

Anthropology, Education and the Wider Public

Hilary Callan and Brian Street

ABSTRACT: The article addresses the position of anthropology in new educational contexts, considering anthropology *in* education and the anthropological study of education. While some transatlantic comparisons are drawn, the emphasis is on developments within the U.K. These are treated historically, using the Royal Anthropological Institute's experience in working for an anthropological presence in pre-university education from the 1980s to the present as an extended case-study. The work done by the RAI's Education Committee to design and introduce a new GCE A-level in anthropology, culminating in its successful accreditation by the national regulator, is recounted in the style of 'rich ethnography'. A case is made for the potential of academic associations to create the alliances across sectors that are needed in this context; and conclusions are tentatively drawn regarding the implications of these initiatives for the future of the discipline and its public engagement.

KEYWORDS: education, ethnography, GCE A-level, public engagement, Royal Anthropological Institute

Introduction

In this article we consider the relationship between anthropology and education, concentrating on anthropology *in* education and the scope for anthropology to intervene in education policy and curricula, as well as becoming more visible in the wider public sphere than it is at present. Following a brief discussion of some theoretical perspectives, we describe the Royal Anthropological Institute's (RAI) education programme, as a case study of such intervention. We trace some of the connections between entry routes to formal study of anthropology at degree level, the presence of anthropology in pre-university education, and anthropology as seen from the 'outside' by its wider audiences. We record the successful development, within the education programme, of a new GCE A-level qualification in anthro-

pology; and speculate on the extent to which the visibility of anthropology in the U.K. may be changed in future by its presence as a taught subject at pre-university level.

The case study focuses on the U.K. experience and, in particular, that of negotiating a presence for anthropology in pre-university curricula. However, comparative experiences from outside the U.K., especially the U.S., are instructive, and will be drawn on where appropriate. We consider the role of discipline-based professional associations in helping facilitate such developments; and in creating a synergy between those teaching the discipline in university and those in other institutional or occupational settings having anthropological interests and perspectives. The conclusion returns to the broader issue of the need for anthropology to engage with education and with the public sphere, and brings together

the notions of anthropology *of* education and anthropology *in* education.

Anthropology and Education: Theoretical Perspectives

Green and Bloome (1997), writing mainly about anthropology and education in the U.S., have distinguished between the anthropology *of* education and anthropology *in* education, with particular reference to the uses of ethnographic approaches. We will discuss the wider issues associated with anthropology *of* education towards the end of this chapter, but our major focus here will be on anthropology *in* education. There has until recently been less emphasis in the U.K. than in the U.S. on how the discipline might contribute to educational courses, in particular with regard to pre-university education, despite some early attempts by the RAI Education Committee in the U.K. around the time of the Swann Report¹ to bring anthropological perspectives to issues of education policy and curriculum (see below). More recently, however, issues surrounding citizenship, and the role of diversity in contemporary social orders, have become prominent across schools and universities. As we shall see, members of the RAI Education Committee have been working to bring an anthropological approach to courses that address these issues, encouraging students to consider critically their own cultural and social assumptions.

In the U.S. there has been a close link for many anthropologists between an interest in the ethnography of communication and a concern for practical interventions in educational policy, although McCarty and Brayboy (2009) point out that there is still a struggle to get an anthropological voice heard, notably in the context of 'No Child Left Behind' mandates for 'scientifically based' quantitative evidence. The policy debate, they suggest, still seems to 'snap back to the 1960s, when characterizations of students of color were cloaked in the language

