WILEY

A·M·E·R·I·C·A·N
ANTHROPOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

Notes

1. For a discussion of the fallacies of the deficit explanations, *see* Baratz and Baratz, 1969, 1970; Leacock, 1971; Valentine, 1968, 1971.

2. For a fuller discussion of state and federal laws pertaining to multi-cultural education, *see* Seifer, 1973, and the United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1975.

References

Baratz, J. C. and S. S. Baratz. "The Social Pathology Model: Historical Bases for Psychology's Denial of the Existence of Negro Culture." Paper presented at APA, Washington DC, 1969.

Baratz, S. S. and J. C. Baratz. "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism. 40 *Harvard Educational Review* 29, 1970.

Goodenough, W. *Culture, Language and Society.* Reading MA: Addison-Wesley (a McCaleb Module in Anthropology), 1971.

Leacock, E. B. (ed.) *The Culture of Poverty: A Critique.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971.

Seifer, N. "Education and the New Pluralism: A Preliminary Survey of Recent Progress in the 50 States." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Coordinating Assembly on Ethnic Studies, Detroit MI. ED 081 885, 1973.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education.* Washington DC: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 51, 1975.

Valentine, C. A. *Culture and Poverty.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1968.

———. "Deficit, Difference, and Bicultural Models of Afro-American Behavior." 41 *Harvard Education Review* 136, 1971.

MULTICULTURALISM AS THE NORMAL HUMAN EXPERIENCE

Ward H. Goodenough
University of Pennsylvania

Anthropologists traditionally have acted on the assumption that most societies are not multi-cultural, that for each society there is one culture. They have seen multi-cultural societies as developing only in the wake of urbanism, economic specialization, social stratification, and conquest states.

The view of culture that characterizes societies or sub-societies as wholes is appropriate to problems that involve comparing societies as organized human systems, or that call for the classification of societies according to one or another taxonomic scheme. For these purposes, minor cultural differences from household to household (such as reported for the Navajo by Roberts, 1951) or even from village to village can often be conveniently ignored. But such a macro-view of culture, if I may call it that, is inappropriate for the theory of culture, for any theory of something necessarily considers the processes of which that something is a product and that accounts for the way it changes over time. If by culture we have reference to the understandings about things and the expectations of one another that the members of a society seem to share, then a theory of culture requires us to consider the processes by which the individual members arrive at such sharing. In this regard, the differences among individuals, their misunderstandings, the different ways of doing things family to family and village to village, all become noteworthy.

When we look at process, then, we no longer look at societies only as wholes, but at individual people as learners of culture in the context of social interaction, as they pursue tneir various interests and try to deal with their various problems of living—problems that involve the necessity of choosing among conflicting goals, competing wants, and long-range as against short-range concerns. From the standpoint of process, multi-culturalism is no longer a feature of complex societies alone but, as we shall see, is to be found in simple societies as well. To say this is not to deny that multi-culturalism is playing an increasingly prominent role in the affairs of complex societies, but that the difference between complex and simple societies in this regard is one of degree and not of kind.

Culture is learned, we anthropologists have always properly insisted. From the learner's point of view, the need is to learn what the expectations are in terms of which others act. The understanding arrived at regarding the expectations of parents are tried out on other adults. In the absence of feedback to the contrary, one assumes that these others have the same expectations as one's parents. Thus, one comes to attribute concepts, beliefs, and principles of action uniformly to a set of other people, finding that for one's own practical purposes one can successfully do so. What is thus attributed to that set

4

of others becomes the culture of that set. I use the word "culture" advisedly here, for in anthropological practice the culture of any society is made of the concepts, beliefs, and principles of action and organization that an ethnographer has found could be attributed successfully to the members of that society in the context of dealing with them.

From this point of view, the sharing of culture by the members of a group is a matter of attribution. The apparent validity of this attribution is measured by its practical utility for dealing effectively with members of the group in particular situations. The process is that of stereotyping. The very limited purposes and situations in which a plantation manager in the Solomon Islands interacts with his Melanesian workers may result in very crude stereotyping of them by him and of him by them, stereotyping that serves its very limited purposes but is found entirely wanting when the bases for interaction are expanded. Good ethnography requires putting the ethnographer's stereotypes to tests that are similar, or at least equivalent, to those by which the society's members test the adequacy of their individual stereotypes of their fellow members.

What does all this have to do with multi-culturalism? In the learning process, people inevitably find that they cannot generalize the same expectations onto everyone. Children learn that the expectations of their parents and other adults are not the same in many respects as the expectations of their playmates. They find that the expectations of their mother and their father's sister are different, and so on. There are different role-expectations that go with different social relationships and social situations. Each of these different expectations constitutes a different culture to be learned. Because such cultures are situation-bound, and thus ordered with respect to other situation-bound cultures, we may choose to think of them as sub-cultures or micro-cultures, reserving the term "culture" for the larger, ordered system of which these are a part; in this sense, culture ceases to refer to a generic phenomenon of study and refers instead only to some level of organization of that phenomenon. From a theoretical viewpoint, the process of learning a society's culture, or macro-culture, as I would rather call it, is one of learning a number of different or partially different micro-cultures and their sub-cultural variants, and how to discern the situations in which they are appropriate and the kinds of others to whom to attribute them.

