school. These ethnographies represented a significant historical shift in approach and focus as well as an opening of domestic sites for study in educational anthropology.

At times there is a tension surrounding differing perceptions of where the CAE and the *AEQ* should focus, be it domestic or international, in school or community, on research or direct application. Sometimes that tension is between what is considered important from an educator's point of view and what may be considered important from the point of view of an anthropologist. At other times the tension may be between what is considered the role of an anthropologist and the place of applied anthropology and advocacy. The focus of study for educational anthropologists is reflected in the editorial focus of the *AEQ*, which shifts among schooling within institutions and in classrooms, education within and encompassing communities, education in nonmainstream and international cultures, and research studies emphasizing the theoretical and the applied. Recent efforts are inclusive of the multiple interests and the diversity of focus in the CAE and the *AEQ*.

The CAE currently has 12 standing committees that allow for the differences in focus and that define some of the broad arenas of concern to

educational anthropologists. Committee members have changed the names of their committees when they have an internal shift of focus, a broadened mission, or when the sociopolitical context changes. For example, Committee 3 used to be called Teaching of Anthropology, and Committee 6 was the Joint CAE/Society for Applied Anthropology Policy Committee on Culture and Bilingual Education. According to *AEQ* (2003), current committees are:

1. Anthropological Studies of Schools and Culture
2. Language, Literacy, and Cognition
3. Anthropology of Post-Secondary Education
4. Ethnographic Approaches to Evaluation in Education
5. Transnational Issues in Education and Change
6. Multicultural and Multilingual Education
7. Blacks in Education
8. Spanish-Speaking Concerns
9. Gender in Schools and Society
10. Culture, Ecology, and Education
11. Study of Cultural and Educational Futures
12. Study of Cultural Transmission/Acquisition

These lay out the terrain. There is applied work in each of these arenas, as well as in territory shared with other anthropological applications, such as education in museum anthropology or medical anthropology. Additionally, some issues tie committees together for various periods of time. Some committees have more consistently encouraged advocacy.

Advocacy in the History of Applied Educational Anthropology

The ebb and flow of applied educational anthropology's popularity may be tied to sources of funding and to fluctuations in the job market, but entrenched attitudes toward the relative respectability of applied anthropology, as well as the subfield's trend toward advocacy, have contributed to its status and the consequent nature of its popularity.

Advocacy is the championing of a cause, perspective, position, or people; it is speaking or writing in favor or support of something. Because advocacy implies making a choice based on some criterion or criteria, it also implies bias. Advocacy in itself may be considered a positive thing, usually guided by a moral imperative and ethical choice, but we attach a negative value to it in our society when we associate it with bias because we associate bias with a lack of objectivity and with the nonscientific. The fact that physicists have for

several decades been telling us that true objectivity is an illusion seems to have little deterrent impact on the defining and redefining of what is objective—and therefore scientific. A prime example is the recent determination of what qualifies as "scientific" for funding educational research, which has severe negative implications for ethnography and other qualitative research methods that are often erroneously considered anecdotal and unscientific.

The impetus for advocacy may grow from an immediate need for protection and survival, or it may evolve from working with the complexity and embeddedness of education. For example, we recognize the acquisition of culture, primary in notions of education, as occurring everywhere—including in schools. One cannot assume that critical thinking, empowerment, and individuality are believed healthier than acceptance and conformity. Joe Tobin and colleagues (Tobin, Wu, and Davidson 1989) noted in their study of preschool in three cultures that when confronted with the concept of "giftedness," Japanese teachers defined it as "fitting in" rather than "standing out." The extremes on the continuum of connectedness, for which we educate members of society, might be like the one-minded Borg of *Star Trek* on one end and individualism to the point of anarchy on the other.

Educational anthropologists know that beliefs about what is best for "the good society" and what is envisioned as "the good society" vary between and within cultures. Are social justice, equity, and unity-in-diversity integral to that vision, or are other conceptions supported by embedded assumptions foremost? One cannot live in these times without realizing that notions of good or effective education are disparate. The choices for educational policy usually reflect the assumptions and perceptions of the powerful and do not necessarily benefit all.

Educational anthropologists address the full spectrum of educational issues, and, like all human beings, however much they may believe everyone has a right to her or his own perspective, they perceive some approaches and outcomes as better than others. Selecting one perspective as more valued—indicating the desirable path—is advocacy.

For example, in the case of children whose culture and first language are different from those of the dominant group, or in the case of immigrants in new host cultures with new languages, there is a range of responses perceived as most advantageous for the children. There are educational anthropologists who advocate a "maintenance" bilingual and multicultural education program, others who advocate for "transitional" bilingual education programs and cultural accommodation, and yet others who believe it is in the best interest of the culturally different immigrant families to be required to learn the dominant language so that the children can assimilate and be able to navigate their host culture with ease and little or no stigma.[4]

Each of these advocacy positions is based on the interpretation of specialized knowledge. We have learned from history and experience that just offering the "facts" does not ensure that everyone will come to what may be considered the wise conclusion. Our specialized knowledge is a referent for assumptions about what should be the position of advocacy.

The degree of our advocacy—whether implicit or explicit—might depend on the context, our position in it, and the surrounding political climate, but there is always an agenda, even if it is simply to empower a community to have its own agenda or evaluate a program or policy in light of goals and assumptions. Concha Delgado-Gaitan said:

> The way that I work with community is applied. Through my role as a participant-observer, I have become actively engaged with the communities where I research to act as a "facilitator." By doing so I am able to act as an advocate for the families, using research data to inform and develop agency for the people as they shape policies and practices in the schools and the community at large to improve their living conditions. (2002)

Donna Deyhle noted, "Applied anthropologists, by the very nature of their work, attempt to put into action their research findings to assist the informants and the communities in which they work" (1998, 44).

Most teachers believe they are advocates for children. Most educational anthropologists, some of whom also are teachers, believe their specialized knowledge makes them potentially more effective advocates for children and for amelioration of the issues having an impact on their success within their micro- and macro-sociocultural contexts. Advocacy is virtually embedded in anthropology and education.

The tradition of advocacy in work with education of culturally diverse and indigenous groups is quite strong. Contemporary educational anthropologists build on the foundation of earlier applied anthropologists. Theresa McCarty, advocate for Navajo indigenous education, community empowerment, voice, and identity on the path to social justice, explained:

> I long ago stepped "over the line" between researcher, writer, and friend, a line that is, I believe, artificial and obstructive to long-term ethnographic and applied research and that, at any rate, would have been impossible to sustain with this small, kin-centered community. (2002, 3)

McCarty's comment is more than a statement of method; it is a declaration of connectedness that holds within it embedded advocacy. Donna Deyhle

also assumed an advocate's role through her research. In 1998 she explained the path of multiple roles in her years of research with Navajos in a Mormon community school district.

> After I had been in the field for 2 years, listening, observing, and learning, I moved into an informed advocacy role. At first my efforts started with writing a dropout prevention grant and providing in-service training for teachers and parents. Four years later, my role has moved to the position of expert witness for the Office for Civil Rights, the Justice Department, and a Navajo civil case. (44)

However much advocacy is an integral part of applied anthropology, historically it has held a tenuous, if not subordinate, role in general anthropology. Entrenched attitudes toward the relative respectability of applied anthropology and the commitment to advocacy contributed to its variable status and consequent popularity. Spindler (1984) explained that there was a distancing from offering advice and a striving toward objectivity. He suggested that "Kroeber would try to avoid personal biases and moral judgments but would agree that an analysis of the effectiveness of an educational program in light of its declared goals and in comparison to alternative procedures would be acceptable anthropological behavior" (1984, 4). Advocacy, however, was discouraged because it was considered to be outside the parameters of proper anthropological behavior. Spindler summed up the Stanford Conference participants' strong feelings, indicating that "anthropologists could study and report on educative process and systems, but they should refrain from advocating specific policy decisions, since these are essentially political and administrative domains" (1984, 4).

Historically, however, the CAE has taken a stand on controversial issues and advocated for equity, diversity, and amelioration of problems threatening education. Inspired variously by the CAE Committee on Spanish-Speaking Concerns and collaboration between the CAE and the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) Policy Committee on Culture and Bilingual Education, the CAE passed resolutions in 1974, 1978, and 1981, advocating for equity in education and the rights of culturally diverse students in education. Of the resolutions, Marietta Saravia-Shore and Steven Arvizu indicated:

> They are succinct summaries of anthropologists' suggestions to educators concerning the significance of becoming aware of and taking into account their own cultural expectations, perspective, and interaction patterns and those of their students. The resolutions also state clearly . . . concern for respecting and attending to cultural and linguistic differences in educating students of diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds and

ensuring that members of the community participate in decision making concerning the education of their children. (1992, xvii)

These issues continue to be in the forefront of educational policy debates.

The 1980s brought more explicit pleas for direct application of anthropological research to educational practice and policy. Courtney Cazden recalled only "two clear examples . . . where ethnographers . . . not only described problems but . . . stayed to collaborate with teachers in designs for change" (1983, 35). Jean J. Schensul shared her belief that "the cutting edge in our field lies in the expansion of educational anthropology from the university into local communities, school systems, and other learning settings" (1985, 64). Yet she noted that

> [i]n educational anthropology, the tradition of research and demonstration, of testing theory through practice, is limited. Most accounts of application in education presented by anthropologists focus on evaluation, the uses of ethnographic research methods in the classroom, or ways of teaching teachers to use ethnography to understand their students. (66)

Schensul suggested that the questions educational anthropologists need to address, such as those involving equity, race, and location of power, were considered outside the boundaries of what was acceptable because they required intervention or advocacy, rendering them controversial and biased.