of educational disadvantage and a culture of poverty' (McCarty and Brayboy 2009: 14). Against this backdrop, the anthropological sensitivity to context, bilingual issues and moving beyond 'the fallacy of simplistic numerical solutions to desegregation', struggles to be heard. Nevertheless, there are numerous distinctive examples in the U.S. of how an anthropological approach can refine such policy perspectives. Shirley Brice Heath's (1983) classic account of the everyday language and literacy practices of children, for instance, challenged the dominant model of schooling, and indicated what students might bring with them to school rather than seeing homes as 'in deficit'. For Del Hymes, insights derived from anthropological research were part of a broader commitment to anthropology's 'relevance to wider publics' (Hymes 1996: 14): an issue also signalled in Lassiter's seminal piece on applied anthropology, published in *Current Anthropology* (Lassiter 2005). In the same spirit, the work of the Spindlers (Spindler and Spindler 2000) on anthropological approaches to learning and education has been classic, both in anthropology degree curricula and for those teaching in pre-university sites. However, in the U.S., as in the U.K., such approaches have also come up against strong policy pressures that resisted what was seen as objectionable relativism, preferring for political reasons to advocate universalistic and hegemonic 'standards' in both language and education. A classic example of anthropology-related educational initiatives colliding with conservative policy was the MACOS (*Man, A Course of Study*) project. This attempted to provide films and curriculum materials for schools, starting with examples drawn from outside the mainstream U.S. such as Asen Balikci's celebrated Netsilik Eskimo film series. Certain Republican senators opposed this project on the grounds that it featured supposedly 'primitive' societies, in an educational context where – it was held – 'progress' and 'modernization' should be the norm. In the face of this Congress-level op-

position, the series was withdrawn and the MACOS program terminated.

Nevertheless, the work of anthropologists has penetrated areas of education in the U.S. This is evidenced by the work of the AAA's Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE) which has an extensive website with details of materials, covering (for instance) how ethnicity and racism might be studied in schools (www.aaanet.org). At the research level, the journal *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* provides institutional forums for debate and refinement of these issues, and for anthropologists' contribution to educational policy in the U.S.

Anthropology and Education: U.K. Experience before 1990

In the U.K. during the 1980s there was a movement by members of the then Education Committee of the Royal Anthropological Institute to support colleagues in schools, who were attempting to draw upon anthropological perspectives in their teaching. This strategy appeared especially feasible with respect to what were termed 'Mode 3' units of work in the then General Certificate of Education (GCE) O-Levels (i.e. 'Ordinary' level qualifications), which provided teachers and their students with the possibility of personal studies, projects and report writing that were internally assessed and externally moderated. Courses emerged in a number of schools that suggested ethnographic routes for students studying their own social environments. Teachers would then give the written account a grade that would contribute to the overall GCE score. Anthropologists worked with colleagues in education and in other social sciences to run conferences; and produced special issues of *Social Science Teacher*, the journal of the Association of Teachers in Social Science (ATSS 1978), whilst the RAI Committee produced a teachers' resource guide.

Later, central regulation of courses and programmes made it harder to pursue such local

approaches as those represented by the Mode 3, and even now the QCA (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority) only validates 'personal study' in very few subject areas.² This is partly because of adverse national publicity about 'plagiarism', including a belief that children would simply download material from the internet; fear of middle-class parents unduly supporting their children at a time of high competition for places in further and higher education; and a move towards a more competence based, external criteria-driven view of learning, in which a more reflective and critical approach of the kind encouraged by anthropology might be less valued. It is in the context of these pressures – and to some extent against their grain – that the development and accreditation of an anthropology A-Level, described below, have to be seen.

But another strand of those earlier attempts to bring anthropology into pre-university education can also offer lessons for the present. In the mid-1980s, at the time of the Swann Report, there was growing concern that schools were not well placed to deal with the issues raised by cultural and linguistic diversity. Originally set up as the Rampton Report (Department of Education and Science 1981), this inquiry was concerned with the underperformance of ethnic minority students – for instance, children of migrants who had been encouraged to come to Britain in the 1970s from (in this case) the Caribbean, to work in employment sites such as the National Health Service. Such students were entering the school system with different language knowledge and different home background experiences from those of many 'traditional' 'English' students, and this was seen to disadvantage them in formal schooling. Following Rampton the government widened the remit to consider all ethnic minority students, not just those from the Caribbean.