All human beings, then, live in what for them is a multi-cultural world, in which they are aware of different sets of others to whom different cultural attributions must be made, and of different contexts in which the different cultures of which they are aware are expected to be operative. Their competence in any one of these is indicated by their ability to interact effectively on its terms with others who are acknowledged as already competent. Everyone develops varying degrees of multi-cultural competence in at least some micro-cultures. Inter-societal contacts make at least some people minimally competent in some aspects of different macro-cultures as well. The range of cultural diversity increases in complex societies, where multi-cultural competence at the macro-cultural, as well as the micro-cultural, level may play an important role in the conduct of affairs and in differential access to privilege and power. I shall come back to this in a moment. Before I do, I wish to summarize what I have been implying in the preceding discussion of culture by observing that it is analytically and conceptually useful to distinguish among the following: (1) culture as a phenomenon, arising out of learning, in the context of interaction, the expectations people attribute to others; akin to Mead's (1934) concept of the "generalized other." (2) the specific micro- or macro-cultures individuals attribute to specific sets of others as the ones that are appropriately operative in social situations; (3) the range of variance in what the individual members of an interaction network or group attribute to the membership of the network or group as the group's culture; (4) the number of such interaction networks and groups in a social unit under consideration, the degree to which they overlap in membership or come together in larger networks or groups, and the subject matter with respect to which they function as networks or groups; and (5) the total range of knowledge of, and competence in, various micro-cultures and macro-cultures that is possessed by the members of a given social unit, whether or not they are appropriately operative in interactions within that unit, and that compose what can be called the "cultural pool" or "reservoir" of the membership of that unit (Good-enough, 1971).

Of obvious interest for the study of continuity and change are the specific processes by which the variance in cultural attributions individuals make to their network or group is kept within workable bounds (see no. 3). Whatever these processes are, they clearly have to do with the rates and kinds of interaction that take place among members of the network or group. Of interest, too, are the processes by which an element in a group's cultural pool (see no. 5) gains or loses status as part of a specific micro-culture that is expected to be operative in some context (see no. 2). Also of interest are the processes that increase or reduce the number of networks or groups within a society (see no. 4) and that affect the extent of overlap in their memberships. All of these processes involve people pursuing their various and competing interests, a consideration that brings us back to privilege and power.

Real social power, as distinct from jural authority, is a function of two variables. One variable is the extent and intensity of people's wants, and the other is the extent to which people are in a position to facilitate or

5

impede the gratification of one another's wants. If nothing matters to me, even whether I live or die or whether I am free of pain, then no one is in a position to affect my behavior and no one has any social power in relation to me. If, on the other hand, others are unable to gratify any of their wants without my cooperation, then I have enormous power in relation to them. In no human society is real social power ever evenly distributed. The greater dependency of the young, the old, the sick, and the infirm on others for the gratification of their wants, and the relative lack of dependency of others on them, guarantee unequal power relationships everywhere. Such inequalities are compounded by individual differences in knowledge and skills and in physical and personal attractiveness. The cultural definition of jural relationships and the different rights and duties that attach to different social identities in their dealings with one another inevitably reflect these inequalities in real power, and also reflect the kinds of trade-offs that people in their past dealings have been able to achieve as the basis for present cultural expectations.

Among the resources to which access is of paramount importance in power relationships are the various micro-cultures that make up a macro-cultural system. Growth in the number of specialized skills and bodies of knowledge produces more power in the social system to be distributed and managed and expands the possibilities for inequalities in power. The amount of power in a social field of relationships, it seems, increases directly as the complexity of the field increases, and its management becomes a problem of increasing importance and difficulty for the people involved.

Even in the relatively uncomplicated societies of Melanesia and Micronesia, with which I am personally familiar, control of specialized forms of knowledge is perceived as a source of social power generally and of political power in particular. Validation of claims to land and political office rests on a public display of a kind of knowledge that only those in line of succession are given access to. For those not in line of succession to aspire to such knowledge is to presume to what they are not entitled. I suspect it was no accident that, in 1964, in the little community of Romonum on Truk in Micronesia, all four of the salaried government positions under the American administration (medical assistant, local judge, school principal, and teacher) were monopolized by the highest ranking men in the two chiefly lineages. Even more significant was the fact that no one but children of chiefly rank had qualified for education beyond the elementary level in accordance with an apparently impartially administered examination system. Access to the kinds of alien cultural knowledge and skills which the schools afforded seems to have been perceived, like access to important forms of traditional knowledge, as appropriate for persons of high social rank

and inappropriate for those without it. I don't think this was a matter of which they were necessarily conscious, but that it resulted largely from what they felt somehow to be appropriate to their own sense of social self.