Current official attitude toward advocacy, reflected in American Anthropological Association policy, provides more professional comfort for those educational anthropologists who have, especially since the 1970s, urged advocacy in shaping policy and programs to reflect anthropological insight and to foster equity and social justice. The rhetoric has changed, and there certainly are many more anthropologists advocating change, but there still exists ambivalence toward application and advocacy. Providing a historical perspective, Donna Deyhle, herself committed to advocacy, warned, "Advocacy work . . . can have negative repercussions on both the work of the anthropologist and on the local participants" (1998, 44). Issues surrounding advocacy are themselves complex. Reflecting on advocacy in her work with the Navajo Nation and Mormon school community, Deyhle posed:

> From the advocacy position of critical theory, critique and transformation are goals of research. But what voice does one listen to in complex communities? What does *transformation* mean when one group's core religious beliefs require the transformation of the other group against its will? Ethically, what does taking sides, or advocacy, mean in com-

plex communities? What happens when research results are used by the powerful to serve their own means, rather than to empower the powerless, as the researcher intended? (1998, 46)

Advocacy, precarious in the field, also remains precarious in the academy. Rosemary Henze (2003) warned that "One has to be willing to risk academic marginalization because one is doing something very *applied*, and this is still not well accepted or valued in the higher education industry."

Advocacy has moved to a larger arena within the AAA. Contemporary advocacy against eugenics issues focuses on recognition of race as a socially constructed concept. Educational anthropologist Yolanda Moses brought this issue to the fore during her 1995 to 1997 tenure as AAA president-elect and president. Education of the general public and of teachers and students through videos to be used in schools and on television grew from initiatives throughout the AAA.

The public policy segment on the AAA's Web site has a section specifically addressing *Culture and Diversity in Education*. This site delineates such areas of concern as the improvement of schooling, policies surrounding standardized testing (and its uses and meaning), the *culture* of schools, equity, the relationship of violence in media to violence in the schools, demographic shifts and the impact of immigrant influx on education, policies surrounding bilingual and multicultural education, affirmative action, and learning technology in cultural context. The Web site lists three education-related goals of the Committee on Public Policy:

1. To identify anthropologists who are studying culture and diversity in education;
2. To determine the state of knowledge and to identify gaps in knowledge that need to be filled; and
3. To assist policymakers and those engaged in related research in understanding the social and cultural factors affecting education policies. (AAA Committee on Public Policy 2004)

It is the third of these that has potential for direct application. The policy committee is in the process of forging an administrative structure among the AAA, the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA), and the SfAA in establishing a Center for Public Policy, the very core of which will be advocacy and direct impact on specific issues, including educational issues (Thu 2004).

The CAE continues to be a strong voice for the field. It sponsors a large block of sessions at annual AAA meetings, and it raises issues of concern for discussion and resolutions on its Listserv and other forums. In 2004 the CAE took a firm stand to support locked out workers at the proposed AAA

San Francisco meeting by holding its own meeting at another San Francisco hotel and inviting other AAA sections to join it.

Because the majority of educational anthropologists work in educational contexts, they maintain their viability by linking with special interest groups (SIGs) in the American Educational Research Association. Members of the Council on Anthropology and Education are prominent members of the Anthropology Education Commission, which was established in 1999 by the American Anthropological Association. The charge of the commission is to integrate anthropology—issues, concepts, and methods—into all levels of education, pre-kindergarten through adult education. The thought is that public understanding of anthropology will increase, and anthropology will help improve education (AAA 2004). Thus, advocacy in educational anthropology has moved beyond its traditional boundaries and promises to build momentum toward making a difference in education.

For those of us who are proponents of advocacy, it is good news that explicit advocacy is developing in educational anthropology—though in some venues political awareness shapes the nature of that advocacy. After navigating advocacy with varying degrees of efficacy, educational anthropologists seek ways to participate in shaping public policy and public debate that invite connection rather than instigate—however inadvertently—reaction. This may occur in the arena of systemic school reform or diverse student success in an era of widespread standards-based, culture-bound, test-driven pseudoreform that appears to reinforce inequity rather than ameliorate it.

But, advocacy-inspired change is occurring in pockets. Hugh Mehan has shifted to primarily applied work such as the CREATE (Center for Research on Educational Equity, Assessment and Teaching Excellence) program in San Diego. Rosemary Henze's Leading for Diversity program is gaining momentum in the schools. Other pockets of change exist due to passionate advocacy by educational anthropologists.

All of the areas discussed in the remainder of this chapter involve such transformation of education in schools and communities. All of the work looks toward understanding cultural and interactional dynamics and creating a shift toward equity, empowerment, and social justice. Some of the areas overlap, but for the purpose of discussion, they are identified as discrete entities.

Educational Change

Systemic educational reform and restructuring is an issue that, since the late 1970s, has gained increasing attention among educational anthropologists. Initially, the term restructuring, as applied in education, meant substantial

change in how we conceive of and do education; it encompassed reinvention and deep structural change. However, the term has been appropriated, and its meaning has become variable, and it is at times synonymous with downsizing. The nature of the issues also has changed through the years, and the issues vary depending on whether the focus is international or domestic. On the international front, Susan Jungck's extensive unpublished work in fostering and facilitating change and restructuring of education in Thailand is disseminated within Thai educational systems and continually has a direct impact on Thai educational policy. Jungck often shares her work with other educational anthropologists at professional meetings. Some educational anthropologists working internationally may address educational changes imported from Western education. Anthropologists take a contextualized look at the impact of imported child-centered philosophy and pedagogy and engaged learning on various differently structured cultures; these constructs are thought to be inherently superior and ideal by many Western educators. Other educational anthropologists work in various capacities for government agencies, the United Nations, or nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

For American education, the 1970s seemed to provide a window of opportunity to address significant changes in educational organizational structure, with profound shifts in approaches to leadership, accompanied by empowerment of teachers, students, and parents. My own work in this area grew out of frustration from encountering rigid barriers in my efforts to create emergent, interdisciplinary, and multicultural curricula in a culturally diverse Southwestern community. Using several small grants from the Cultural Awareness Center of the University of New Mexico, I developed and implemented innovative elementary education programs addressing cultural diversity in New Mexico. For the Education Division of the Museum of New Mexico, I developed a videotape about using traveling museum kits to integrate culture into an interactive, interdisciplinary curriculum. Eventually, my doctoral dissertation addressed sociocultural and philosophical barriers to educational change. I focused on the entrenchment of worldview in educational structures (Greenman 1994). As a consultant to the superintendent of the district where I had taught, I analyzed plans for restructuring and wrote the preliminary report for the school district's first yearly School Improvement Plan efforts.

Educational anthropologists involved in educational change are employed in a wide range of venues such as school districts, universities, privately funded centers for change, and think tanks. G. Alfred Hess, Jr. was, for many years, executive director of the Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance, where he had direct input to school policy. The Chicago Panel was made up of 20 nonprofit agencies comprising a

multiethnic, multiracial coalition with a focus on Chicago public education improvement (Hess 1991, xvii). Even before he was hired by the Chicago Panel, Hess was directly involved in policy development and implementation in the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). He engaged in planning for Mayor Harold Washington's Educational Summit in the fall of 1986. Hess was instrumental in crafting legislation that created the Chicago School Reform Act in 1988. According to Hess, "The act fundamentally changed the structure of public education by creating Local School Councils consisting of two teachers, six parents, two community representatives, the principal, and, in high schools, a nonvoting student" (Hess 1991, 1). One of the central tenets of the restructured CPS governance was participatory decisionmaking and decentralized authority, intended to empower the community. Unfortunately, the full promise of the Chicago school restructuring for improvement has not yet come to fruition. Currently, Pauline Lipman, who has written extensively about inequity in school restructuring—and, more specifically, Chicago school reform (2002, 1998)—is advocating against the most recent privatization initiative in Chicago.

For urban educational change, concerns about inequity and location of power in decisionmaking fuel educational anthropologists' focus. In an e-mail communication, Patrick McQuillan elucidated how this focus might translate to the work of an educational anthropologist working in academe:

[A]s long as we remain ignorant of the enormity and complexity of the challenges that confront urban schools, we will never create a truly equitable educational system.

With this overarching concern in mind, I consider . . . interrelated areas [e.g., the "achievement gap," low income, native language, race/ethnicity] to be of tremendous importance. . . . [T]oo often we treat schools as though "all students are created equal" and distribute resources accordingly.

Research is therefore needed in two areas, at least. First, to assess which programs and policies work effectively in situations of concentrated poverty. And second, to provide data on the impact these populations have on schools. This information could then be used in a court of law to argue that such schools, because they face additional challenges, should receive disproportionate funding. (This has already occurred in some states.) As funding systems are currently structured, relying so extensively on property taxes, those schools with the least need tend to have the most resources.