The Swann Report, and indeed subsequent government reports on education, were still perceived as focusing on 'problems' and 'deficits' amongst ethnic minority children, whether

with language or with learning. Anthropologists on the RAI Education Committee believed that the discipline offered a more sophisticated approach to such issues, eschewing 'deficit' in favour of 'diversity', and recognising that language varieties could be strengths rather than 'problems' (cf. Leung 1999). Building on the work that had been going on with colleagues in schools using anthropological perspectives in students' own project work, and taking account of the experience of an anthropology course in the International Baccalaureate, the Committee proposed to the RAI that it should support work directed towards development of an A-Level in anthropology. However, there were concerns amongst colleagues that anthropology was not really appropriate as a subject for pre-university students, who were said to lack the maturity and social experience needed to handle the complexity of perspectives such study required. These concerns are recounted in more detail in Street (2010); see also Balzani on the International Baccalaureate and Anthropology and Bennett on the transition to undergraduate anthropology, in this special issue. Moreover, there was concern that anthropologists might take a variety of perspectives on the issues raised by the Swann Report regarding inward migration to the U.K., and some within the RAI did not want the Institute to be seen as taking a particular political stand. Externally too, as stated above, pressures such as the growing tendency for the curriculum and teaching in schools to be centrally directed made it difficult for the kind of reflexive and critical approach associated with anthropology to be acceptable in educational and policy circles.

For these and other reasons, the ambition of creating an anthropology A-Level and, more generally, work to support an anthropological dimension in pre-university curricula and teaching, were effectively put on hold for two decades. As we describe below, however, the climate has recently changed – both within the discipline and externally. There is now strong

national support for pre-university anthropology among university-based anthropologists, funding bodies and also former anthropology students eager to teach their subject in schools. In this altered climate the recently reconstituted RAI Education Committee has mobilized this support and renewed the efforts of the past. In association with the AQA (Assessment and Qualification Alliance) awarding body, it has developed a specification for an anthropology A-Level which has achieved accreditation by the regulator.

In the present climate, the arguments for what anthropology might contribute to education are rather different from those of that earlier period. In an era when global understanding and recognition of diverse ways of seeing the world are of critical social, political and economic importance, anthropology can play a central role in broadening the range and scope of education in such contexts, and is relevant not only for those on university courses but also for students at school and in Further Education. Themes that anthropology brings to bear within education include understandings of the relationship between local and global processes, unity and diversity in human life, personhood, ethnic identity, colonialism and racism, stereotyping, exoticism, representations of 'otherness', and so forth. Themes such as these have been built into the A-Level in anthropology that we discuss in more detail below.

Renewal of Initiatives since 2000

Between 2001 and 2003 the RAI conducted a comprehensive strategic review of its entire operation, aiming to analyse and, where necessary, reposition the Institute in relation to its traditional commitments and its present and future environments. The review identified clear priorities, among which were those of promoting knowledge of anthropology within the pre-university U.K. education system, and

strengthening the discipline's engagement with issues in the public sphere. The review's report, adopted by the RAI Council in 2003, recommended *inter alia* reconstitution of the Institute's Education Committee. This was quickly put in place, with a broad mandate and with some of the same individuals as members who had been active in the initiatives of the 1980s. The Committee began its work formally in 2004, amid widespread confidence that the time was right for the Institute – and U.K. anthropology more generally – to re-engage with the broader educational process and with national priorities such as citizenship education.

An early success came in 2005, with the award of a one-year support grant by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) under its 'AimHigher' programme, the generic purpose of which has been to promote participation in Higher Education among historically under-represented sections of the U.K. school-age population. The case was successfully made that anthropology, through its recognition of the specificities of cultural experience, can contribute to confidence-building among disadvantaged groups and to the legitimization of diverse routes into Higher Education. More broadly, the programme's association with the values of AimHigher has helped to counter perceptions of anthropology as a 'middle-class' and gendered pursuit (unlike sociology, for example): a point also addressed by Bennett, and Hawkins and Mills (this issue). The HEFCE grant made it possible for the RAI to create a broadly based programme of educational outreach in anthropology, and to establish a staff position in support of the programme. The education programme developed by the Education Committee is organized around three principal strands: an information strand, an activity strand, and a curricular strand.