If the management of social power includes the manipulation of access to knowledge and skills, the obvious targets of such manipulation are the conditions necessary for acquiring knowledge and skills. These may be briefly summarized as (1) mental and physical aptitudes needed to develop the indicated skills and to acquire the necessary level of comprehension; (2) a perception of self and of goals that make developing the skills and acquiring the comprehension seem appropriate or desirable; (3) freedom from emotional blocks in relation to the skills and knowledge in question (partly related to no. 2 above); and (4) access to situations in which there is opportunity to rehearse the skills and work at getting the knowledge, as well as opportunity to get helpful feedback (guidance) until proficiency is achieved.

In complex societies, the great number of micro- and even the miacro-cultures they compose are inevitably the subject matter of social and political manipulation. Access to the cultures and sub-cultures in which competence must be demonstrated to establish eligibility for positions of privilege becomes a major matter to which social organization is geared, and is at the same time a prime target for political maneuvering. The social rules that serve to control such access, usually multiple and mutually reinforcing, also become a prime target for reform in times of change, with a resultant change in personal aspirations, as we are currently witnessing in connection with women's liberation and education for minorities.

The problems of multi-culturalism in education, then, arise as aspects of the processes I have been discussing, as does human concern with them. Multi-culturalism is present to some degree in every human society. Differential access to and knowledge of the various micro-cultures in macro-cultural systems is a significant aspect of power relationships in all societies. As multi-culturalism becomes more pronounced and elaborated, and the field of power becomes greater with increasing social complexity, multi-culturalism becomes an ever more important consideration in the management of power relationships and, as such, an ever more serious problem in the politics of education, whose institutions are the instruments by which people control access to more specialized micro-cultures and to the power and privilege they confer.

References

Goodenough, W. H. *Culture, Language, and Society*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley Modular Publications No. 7, 1971.

6

Mead, G. H. *Mind, Self and Society.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1934.

Roberts, J. M. *Three Navajo Households.* Cambridge

MA: 40:3 Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, 1951.

APPROACHES TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: SOME CONCEPTS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Margaret Alison Gibson
University of Pittsburgh

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to analyze several existing approaches to the conceptualization of multi-cultural education within the United States in an effort to increase conceptual clarity and to make explicit a number of assumptions which underlie each conceptualization. Specifically, I shall present five approaches to multi-cultural education. For each of the first four, all programmatic, I shall delineate basic assumptions regarding underlying values, change strategies, intended outcomes, and target populations. The fifth conceptualization stems from an anthropological perspective on both education and culture and, unlike the others, does not equate education with schooling or view multi-cultural education as a type of formal educational program.

To systematize the alternative approaches to conceptualizing multi-cultural education, I have reviewed the educational literature pertaining to bilingual/bicultural education, education for pluralism, ethnic studies, and multi-cultural education, and have delineated the assumptions of those agencies and individuals who are advocating support for such programs. The literature is drawn largely from the publications of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the articles found in the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U.S. Office of Education. My analysis of the several approaches and the assumptions underlying them stems primarily from the anthropological literature on cultural pluralism, ethnicity, and acculturation.

The five approaches I have distinguished overlap and interrelate, but for purposes of analysis I discuss each separately. Contrasts among the first four can most readily be seen in terms of their differing objectives. For this reason, I begin the discussion of each with a statement of purpose. I then present the conditions which gave rise to the approach, the major proponents of the approach, and the underlying assumptions regarding values, strategies, outcomes, and target populations. I conclude each section with a discussion of the assumptions. The following summary briefly gives the statements of purpose for approaches one through four and provides a title for each approach. (1) *Education of the Culturally Different or Benevolent Multi-culturalism—*

The purpose of multi-cultural education is to equalize educational opportunities for culturally different students. (2) *Education about Cultural Differences or Cultural Understanding—*The purpose of multi-cultural education is to teach students to value cultural differences, to understand the meaning of the culture concept, and to accept others' right to be different. (3) *Education for Cultural Pluralism—*The purpose of multi-cultural education is to preserve and to extend cultural pluralism in American society. (4) *Bicultural Education—*The purpose of multi-cultural (or bicultural) education is to produce learners who have competencies in and can operate successfully in two different cultures.

Approach One: Education of the Culturally Different or Benevolent Multi-culturalism.1

The purpose of the first approach to multi-cultural education is to equalize educational opportunity for culturally different students. The conditions giving rise to this approach are, first, the continuing academic failure of students from a certain minority ethnic group whose school performance continues to lag behind national norms, and second, the rejection of cultural and genetic deficit hypotheses regarding students' school failure. The most frequent proponents of this approach are concerned members of the educational establishment who reject the compensatory remedies, such as Head Start, which grew out of the deficit hypotheses, and who view multi-cultural education as a more viable strategy for decreasing the disparity in school achievement between mainstream and minority youth.

The key assumptions underlying the first approach are that culturally different children face unique learning handicaps in schools dominated by mainstream values; that to remedy this situation multi-cultural education programs must be devised which will increase home/school cultural compatability; and that these new programs will, in turn, increase students' academic success. The target populations for this approach are the children from certain minority ethnic groups who lag furthest behind national norms on school performance. These children are labelled culturally different because they share only peripherally in the mainstream culture.

7