A final focus for me is that of involving students in school governance and in shaping their education. In most instances, educational opportunity is defined for students, not by them. . . . When I began research with CES [Coalition of Essential Schools] . . . my colleague

and I took a decidedly theoretical, rather than applied, stance toward our work, in part because that is what CES wanted. . . . We did not offer any specific recommendations. We mainly tried to create a rich description of what was happening in member schools. Nonetheless, our descriptions were, to varying degrees, used by CES schools and staff members. . . . Thus, our research had an impact, albeit indirect.

I am about to embark on a study of a Boston public high school. This time, I intend to have a more direct impact on the school, although I consider it presumptuous to state this goal. Schools are not easy places to change, especially for someone with no formal authority working from outside the school system. However, at this point in my career I think I know enough about research, schools, and educational reform to be explicitly applied. . . . (2002)

Educational anthropologists conduct research to understand how change in educational institutions can occur, and they are persistent in seeking ways to have an impact on improving education. Lisa Rosen's current work at the University of Chicago's Center for School Improvement examines how anthropological research can contribute to innovative institutions that support urban school improvement. She works with a recursive model to have an ongoing impact on changes in professional roles, norms, and practices, that is, to examine how individual and organizational learning, as well as shifts in professional culture, occur (2002).

Educational change, reform, and restructuring may focus on institutional and structural changes but, as was evident in the above examples, include concerns about the locus of power in conceptualizing and implementing those changes. Empowerment of teachers, students, parents, and invested community members is hotly debated. These are areas that lend themselves to advocacy for educational anthropologists.

Cultural Acquisition, Social Capital, and Empowerment of Culturally Diverse Parents

Cultural acquisition is a fundamental anthropological construct that quite naturally falls into the domain of anthropology and education. Anthropological study of cultural acquisition has been approached from many perspectives, including linguistic (Hymes 1964; Ward 1986) and the perspective of mothers' relationships with their children in the sociocultural context (Babcock 1991; Mead 1960; Bateson 1994). Mary Anne Pitman, Rivka A. Eisikovits, and Marion Lundy Dobbert (1989) described cultural acquisition as a "holistic approach to human learning" with a focus on the processes of learning in cultural context. As they so succinctly explained, cultural acquisition

is a concept much broader than schooling, than informal teaching and learning, than childraising, or even than cultural transmission. Certainly in many societies parents and other adults do a considerable amount of directing, teaching, and shaping, all of which is designed to transform children into desirable adults. But for humans, as for other primates, instructive and formative activity constitutes a very minute part of the learning process. Instead, the major forces "shaping" children and young people in the process of culture acquisition are the same as those that shape or direct all learners, namely, the structures and processes of the entire sociocultural life going on around them. In addition, the process of culture acquisition by which children and young people learn to be fully functioning adults is a holistic one. One does not become a mature adult by sequentially learning the separate elements of adult life and then putting them together to form a whole, nor does one survive as a competent old person through that process. Rather, the junior members of a society or a social group learn whole patterns within the context of everyday life and then in personal action they individualize and adapt these patterns by varying some of the elements or creating new ones. (3)

Harry Wolcott said that he believes cultural acquisition to be *the* central construct in educational anthropology.

The [primary] aspect of my work, encompassing the other [aspects] as well, is cultural acquisition, including cultural transmission but focusing more on the learner than on the transmitter. I have been writing about this theme in articles over the years and have now completed a book that draws some of this work together in a case study that begins with an ethnographic autobiography of an out-of-school youth. The book, *Sneaky Kid and Its Aftermath,* incorporates the title of an article originally published in 1983 and brings the story up to the present, with its subtitle, *Ethics and Intimacy in Fieldwork.*

Cultural acquisition is the banner that I have proposed as the core topic for our efforts in anthropology and education: a focus on how individuals acquire and act out their unique versions of culture. The topic does not preclude all the other things that go on in anthropology and education, including studies of the social organization of schools or the enactment of formal educator roles. But it is a far broader charter: a focus on what and how as individuals we learn from the cultural influences surrounding us. It takes a broader look, to study not only what educators are doing, and what children are learning in schools, but inquiring into what [each] of us learns in our out-of-school lives as well. It is not school-focused; it is person-focused. It is not focused on school-age students or professionally trained teachers but on all human

beings, anywhere, and how they have come to act, and more or less want to act, as their fellow participants want and expect them to act. This is not "applied" work per se; rather, it is a broad issue that guides the particular questions we pursue and gives the anthropological perspective we want to bring.

Educational researchers do a thorough job of assessing what is learned in school—almost too thorough a job from an anthropological point of view, since they can and do ignore what else is learned, or what is not learned, or what is learned that negates the formal learning taking place. But far more important is to place the learner in a broader context so that school itself—even when achieving its stated purposes—is never more than part of the entire picture. That charter provides an endless assignment. Educational anthropologists need to confine their purposes to the questions being asked and the assistance they can offer, but they must stay tuned to their orientation of what *is* while others concern themselves with what might be. Thus even the most applied of educational projects will find its anthropologist asking about, or at least wondering aloud, how the system works now, what may be gained or lost in the proposed change, and whether what people are learning—everyone involved, not just the so-called target group—will be different, and "better." (2002a)

Mary Catherine Bateson poetically described the learning process as an improvisational dance, warning that we cannot trip over ambiguity or uncertainty.

Improvisation and new learning are not private processes; they are shared with others at every age. The multiple layers of attention involved cannot safely be brushed aside or subordinated to the completion of tasks. We are called to join in a dance whose steps must be learned along the way, so it is important to attend and respond. Even in our uncertainty, we are responsible for our steps. (1994, 9–10)

Bateson provided examples of cultural acquisition and learning in cultural context where the dance takes place.

To acquire an operational knowledge of a culture is to acquire cultural or social capital within that culture. That social capital gives one the power to navigate the culture in question. Children may gain cultural and social capital implicitly as part of their enculturation process. Adults, however, must take a more explicit approach to gain cultural capital. They may acquire it through consciously learning about another culture and using that knowledge to function well in their secondary culture while maintaining their

primary culture (accommodation), or through adopting the secondary culture as primary and infusing it into their lives (acculturation). They may gain social capital by consciously learning how to attain resources and how social organizations, such as bureaucracy, operate. Consciously gaining cultural or social capital is a form of empowerment.

Empowerment of immigrant, poor, and culturally diverse parents and communities has been a focus of educational anthropologists since the late 1960s and early 1970s, accompanying the focus on culturally relevant curricula and education. Steven Arvizu's early work with the Cross Cultural Resources Center at California State University in Sacramento focused on parent participation and home-school linkages with an eye toward empowering parents (Arvizu 1992). His demystifying the concept of culture for parents helped provide them with an understanding of themselves in multicultural contexts, which led to gaining the cultural and social capital needed to help their children navigate their world.

When educational anthropologists see the difference this empowerment makes in the lives of people who had been disenfranchised, they may develop a sense of satisfaction from their work and advocate further for facilitating the acquisition of social capital. Kathryn M. Borman has done extensive work on projects addressing educational reform on a national scale, such as the National Science Foundation's Urban Systemic Initiative, a reform that directed resources to schools in the highest poverty urban districts in the United States. However, in terms of direct impact on educational change, the one project that stands out for her is one that related the parental gain of social capital to the education of their children.

> I believe that the effort with the largest impact was the work I carried out with colleagues at the Urban Appalachian Council in Cincinnati. At the UAC during the 10 years I worked with the dedicated staff members of that organization (many of whom were of Appalachian origin), we were able to provide training for parents of children who were students in the public schools of the city. The training was aimed at providing parents the tools they needed to get the services and assistance they needed for their children. (2004)

Some educational anthropologists work with parents of very young children, in both community settings and preschool environments. Cultural acquisition is a focus in this work, and, when there are dual cultures, multicultural acquisition often becomes an issue. Progress of children in complex cultural environments is followed during formal schooling years. Parents of those children tend to lack the social capital needed to effectively advocate for their children. Lotty Eldering, working with immigrant families in the

Netherlands, tried to influence immigration policy with an eye toward acquisition of social capital for immigrant mothers. She described her career-long efforts to this end:

> In my view family education should be a substantial part of research being done by anthropologists focusing on formal school education. In my work I have studied amongst others preschool intervention programs and risk factors for children growing up in *female-headed* immigrant families (Moroccan and Hindustani families in the Netherlands). Family education studies are essential for a good understanding of the impact of schools and other formal educational settings on school success.
>
> As to the application of research outcomes, that is a complicated matter. . . . Sometimes research outcomes are too new to be applied (politicians always are far behind social reality). One of the conclusions of my PhD study for instance was that the Moroccan families would permanently stay in the Netherlands and I recommended [that it be policy for] them to learn Dutch. Only in 1998, 20 years after the publication of my book on Moroccan families, are new immigrants compelled to learn Dutch. Most of the earlier generations of immigrants speak no or very little Dutch, particularly mothers, who are the main educators of the children. These examples show, in my view, that processes within the family, in the broadest sense, have great impact on school achievement and social mobility of immigrant children. (2002)

Policy and power surrounding the education of preschool children was a focus of Sally Lubeck's work. She studied, internationally, the social processes through which women socialize young children to particular ways of life, how governments support the care and education of young children, and the implications for policy support of institutional structures. Lubeck posed the following questions that evolved from her research and drove subsequent work:

1. How can public policy be formulated to address the strengths and challenges that exist within local communities?
2. How do power, social relations, language, and material practices effectively serve to "construct" particular kinds of services and organizations within communities and nation states?
3. How does discourse function to constrain what is seen as necessary or desirable within a particular policy context?
4. What are the possibilities for creating self-conscious, democratic communities willing and able to dialogue across difference? (2002)

Three interrelated areas formed the core of Lubeck's work: (1) Cross-national policy research regarding early childhood education and care (ECEC), (2) ECEC policy research within the United States, and (3) "cultural politics," dealing with issues of diversity, power, and voice in political decisionmaking. She explained the nature of some of her research and work:

> In my early work I used data from the International Labour Office (ILO) to compare parental leave and child care policies and provisions cross-nationally (e.g., Lubeck, 1989). Later, I did fieldwork in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) when, prior to unification, the GDR had the most extensive publicly supported child care system in the world. I was responsible for interviewing American teachers for the TIMSS Case Study Project (which compared the American educational system with those of Germany and Japan). More recently, I served as a member of the review team and Rapporteur for the Country Note on the United Kingdom, in conjunction with the OECD *Thematic Review of Early Childhood Education and Care Policies* in 12 countries. (2002)

The levels of influence here are from the details of everyday practice to the broad scope of policy. All of the examples support equitable education by recognizing the part that parents play in the education of their children.