The programme's information strand aims to provide clear, good-quality, audience-appropriate materials on anthropology designed for pre-university students, teachers, careers advisers and parents. Much of the information

will eventually be web-based, and a dedicated *Discover Anthropology* website (www.discoveranthropology.org.uk) was launched in 2009. A blogspot, *Anthropologist About Town*, a weekly diary of anthropology-related events of interest to those new to the discipline, has proved very popular with users. The RAI is a partner, with the University of Sussex and Brighton Museum and Art Gallery, in an on-going project, 'Discovering Anthropology through Museum Outreach and Education', to develop schools' learning resources based on museum collections. This has recently been published as *Culture, Identity, Difference* by the Royal Pavilion and Museums, Brighton and Hove (see Basu and Coleman, this issue). The activities strand of the education programme has included organising the annual London Anthropology Day for school students and teachers held at the British Museum (Basu 2008), and contributions to the Economic and Social Research Council's Festivals of Social Science (see below) and the British Association for the Advancement of Science Festivals of Science, in which the Education Officer has played a major role. The curricular strand seeks to develop a presence for anthropology within school and FE curricula. The emphasis since 2005 has been on creating a structure and content for an A-Level qualification in anthropology; and the RAI's partnership with the awarding body, AQA, to develop the A-Level and pilot it through the accreditation process, began in January 2008.

The programme as a whole has received endorsement from other national players in the U.K., including discipline-based organizations and those with broader national policy and funding remits. An International Benchmarking Review of U.K. social anthropology, conducted by the Economic and Social Research Council (the U.K.'s public sector funding body for the social sciences) in 2006, gave special mention to the education programme. Since 2007 the programme has been financially supported by the ESRC under its 'Science in

Society' scheme, the purpose of which is to promote public understanding of, and engagement with, social science across the board. Throughout this period the RAI has participated in the ESRC's annual Festival of Social Science, as part of the 'activities' strand signalled above, by organizing public events and film screenings on topics of widespread interest such as 'childhood', 'communities and food', 'the social life of plants' and 'the meaning of water'. These events have, to date, drawn large and growing audiences, many of whom have had no previous knowledge of social science or anthropology. Amongst the positive feedback from one participant in a recent event was: 'Perhaps in several years' time people will no longer look at fellow anthropologists with blank faces when they say what they study/ have studied!'

An A-Level Qualification in Anthropology

An early decision taken by the Education Committee, as part of the 'curricular' strand, was to design and lobby for, a GCE A-Level (i.e. 'Advanced' level) qualification in anthropology as a key component of the renewed programme. There were several reasons for this choice. Apart from an optional course within the International Baccalaureate, anthropology as a named subject is not taught at pre-university level in the U.K. This absence has clearly contributed to the subject's lack of visibility in both education and the wider public domain. An A-Level (the standard qualifying examination for university entrance in England, Wales and Northern Ireland) would, it was felt, by its mere presence have a symbolic and information value larger than the numbers of students who might opt to take it. For university departments offering undergraduate degrees in anthropology, the qualification would offer a clear pathway into the subject, although the consensus also was that this should not

place obstacles in the way of those discovering anthropology through more serendipitous routes. There was, however, agreement that the A-Level should not be allowed to become a diluted version of an undergraduate degree, but should be designed as a self-contained course in its own right. The existence of an A-Level was also seen as, in the longer term, offering enhanced career opportunities for anthropology graduates wishing to enter the teaching profession in their own subject. However, at least as important as the institutional rationales was a belief that anthropology is a subject that can and should be available to secondary-age students alongside other subjects, as part of a contemporary liberal education. The conviction was and is that while the A-Level would open up a 'pathway' into degree-level anthropology, it would equally enrich the education of those going on to degrees in other subjects – or taking different directions in life altogether.