Equity, Empowerment, and Social Justice in School Systems and Communities

Educational anthropologists address many dimensions of equity, as well as success and failure in education (Erickson 1987; Mehan, Hubbard, and Villanueva 1994; Trueba 1988; Voght, Jordan, and Tharp 1987). John Ogbu's (1982, 1990; Gibson and Ogbu 1991) controversial theories about differential achievement of *immigrant* and *involuntary* minorities and cultural discontinuity have generated spirited and continuous debate. His theories have been used in the development of educational policy. Margaret Eisenhart's extensive work with gender equity in education and in the scientific community identified the illusion of gender neutrality in policies. The concept of gender neutrality addresses assumptions that a policy is considered objective and gender neutral if it is framed in the male voice. When asked to reflect on her current work, she said:

> I think that the challenges to traditional ways of conceptualizing culture that are posed by phenomena such as youth culture, popular culture,

transnational movements, globalization, etc. and their resolutions bear directly on how we use "culture" in schools and other educational settings.

The core of my work right now is to design, implement, and study an after-school program in science and technology for low-income African American and Latino middle-school girls. These girls live in an inner city environment that includes the phenomena referred to above. They do poorly in poor schools, and they have little or no interest in science and technology as presented in school. What I am trying to do is: (1) learn about the "culture" of these girls; (2) learn what science and technology experts consider good curriculum for girls; (3) join 1 and 2 in an attempt to create a sci/tech curriculum that motivates the girls and develops their skills; (4) study the girls' responses to the curriculum, modify it, and re-study it. I see this as similar to a "design experiment" or "design study" as described by Ann Brown and others.

In addition to my own use of my research findings to improve the after-school program, the findings are also being used to redesign programs for high school girls in engineering, precollegiate preparation programs for high school students and their parents, and academic support groups for minority students. (2002)

Social justice, equity, and diversity-embedded change also are goals of advocates, such as Rosemary Henze, who focus on change within the school system. Like so many educational anthropologists, Henze works with pre-service and in-service teachers as well as educational administrators in efforts to create change and embed diversity. She seeks ways to have greater impact on teachers, students, and school systems. Henze discussed some of her problem-solving approach and initiatives.

> I'm very interested in seeing if I can have an impact on practice by "translating" some key concepts of educational anthropology into terms that teachers can use. One concept I am trying to translate, currently, is the notion of the social construction of race. I find it amazing that with so much written about this in the past century, it still has not made its way into the public consciousness.
>
> The other thing that is "core" to what I'm doing now is what we call the "Leading for Diversity Project." Together with colleagues, I have been working on researching, describing, and disseminating what it is school leaders can do to improve ethnic relations in schools. It's a workbook format, for pre-service or in-service school leaders, so very "practical" in an effort to [have an impact on teachers, students, and school systems]. We're also working on a video to accompany . . . the book. . . .

I'm trying to enfold what I know of important educational anthropology concepts and practices in what I teach my students. (2003)

The role of the family and community in effecting educational change, especially for immigrant populations, is central to the work of many educational anthropologists. In her long-term research and advocacy relationship with a California Latino community, Concha Delgado-Gaitan learned new dimensions of community self-determination. Reflection on her work began with the question, "How can research in anthropology and education be used to inform local community change?"

[Anthropologists] know so much about the "problems" that oppress communities where we work and we need to look at how all of this research can directly impact the people who need it most. Through long-term ethnographic methodology in poor and immigrant communities, my research has shown that meaningful change and empowerment is possible from the grassroots level through family and community literacy. It gives a model for other communities' self-empowerment.

In addition to academics who work in my home field of anthropology and education, I am contacted on a regular basis by [practitioners and scholars] . . . that use my work for its methodological paradigm as well as the theoretical premises that culturally acknowledge the people's potential for changing the power relations of the conditions in which they live involving language learning, literacy practices, accessing family resources, and building sociopolitical organization. (2002)

Educational change in communities includes education in informal settings that engage and empower urban youths to be agents of change through informed social action. Jean J. Schensul reflected on the variety of ways she applies educational anthropology to urban education and social justice initiatives. Schensul champions education as an open construct; taking place in the community and envelopes other-than-traditional school curricula. Her reflection summarizes her career trajectory as an educational anthropologist and the range of her work.

Career Trajectory of Jean J. Schensul

I have viewed myself as an educational anthropologist from the moment that I understood, under the mentorship of a critical sociologist, that I had the power, as a teacher/instructor, to reverse power relationships in the classroom. I learned as a college anthropology instructor that I could put aside didactic instruction and engage students in a dialogic exploration of critical questions relating to race, eth-

nicity, culture, difference, language, intelligence, interpretations of history, power and control simply by raising questions and exposing them to sources of information and the opportunity to engage in facilitated discussion. For me this was a dual revelation. First, I saw that I could bring about educational change—that I could, as an anthropologist, function as an interventionist. Second, I saw that I could study these issues and that I was interested in testing interventions that reversed the established power structure and studying factors that prevented such reversals in settings where the students were not heard, in contrast to settings in which they believed, because of wealth and social status and the privilege of race, that they had the right to be heard.

My burning questions in educational anthropology have been directed toward understanding the circumstances that stimulate, support, and encourage urban American children and youth to pursue knowledge and social action, to see that they have the right to know and to promote their civic engagement as active and critically involved citizens. Further, I do not see that educational anthropology's purview is in the classroom only. For me, education occurs in multiple formal and informal settings. For this reason, I have a passionate commitment to creating the informal settings that support both youth and adults in a process of engaged learning, critical analysis, and social action. Questions that are central to my work have to do with how such settings vary across provinces, states, countries and class; how, for example, critical inquiry can occur in national settings where active conflict and confrontation are not acceptable; how gender, ethnicity, race, and power restrict, enhance, empower, and restructure learning processes.

I believe that the concept of education is interdisciplinary and intersectoral—addressing art, intelligence, social and emotional learning, sexuality and AIDS, substance use and abuse, and a vast range of other social phenomena. Educational anthropology should not limit itself to the subject matter of classrooms. A burning question has to do with why the field has restricted itself to an analysis of school-based phenomena, when learning qua education takes place in multiple settings in multiple ways. I have been proud of my discipline's perspective on formal education and, at the same time, frustrated with the limitations the discipline has placed on the way we conceptualize, address, intervene in, and study/evaluate educational processes.

The core of my work in educational anthropology has been theorizing about developing, describing, and evaluating alternative learning environments for adults and youth. My first piece of research addressed individual, institutional, and structural changes in the Mexican education system as a response to industrialization. This was not applied research, but the research was published in Mexico in Spanish and may have had some effect on the country's perception of the limited role of education in promoting upward mobility and the ways in

which worksites used educational degrees to promote or restrict entry to work and occupational mobility.

A second thrust of my work has been the creation of alternative community-based work environments, in which applied research for social action has played a major role. The two main settings where I have used this approach have been the Hispanic Health Council (1978–1987) and the Institute for Community Research (1987–present). [The Institute consists of] a multiethnic group of 65 full-time, 12 part-time, and 41 youth researchers. I was a co-founder of the first organization and the founder of the second. Each of these environments has involved dedicated applied research. Each has integrated university-trained researchers with a political commitment to community change, with community educators and activists who see the opportunity to use research as a tool for change. My role has been to develop and implement projects that permit these two radically different sectors, with a common goal, to come together, to learn from one another, and to integrate their experience and knowledge in the context of a formal research project directed toward social change. The organizational environments I favor and promote are communal learning environments. Principles include good facilitation that supports equally valued input from all participants, sharing popular and academic knowledge, providing good social and cultural supports, and directing work toward an accomplishable goal with community importance.

Probably the most significant focus of my formal applied educational anthropology work has been the development of a popular action research training model that the Institute for Community Research (and prior organizations) have used with low income community residents—men, women, older adults, adolescents, pre-adolescents, gay and lesbian youth of color, and other groups. This model is driven by a constellation of integrated theories of identity, multiple intelligences, personal and social empowerment, social learning and social construction, critical analysis, gender and power, and more recently queer theory. It begins with the development of close working and personal relationships between adult facilitators and participants. These relationships provide the foundation for broadening interactions and trust among members of the group or learning community. The group then engages in the traditional steps of participatory action research—identifying an issue, developing a conceptual and action model, learning about and utilizing multiple interactive approaches to data collection, using the relationships derived through data collection to build a power base, jointly analyzing and presenting data, and using data as a means to rally and organize support for desired action. This process seems

simple, but it is indeed very complicated. It requires dedicated, experienced, and politicized research staff, a supportive learning environment, appropriate creative and flexible research technology, rules and regulations that are suitable for different target populations (by age, ethnicity, sexual preference, or other factors), proper analytic procedures and technology, and a variety of means of disseminating and utilizing research results over time. We have conducted at least twelve demonstration programs that use this fundamental model, most of which have been funded with public sector money and some private funds . . . ; we are currently evaluating this model for risk prevention with funding for a three-year Center for Substance Abuse.

Another approach to the development of alternative educational environments involves the introduction of cooperative learning and the social construction of problem solving knowledge to middle school children. This project, funded for almost five years by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, is really intended to change the instructional relationship between students and teachers, between teachers and principals, and between schools and the Social Development Department of an urban school district. The use of cooperative learning and social constructivist techniques engages students in building on their own realities and knowledge base, learning from other students, and obtaining new information from guided informational sources. Students construct and co-construct new narratives of situations related to addressing social problems, drug use, and sexual risk—situations more closely culturally and socially related to their own realities. As they co-construct alternative pathways to risk avoidance and harm reduction, which they discuss and agree on, they create safer options for themselves when they confront these social risks. The most important underlying message of the curriculum, however, is not that there is a right or wrong way of approaching these social problems. It is that youth, working together and utilizing their knowledge base and social and informational resources, can emerge with a variety of social options that work for them, while reducing their exposure to drug, social, and sexual harm. Our team of anthropologists and psychologists . . . is delighted that this approach is now being integrated into our partnership school district, with the intention of utilizing the model instructional program in years to come. We are especially delighted, since the objective of the curriculum is inherently subversive—it is explicitly designed to enhance the power of the teacher AND the student together, in generating new solutions to both new and ongoing social and educational problems. (2002)

Education for the Culturally Diverse and Multicultural Education

Educational anthropologists perhaps are best known for their work with culturally diverse and indigenous groups. The tradition of advocacy in this arena is quite strong. Cathie Jordan's (1985) applied work with the Kamehameha Project is a classic example of how ethnographic information demonstrating cultural discontinuity was directly applied to create culturally relevant educational structure and pedagogy. Jerry Lipka's (1991) work with the Yup'ik also had direct impact on creating indigenous programs, curricula, and pedagogy. Theresa McCarty (2002) worked with the Dine/Navajo, advocating for indigenous education, particularly at Rough Rock. She supported community members' redefinition of identity, finding their voice, and empowerment to attain social justice. Donna Deyhle, who has been working with Dine/Navajo in a Mormon community school district for many years, indicated that there is evidence of recent profound change.

> One issue that has changed, and is very exciting, is that the district seems to be coming full circle—moving from a racially based decision— no Navajo language or culture—to using Navajo language and culture in the school curriculum to enhance student success. Rather than ignoring the ethnographic research . . . they are trying to "come on board." Most amazing is that they have asked me to come back into the district and do research for the next three years looking at what they are calling "pockets of excellence"—successful teachers working with Navajo youth. I think it is exciting! It also speaks to the sometimes roller coaster ride I've had with the district and Navajo communities over the past twenty years. First [I] started as the ethnographer, then "Indian lover," lawsuit enemy, etc., etc., and now, back to ethnographer. What a wild path. And I am flattered that the district trusts me, even though I was super critical of them. So a team [of educational anthropologists and graduate students] will be working in and out of there. (2002)

Although culturally relevant education, education for cultural understanding and multicultural, cross-cultural, and intercultural education have longevity among educational anthropologists, the concept of multicultural education, since its emergence in the late 1960s, has also been an area of concern. There are frequent complaints that the concept has been appropriated, trivialized, packaged, or otherwise applied in ways contrary to intent (Greenman and Greenbaum 1996). Margaret Gibson developed the first typology of multicultural education in 1976. Shane Martin and Magaly

Lavadenz (1998) developed one of the most recent typological models of educational response to diversity. Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant's typology presented in their book, *Making Choices for Multicultural Education* (2003), now in its fourth edition, is one of the most widely used. Though they tried to present different approaches to multicultural education and the implications of each in an objective, nonhierarchical way, Sleeter and Grant include a chapter in which they articulated strong advocacy for the transformational/ social reconstructionist types of multicultural education.

These typologies and others clearly reveal the philosophical assumptions implicit in each approach. Work with preservice teachers and educators in the schools reveals a lack of openness to assumptions different from those held personally, which results in resistance to diversity (Greenman and Kimmel 1995). Educational anthropologists consistently seek new ways to create bridges to understanding and acceptance of difference. Linda Levine (2002) stated

> I'm still concerned with the need to move beyond essentialist notions of culture while acknowledging the persistent power and politics and impact of difference in this society. . . . I've been trying to help preservice and practicing teachers move beyond popular assumptions and their own sedimented histories by creating (and guiding) opportunities for the [discussions] across differences that are so crucial today.

Mary Hauser (2002) assessed the core of her educator work as a need "to help students to understand the influence of culture (the culture of the students, the teacher, and the larger American culture) on what happens in schools."

Heewon Chang, who shares some of the same concerns, advocates vigorously for multicultural education. She struggles with ways to be most effective in her work with educators. Chang stated that the following questions are ever present:

1. How can I safeguard (at the same time, critically examine) the anthropologically sound understanding of culture in multicultural educational research and writing?
2. How can I keep educators from essentializing culture (ascribing a set of characteristics to a certain cultural group and reducing all distinctive characteristics as cultural differences) and help them develop functional cultural sensitivity toward their students of diverse cultural backgrounds?
3. How can we bring more global perspectives (and comparison) to the understanding of educational issues in the United States? (2002)

Chang's focus on multicultural education is intertwined with her work in educational anthropology. In her advocacy work, she returns to these questions to disengage trivialized notions of culture and multicultural education. One solution she initiated is a journal dedicated to issues surrounding multicultural education. She stated: "To bring more anthropological and global approaches to multicultural education I have been editing and publishing the Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education for the last 4 years, which reaches scholars and practitioners of multicultural education in 40 different countries" (2002). The journal can be found at http://www.eastern.edu/publications/emme.

Educational anthropologists working with cultural diversity issues can have an impact on education by working outside of the schools. For example, I work with the Cultural Connections Program of the Center for Cultural Understanding and Change at the Chicago Field Museum. For the 2003–2004 program year, there were 23 core partners that are ethnic museums or cultural centers. The program uses anthropological concepts as its core, in efforts to help teachers, parents, and community members understand culture and diversity and the rich traditions in Chicago neighborhoods. The program also intends to have direct impact on curriculum design and culturally relevant teaching through the teacher component. A theme, such as *Traditions of Transition: Understanding Rites of Passage*, is selected each program year, and the core partners have events for the parent programs and the teacher and community member programs.

Chicago anthropologists, many of whom are members of the Chicago Association for the Practice of Anthropology (CAPA), are an integral part of the program development and implementation. CAPA provides resources and expertise. Members participate as volunteers and consultants. They facilitate discussions for the Cultural Connection teacher and community program events, guide neighborhood and cultural center visits, conduct workshops for Cultural Connection parent group program events, provide feedback and guidance in program development, and conduct ethnographic program evaluation.

As an educational anthropologist, I am able to create bridges between the anthropological constructs and the teachers and parents. I have contributed unique insight to designing and conducting evaluations, creating workshops for ethnically diverse parents and to developing and facilitating programs. The first year I worked with the Cultural Connections Program, I became part of the program evaluation team, focusing on the program's teacher component. I developed the protocol for a teacher focus group to augment their written evaluation questionnaires, conducted the focus group, and analyzed the data gathered from the focus group and participant observation of

teacher events. The Center for Cultural Understanding and Change uses evaluations to inform content and to structure changes for further program development. Other anthropologist work includes facilitation of discussions at the program events.

The anthropological perspective brought to the Center for Cultural Understanding and Change is invaluable in the Center's diversity work, and it adds depth to understanding for program participants. Data from teacher focus groups and ethnographic program evaluations affirm that the quality and focus of discussions were greatly improved when anthropologists were facilitators. I also worked in the parent program component. A group of Spanish-speaking parents from one school attended two cultural events and participated in a follow-up workshop. At the ethnic museum and cultural organization events, I presented content about life transitions and rites of passage, grounding it in their own life experiences. Also, I developed and facilitated for parents a capstone workshop at their children's school. The facilitator team developed a final event for all parent groups. In the program evaluation, parents said they developed a broader perspective and learned a great deal that would benefit them in educating their children about their own culture and in being open and appreciative of difference and diversity. The anthropological theory and methods infused in the Cultural Connections Program has made such an obvious and profound contribution that the relationship to the Chicago Association for the Practice of Anthropology is becoming increasingly formalized.

Methods Used in Educational Anthropology— Including Ethnographic Evaluation

Though recent studies more frequently weave in quantitative methods, ethnography, in its many incarnations, is the heart of the methodology used in anthropology and education. Basically, ethnography is the description of a culture or group. In educational anthropology, this may be education in a community, in an ethnic neighborhood, on a reservation, in a foreign country, in an urban area, in a suburban development, in a village, or in the rural countryside. It may encompass a school district, a playground, a bus route, a school, or a classroom. Ideally, the initial approach is broad, and the foci and subsequent methods emerge from observation; however, in applied anthropology, an existing predefined problem may guide the research and intervention.

The foundation of ethnography is *participant observation*, which David Fetterman suggested is necessary for fieldwork to be effective: "Participant observation combines participation in the lives of the people under study

with maintenance of a professional distance that allows adequate observation and recording of data" (1989, 45). As the research progresses, the educational anthropologists develop or bring in additional methods and tools. The methods may include formally structured, semistructured, or informal interviews; focus groups; questionnaires with open-ended questions; life histories; review of records, documents, or other written material; discourse analysis; or projective techniques. To validate information, data are derived from at least three different sources. This is called *triangulation*. Multimethod research has become quite common for educational anthropologists. Given the current climate overshadowing credibility for what is considered "scientific" and valid, statistics often are infused in largely ethnographic studies. These may be descriptive statistics derived from thematic analysis or other statistical analyses generated from surveys or forced-choice questionnaires. To facilitate observation, educational anthropologists may use classroom observation forms, protocols or topical checklists, sociograms to graph movement and interaction, and predetermined codes for actions or incidents. Time frames for observation and recording may be blocked out. Educational anthropologists also may use audio or video recording devices and still photography. Analysis of data includes sorting and coding, looking for patterns, and identifying themes. This can be done in many ways, perhaps employing color-coding or index card organization. There also are computer programs that facilitate analysis. Reflection is integral to the process.

Traditional ethnographic studies have long been used to inform policy and program development. Ethnographic studies of school districts, schools, and classrooms are a mainstay of educational anthropology. Margaret D. LeCompte and Jean J. Schensul (1999) developed a seven-volume *Ethnographer's Toolkit* as a guide for the increasing number of people using ethnography for educational research. These volumes take the researcher from design and methods through analysis, interpretation, and application. Harry Wolcott (1990) offers guidance on organizing and writing about the results from qualitative research.

Patrick McQuillan described the importance of ethnography to his work:

> As an educational anthropologist I try to spend as much time as possible in schools working with a wide range of school personnel over extended periods of time so I have an holistic sense for what is happening in the real world of schools and classrooms, with the concomitant responsibility of writing up this work for relevant audiences. . . . I believe the ethnographic method helped me understand the micropolitical dimensions of an educational reform endeavor that many viewed as mainly academic in nature. (2002)

Ethnography also has spawned and inspired other forms of qualitative methods. Michele Foster (1997) employed oral life history to learn about African American teachers' teaching. Joseph A. Maxwell (1996) developed a model for an interactive approach to qualitative research design. Judith Preissle also has been innovative in qualitative research design: "The broadest application of my work has been in qualitative research methods and design where it is used by other researchers in planning their own inquiries and by methodologists in ongoing discussions in the field" (2002).

Many variations of ethnography have evolved, largely from attending to the context in which research is being done. For example, Lisa Rosen's current project uses a recursive ethnographic loop. She described the method as follows:

> My project is explicitly conceptualized as ethnographic "design research," which means that my findings regularly feed back into the design of the charter school and the work that surrounds it. Likewise, I regularly present findings to the participants in my study, who are also my colleagues, and facilitate reflective dialogue about both progress and challenges. My research thus has both immediate and long-term application. (2002)

The sociolinguistic ethnography of communication research conducted by Susan Urmston Philips (1993) is considered microethnographic within the context of traditional ethnography. Microethnography usually is associated with focused study in one location, such as a classroom. Philips examined communication structures in classrooms and community. Her work inspired further study of participation structures, using a variety of methods for gathering data. Frederick Erickson and Gerald Mohatt (1982) were early proponents of videotaping in schools and classrooms as part of ethnographic study. They used videotape to gather data in their study of participant structures and activity transitions in an Odwa school. The unit of analysis was determined by studying the tapes. Taping of any kind in schools, however, has become more cumbersome with the extensive permission-granting process.

Discourse analysis is used in studying interaction dynamics in schools, classrooms, school board meetings, and policy development. Educational anthropologists incorporate different methods as called for within a single study. For example, Sally Lubeck described her use of multiple methods:

> My research group recently completed a three-year study of four Head Start programs using ethnography and discourse analysis as tools for understanding how Head Start takes shape in a diversity of

communities. In conjunction with this work, we assisted one program in creating a "community of practice" among staff members, who now provide half of their own professional development. (2002)

Lubeck also used deconstruction to illuminate taken-for-granted assumptions about particular social groups, practices, and policies (e.g., Swadener and Lubeck 1995).

Policy- and program-driven ethnographic work within the parameters and time restraints of international agencies may inspire innovative adaptations and means of rapid assessment while maintaining ethnographic integrity (e.g., Handwerker 2001) and resisting what may look like "drive-by ethnography." In developing anthropological methods for the application of anthropological wisdom, Robert Textor sought the path less traveled. He developed "anticipatory anthropology" (1985) for use in educational and community planning. Textor was one of the organizers of the Educational Futures Committee in the CAE. Currently he is advocating for ethics education in business.

Harry Wolcott writes extensively about using ethnographic methods in education, with an emphasis on trying to maintain the integrity of ethnography. His ethnography of a school principal (1984) has been used to make decisions about the leadership role in schools. Reflecting on his work in educational anthropology, he shed light on his career path.

Career Trajectory of Harry Wolcott

I "grew up" with anthropology and education; my respective "careers" are intertwined. My dissertation was a study of a Kwakiutl Indian village and its school, a study that satisfied professors in both fields and helped to form the link between them. Fieldwork was in 1962–63, the dissertation completed the following year, and a book, *A Kwakiutl Village and School*, in 1967. My next study was done closer to home—across town, as a matter of fact—as I assumed a faculty position at the University of Oregon. That was a study of an elementary school principal; not what he should do, or what the literature said about him, but of one real live human being and how he actually went about doing it. *The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography* was published in 1973. Another study looked at a school district working through a district-wide and grand scale (but not otherwise so grand) educational innovation, an innovation that I put in anthropological perspective by comparing the social organization of the school district to a moiety organization. *Teachers Versus Technocrats* was published in 1977.

From my perspective, none of these studies was "applied" in its intent, but each of them could be reviewed for its lessons for the future as well as its observations on how things were at present. And they

heralded a new turn in educational research in which it became okay to examine single cases in depth of what was actually occurring in schools. So for a second thrust, I began writing what became a quartet of books dealing with aspects of qualitative research in general and ethnographic research in particular. My intent was to keep ethnography distinguishable as a particular kind of research at the same time that its fieldwork techniques were made more widely available to all. *Transforming Qualitative Data*, *The Art of Fieldwork*, *Ethnography: A Way of Seeing*, and *Writing Up Qualitative Research*, now in a second edition, are the result of that line of work. . . .

My studies have helped prepare teachers going into similar assignments like the village school, or administrators to find a broader perspective, or researchers to employ a wider assortment of field techniques in addressing their problems. More often I think my work has led to a softening of objectives, a less heavy-handed approach toward a "recalcitrant" group, more patience on the part of the official transmitters of cultures, more appreciation for what people already *are* than what they can become. It is "work in progress" in a constantly shifting ethnoscape. (2002a)

Building on Wolcott's seminal work in developing educational anthropological methodology and the tradition of action research in applied anthropology, action research has become a popular method in educational anthropology. According to Geoffrey E. Mills,

Action research is any systematic inquiry [using qualitative methods] conducted by teacher researchers, principals, school counselors, or other stakeholders in the teaching/learning environment to gather information about the ways that their particular schools operate, how they teach, and how well their students learn. This information is gathered with the goals of gaining insight, developing reflective practice, effecting positive changes in the school environment (and on educational practices in general), and improving student outcomes and the lives of those involved. (2000, 6)

Application of research resulting in action or intervention is key in the commitment to bringing about educational change. In applied educational anthropology or in action research, how can one increase the odds of being effective? Kathryn M. Borman shared what she believes ensures success.

In my experience, the best way to ensure some impact is to get as close as possible to the folks whose lives you are most invested in. . . . I am now convinced that the best results attend efforts that (1) are close to the community, (2) are carried out over a long period of time, and (3)

become institutionalized in both the target organization (in this case, the schools) and the facilitating organization (in this case, the UAC). (2004)

One of the first applied uses of ethnography in education was in evaluation. Judith Preissle Goetz and Margaret LeCompte (who at the time worked in the Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation of the Houston Independent School District) not only fostered use of ethnography in educational research (e.g., Preissle Goetz and LeCompte 1984) but also in educational evaluation (e.g., LeCompte and Preissle Goetz 1984).

Whether applying ethnography to evaluation through school district employment, academic research, independent consulting, or, like Jolley Bruce Christman (with Elaine Simon and Eva Gold), starting a dedicated business like their Research for Action, educational anthropologists ensured that this approach became more widely known and accepted in both educational and anthropological circles. David Fetterman, known for his innovative evaluation work (e.g., Fetterman 1984; Fetterman, Kaftarian, and Wandersman 1996), talked about his inspirations and the path of his career.

Career Trajectory of David Fetterman

There are questions that have stayed with me over time that seem to have great meaning for me, questions that continue to preoccupy me, capture my imagination, and make me think.

1. Questions of equity—How can it be that groups are systematically disenfranchised from the society because of the color of their skin or their socioeconomic status?
2. Questions of fairness—Why are good people often treated so badly while those with little regard for others often prosper?
3. Questions of hope—How can we help others help themselves to improve their lives and the lives of others?

The core of my work is soliciting the insider's or emic perspective of reality and allowing it to guide the construction of theory and meaning. My book *Ethnography: Step by Step* (1989) highlights ethnographic concepts such as . . . contextualization (placing data in context to meaningfully interpret data), nonjudgmental, triangulation, and culture. These have been guiding forces in my life and my work as I do my best to unravel the grand mystery before us each day. I have taken this core tradition and applied it to evaluation in my books (e.g., 1984). . . .

Traditional ethnographic concepts and techniques applied to evaluation enable the insider's voice to be heard and have an impact on pol-

icy decisionmaking. In addition, an ethnographic approach to evaluation allows for a more meaningful and fair evaluation of a situation, classroom, or event. Shifting gears yet again, I have moved into a new domain fusing ethnography, evaluation, and empowerment. I developed a new approach to evaluation called "Empowerment Evaluation" (e.g., 1996). This approach has stirred the imaginations and emotions of many evaluators. It is designed to help people learn how to evaluate their own program, instead of relying on an external evaluator. It is built on the premise that the insider's view or emic perspective matters. More to the point it is similar to action anthropology, since the group is in charge, not the ethnographer or evaluator. The evaluator in this case is a facilitator helping the group determine their mission, take stock of where they are as a group/program, and plan for the future. . . .

My approaches have been adopted in higher education, government, inner-city public education, rural education, nonprofit organizations, corporations, and foundations throughout the United States and abroad. A wide range of program and policy sectors use these approaches, including substance abuse prevention, HIV prevention, crime prevention, environmental protection, welfare reform, battered woman's shelters, agriculture and rural development, adult probation, adolescent pregnancy prevention, tribal partnerships, individuals with disabilities, doctoral programs, and educational reform movements such as the Accelerated Schools Project.

A final note: Although my mom was not sure how I would get a job as an anthropologist, she always encouraged me to follow what I believed in. I have done that and for the most part the money has followed. I recommend the same to anyone as they contemplate their future—follow your heart; it will bring you where you really want to go or at least where you belong. Educational anthropology has done that for me. (2002)

Conclusion

This chapter barely scratches the surface of the anthropology and education domain. I defined the concept of educational anthropology as the anthropological study of education in all of its contexts, including early enculturation, formal, informal, and nonformal education. The rich history of anthropology and education was discussed, along with the evolving strength in advocacy for issues supported by ethnographic data and other research. Examples were offered of how educational anthropologists approach advocacy in questions of equity, of empowerment, of facilitating understanding of culture in a complex multicultural society, of creating

educational change, and of providing teachers with knowledge and understanding to teach and help attain social justice.

The ways in which educational anthropologists work to achieve educational change were explored. How educational anthropologists have an impact on empowerment of culturally diverse parents and communities and the acquisition of social capital also was discussed. Cultural acquisition was reviewed as a fundamental construct in anthropology and education, and education of culturally diverse students was examined. Obviously, there is exciting and important territory to be explored. The field of educational anthropology is constantly evolving, seeking new ways to address persistent educational problems and rising to the challenges of new educational issues. Educational anthropology is ripe with possibilities to apply anthropological knowledge and methods in transforming society. This is an era of increased standardized testing, where testing itself under the rubric of accountability is perceived as educational reform, and where standardized testing induces reification of racial and class categories, where inequity persists, and where legislatures are influenced by fundamentalist segments of society. Doing applied anthropology in these conditions raises its own new challenges. Work is needed in learning and teaching how to navigate the new "culture" created by standardization so students can succeed in the ways deemed essential. One of the wonderful things about educational anthropology is that it provides the context so often lacking in other educational research. Because we look at the whole picture, we include important information that might reframe the problem. We examine what is left out as well as what is included.

There is increased interest among educational anthropologists in the way policy is framed, developed, and implemented, and in the impact it has. A simple policy may be ineffectively implemented or may have unintended impact. In efforts to "leave no child behind," letters sent home to notify parents that a teacher "is not qualified to teach" their child may intend to empower the parents to seek the best education for their child, but may actually undermine the teacher and what learning may be occurring. Educational anthropologists often pose the questions people do not think to ask, and perceive interactions and ramifications that are so embedded that they are invisible to the untrained eye. It is exciting to be part of the insightful efforts in applying anthropology to various dimensions of education.

Notes

1. E. D. Hirsch Jr. (1988) constructed a list of 5,000 "essential names, phrases, dates, and concepts" that he suggested every American must know to be culturally literate. He followed this with a series of books detailing

which of these items should be known by each grade level. The content of Hirsch's list was widely criticized for being ignorant of the diversity that characterizes America, and for being culture, gender, and time bound. Anthropologists, however, also criticized the very conceptualization of cultural literacy as a list of things.

2. To get a pulse on the current thoughts of some active educational anthropologists, I posed three questions to a group: (1) What are your burning questions in educational anthropology? (2) What is the core of your work? and (3) How has your work been applied? I weave throughout the chapter responses from 20 professionals to these questions.

3. The most recent forays into this territory include published responses to the "Cultural Literacy" movement and the challenge to the construct of "race" as physiologically based. Educational anthropologist Yolanda Moses, during her tenure as AAA president, spearheaded the initiative to share understanding of race as a social construct. This initiative resulted in publicly disseminated information, including a series of programs for PBS and schools.

4. For purposes of discussion, delineation of the various positions here is somewhat essentialist. Actual responses to the issue constitute a far richer fabric with subtle variations.

References

American Anthropological Association. 2004. *Anthropology in education: Anthropology Education Commission.* Retrieved November 11, 2004, from http://www.aaanet.org/

Anthropology & Education Quarterly (AEQ). 2003. 34: inside back cover.American Anthropological Association Committee on Public Policy. 2004. Retrieved November 11, 2004, from http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ppc/brief.htm

Arvizu, Steven F. 1992. Home-school linkages: A cross-cultural approach to parent participation. In *Cross-cultural literacy: Ethnographies of communication in multiethnic classrooms,* edited by Marietta Saravia-Shore and Steven F. Arvizu. New York: Garland Publishing.

Babcock, Barbara B., ed. 1991. *Pueblo mothers and children: Essays by Elsie Clews Parsons, 1915–1924.* Santa Fe: Ancient City Press.

Bateson, Mary Catherine. 1994. *Peripheral visions: Learning along the way.* New York: Harper Collins.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1964. Literate and illiterate speech. In *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology,* edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Harper & Row.

Borman, Kathryn M. 2004. E-mail communication from the David C. Anchin Center, University of South Florida, Tampa. Feb. 29.

Bull, William E. 1964. The use of vernacular languages in education. In *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology,* edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Harper & Row.

Cazden, Courtney. 1983. Can ethnographic research go beyond the status quo? *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 14 (1):33–41.

Chang, Heewon. 2002. E-mail communication from Eastern University, St. Davids, Penn. June 15.

Chilcott, John H. 1984. The *CAE Quarterly*, 1973–1976: From newsletter to quarterly. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 15 (1):67–9.

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha. 2002. E-mail communication from El Cerrito, Calif. June 24.

———. 1990. *Literacy for empowerment: The role of parents in children's education*. New York: The Falmer Press.

Deyhle, Donna. 2002. E-mail communication from University of Utah, Salt Lake City. July 8.

———. 1998. The role of the applied anthropologist: Between schools and the Navajo nation. In *Qualitative research reflections: Inside stories*, edited by Kathleen Bennett deMarrais. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eddy, Elizabeth M. 1985. Theory, research, and application in educational anthropology. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 16 (2): 83–104.

Eisenhart, Margaret. 2002. E-mail communication from the University of Colorado, Boulder. July 5.

Eldering, Lotty. 2002. E-mail communication from Leiden University, the Netherlands. June 18.

Erickson, Frederick. 1987. Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. Anthropology & Education Quarterly 18 (4): 335–6.

Erickson, Frederick, and Gerald Mohatt. 1982. Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action*, edited by George Spindler. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fetterman, David M. 2002. E-mail communication from Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. July 2.

———. 1989. *Ethnography step by step*. Applied Social Research Method Series, vol. 17. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

———, ed. 1984. *Ethnography in educational evaluation*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Fetterman, David M., Shakeh J. Kaftarian, and Abraham Wandersman, eds. 1996. *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Ford, Rosalee. 1997. Educational anthropology: Early history and educationist contributions. In *Education and cultural process: Anthropological approaches*, edited by George D. Spindler. 3rd ed. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Foster, Michele. 1997. *Black teachers on teaching*. New York: The New Press.

Gibson, Margaret. 1976. Approaches to multicultural education in the U.S. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 7 (4):7–8.

Gibson, Margaret A., and John U. Ogbu. 1991. *Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigrant and involuntary minorities*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Greenman, Nancy P. 1994. Not all caterpillars become butterflies: Reform and restructuring as educational change. In *Changing American education: Recapturing the past or inventing the future?*, edited by Kathryn M. Borman and Nancy P. Greenman. Albany: SUNY Press.

Greenman, Nancy P., and Susan D. Greenbaum. 1996. Multicultural education. In *The encyclopedia of cultural anthropology*, edited by David Levinson and Melvin Ember. Lakeville, Conn.: American Reference Publishing.

Greenman, Nancy P., and Ellen B. Kimmel. 1995. The road to multicultural education: Potholes of resistance. *Journal of Teacher Education* 46 (5): 360–8.

Handwerker, W. Penn. 2001. *Quick ethnography*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Hauser, Mary. 2002. E-mail communication from Carlton College, Northfield, Minn. July 8.

Henze, Rosemary. 2003. E-mail communication from San Jose State University, Dept. of Linguistics and Language Development. July 4.

Hess, G. Alfred, Jr. 1991. *School restructuring, Chicago style*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Corwin Press.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. 1988. *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Updated and expanded. New York: Vintage Books.

Howard, Alan. 1970. *Learning to be Rotuman*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1964. General introduction and section introductions. In *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology*, edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Harper & Row.

Jordan, Cathie. 1985. Translating culture: From ethnographic information to educational program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 19 (2): 105–23.

La Belle, Thomas J. 1984. Liberation, development, and rural nonformal education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 15 (1): 80–93.

LeCompte, Margaret D., and Judith P[reissle] Goetz. 1984. Ethnographic data collection in evaluation research. In *Ethnography in educational evaluation*, edited by David M. Fetterman. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

LeCompte, Margaret D., and Jean J. Schensul. 1999. *Ethnographer's toolkit*. 7 vols. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Lee, Dorothy. 1986. What price literacy? In *Valuing the self: What we can learn from other cultures*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press. Originally published in 1976 by Prentice Hall.

Levine, Linda. 2002. E-mail communication from Bank Street College, New York. July 2.

Lipka, Jerry. 1991. Toward a culturally based pedagogy: A case study of one Yup'ik Eskimo teacher. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 22 (3): 203–23.

Lipman, Pauline. 2002. Making the global city, making inequality: The political economy and cultural politics of Chicago school policy. *American Educational Research Journal* 39 (2): 379–419.

———. 1998. *Race, class, and power in school restructuring*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Lubeck, Sally. 2002. E-mail communication from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. July 2.

———. 1989. A world of difference: American child care policy in cross-national perspective. *Educational Policy* 3 (4): 331–54.

Martin, Shane P., and Magaly Lavadenz. 1998. Beyond multicultural education: A framework for understanding responses to cultural diversity in teacher education. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia, Penn. December 5.

Maxwell, Joseph A. 1996. *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Applied Social Research Methods Series, vol. 41. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

McCarty, Theresa L. 2002. *A place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McQuillan, Patrick J. 2002. E-mail communication from Boston College. June 27.

———. 1998. *Educational opportunity in an urban American high school: A cultural analysis.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Mead, Margaret. 1960. *Four families.* National Film Board of Canada. 1-800-542-2164.

———. 1954. *Bathing babies in three cultures.* University Park, Penn.: Penn State Audio-Visual Services. Retrieved from http://www.medianet.libraries.psu.edu.

Mehan, Hugh, Lea Hubbard, and Irene Villanueva. 1994. Forming academic identities: Accommodation without assimilation among involuntary minorities. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 25 (2): 91–117.

Mills, Geoffrey E. 2000. *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill of Prentice Hall.

Muncey, Donna E., and P. J. McQuillan. 1996. *Reform and resistance in schools and classrooms: An ethnographic view of the coalition of essential schools.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Ogbu, John U. 1990. Minority education in comparative perspective. *Journal of Negro Education* 59 (10): 45–57.

———. 1982. Cultural discontinuities and schooling. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 13 (4): 290–307.

Philips, Susan Urmston. 1993. *Invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press. Originally published in 1983 by Susan Urmston Philips and the Warm Springs Confederated Tribes.

Pitman, Mary Anne, Rivka A. Eisikovits, and Marion Lundy Dobbert. 1989. *Culture acquisition: A holistic approach to human learning.* New York: Praeger.

Precourt, Walter. 1982. Ethnohistorical analysis of an Appalachian settlement school. In *Doing the ethnography of schooling,* edited by George Spindler. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Preissle, Judith. 2002. E-mail communication from the University of Georgia, Athens.

Preissle Goetz, Judith, and Margaret D. LeCompte. 1984. *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research.* Orlando: Academic Press.

Rosen, Lisa. 2002. E-mail communication from the Center for School Improvement, the University of Chicago. June 24.

Rosenfeld, Gerry. 1971. *"Shut those thick lips!": A study of slum school failure.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Saravia-Shore, Marietta, and Steven F. Arvizu. 1992. Cross-cultural literacy: An anthropological approach to dealing with diversity. In *Cross-cultural literacy: Ethnographies of communication in multiethnic classrooms,* edited by Marietta Saravia-Shore and Steven F. Arvizu. New York: Garland Publishing.

Schensul, Jean J. 2002. E-mail communication from the Institute for Community Research, Hartford, Conn. September 3.

———. 1985. Cultural maintenance and cultural transformation: Educational anthropology in the eighties. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 16 (1): 63–8.

Schensul, Jean J., Maria Gonzales Borrero, and Robert Garcia. 1985. Applying ethnography in educational change. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 16 (2):149–64.

Shor, Ira, and Paulo Freire. 1987. *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Singleton, John 1984. The CAE Newsletter, 1970–1973, Origins of the *AEQ:* Rituals, myths, and cultural transmission. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 15 (1): 11–16.

Sleeter, Christine E., and Carl A. Grant. 2003. *Making choices for multicultural education.* 4th ed. New York: J. Wiley Publishers.

Spindler, George D. 1984. Roots revisited: Three decades of perspective. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 15 (1): 3–10.

———. 1963. *Education and culture: Anthropological approaches.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Swadener, Elizabeth B., and Sally Lubeck, eds. 1995. *Families and children "at promise": Deconstructing the discourse of risk.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Textor, Robert B. 1985. Anticipatory anthropology and the telemicroelectronic revolution: A preliminary report from Silicon Valley. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 16 (1): 3–30.

Thu, Kendell. 2004. Presentation by the Chair of AAA Committee on Public Policy to the Chicago Association for the Practice of Anthropology, Chicago. February 29.

Tobin, Joseph J., David Y. H. Wu, and Dana H. Davidson. 1989. *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Trueba, Henry T. 1988. Culturally based explanations of minority students' academic achievement. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 19 (3): 270–87.

van Willigen, John. 2002. *Applied anthropology: An introduction.* 3rd ed. Westport, Conn.: Bergin and Garvey.

Voght, Lynn A., Cathie Jordan, and Roland G. Tharp. 1987. Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 18 (4): 276–86.

Ward, Martha C. 1986. *Them children: A study in language learning.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press. Originally published in 1971 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wax, Murray L., Rosalie H. Wax, and Robert V. Dumont Jr. 1989. *Formal education in an American Indian community: Peer society and the failure of minority education.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press. Originally published in 1964 by the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

Wolcott, Harry F. 2002a. E-mail communication from the University of Oregon. June 28.

———. 2002b. *Sneaky kid and its aftermath: Ethics and intimacy in fieldwork.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

———. 2001. *Writing up qualitative research.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

———. 1999. *Ethnography: A way of seeing.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

———. 1995. *The art of fieldwork.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

————. 1994. *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

————. 1984. *The man in the principal's office: An ethnography.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press. Originally published in 1973 by the University of Oregon.

————. 1977. *Teachers versus technocrats: An educational innovation in anthropological perspective.* Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

————. 1967. *A Kwakiutl village and school.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

10   Applied Anthropology and the Aged

Robert C. Harman

Why should applied anthropology students be interested in gerontology, the study of the aged? There are a number of reasons; the most obvious, and perhaps the most important, is that the world's population is rapidly aging. Approximately 420 million people worldwide were 65 or over at the turn of the century. Population experts estimate that the number of older persons will more than double within a generation (U.S. Census Bureau 2004a). In 25 years, one out of every nine people on this planet will be 65 or older. In light of the social and economic effects associated with an older world, we must consider that developing societies are aging the most rapidly (Kinsella 1997, 18).

This global trend is impacting the United States as well. Although the American population is aging at a slower rate than many nations, the 2000 census showed that older Americans, the 35 million people age 65 or over, comprised 12.4 percent of the country's population compared to only 4 percent in 1900. The aging of the population in the first third of the twenty-first century will dwarf the pace at which it occurred previously. By 2030, one of five Americans will be 65 or over (U.S. Census Bureau 2004b).

The rapid growth in the number of older people has major implications for the workforce. The emergence of new policies and programs for the aged worldwide is unprecedented, and infrastructure for older persons is continually growing. Anthropologists offer knowledge, skills, and experience that augment the effectiveness of understanding and improving the late years of life. Anthropology's contributions to the study of the aged are holistic,