From 2005 onwards, the Education Committee devoted intensive efforts to constructing a specification for the content of the proposed A-Level, and piloting it through the various steps towards acceptance and accreditation. This entailed sustained consultation with the University departments, regulators, funding bodies and individual schools and teachers. In sharp contrast to some of the disagreements of the past, the Committee encountered no opposition of principle from the academic community, although there was lively debate on what should be included in the specification. A key development was the decision at the end of 2007 by the AQA awarding body to adopt the A-Level and work with the RAI on developing and submitting it for accreditation by the (then) QCA. This stage culminated in successful accreditation of the A-level in October 2009. Below, we record aspects of the experience of designing the A-Level, and decisions of principle that have been made in the process.

Full details of the course content can be found on the RAI's dedicated education web-

site at www.discoveranthropology.org.uk; and on that of AQA at www.aqa.org.uk. Here we indicate some of the key features of the programme. The subject can be taken at 'AS' ('Advanced Subsidiary') level, consisting of two units usually taking one year of study in the Sixth Form, and at 'A2' level, comprising a further two units following on from the AS. At AS, the specification offers students the chance 'to grapple with fundamental questions of human life, and in the process to develop skills of critical enquiry, sensitivity and an appreciation of topical debates and issues'. The two units at AS will cover, respectively: *Being Human: Unity and Diversity* and *Becoming a Person: Identity and Belonging*. At A2, the specification gives students 'the opportunity to explore issues in a global as well as local context, and also to apply their knowledge and understanding of anthropological principles to a small-scale investigation on an anthropological topic of their choice'. Within A2, Unit 3 will cover *Global and Local: Societies, Environments and Globalisation*; Unit 4 will deal with *Practising Anthropology: Methods and Investigations*. Unit 4 includes both study of methodological issues affecting anthropology across the board, and a small-scale individual investigation on an anthropological topic of the students' choice. Thus Unit 4 is designed to draw upon the content of Units 1, 2 and 3 to test students' ability to apply their anthropological concepts and knowledge to real life settings. It will be externally assessed by written examination, in which students will answer questions about both the taught content and their individual investigation.

Key Issues and Decision Points, 2005–2009

In drawing up the A-Level specification, certain key issues have had to be addressed and decisions made at the levels of principle, strategy and tactics. The most significant of these are the following.

Decisions of Principle

Design of the course content has called for a lengthy exercise in academic debate and negotiation leading to agreement within the Education Committee on what to include from the whole potential range of anthropology teaching; how to accommodate it to the limited scope of a two-year, four-unit course of study; and how to tailor the material within the prescribed assessment formats of the current A-Level structure. Of the decisions of principle made, perhaps the most significant are the choices to address anthropology as a whole, and to include provision for a small-scale investigation on an anthropological topic of the student's own choice.

- '*Anthropology as a whole*'. The RAI, alone among U.K.-based associations, is institutionally tied to an inclusive conception of anthropology embracing both its biological and socio-cultural arms. It has therefore been logical to build the course content around the inclusive model, taking account also of material culture (in harmony with the inclusion of museum materials as indicated above). However, within academic anthropology there are divergent views about the extent to which what is sometimes termed the 'great divide' between biological and socio-cultural traditions can be successfully transcended in pedagogy and research. Within the wider disciplinary community in the U.K., views were sought via Heads of Departments, through members of the Education Committee reporting back to their own institutions, the annual Anthropology Day in London and through regular reporting to the RAI Council Meetings. Through these contacts and in personal exchanges, some anxieties have been expressed over the representation of 'anthropology as a whole' within the A-Level. These have been to some extent resolved by a decision not to base the

course content on direct presentation of the sub-disciplines *per se*, but rather to build it around broad themes encompassing topics to which insights from the component traditions of ‘anthropology as a whole’ can be brought to bear in the classroom and in students’ reading. Within the course specification, the themes comprising the four units address key issues across anthropology that the Committee anticipate being most salient and inclusive. Only experience in teaching will show how successful this approach proves to be in facilitating the teacher’s task and conveying ‘anthropology as a whole’ to A-Level students.

- *Personal research.* The final unit of the specification, *Practising Anthropology: Methods and Investigations*, provides for the student to design and carry out a small-scale investigation on an anthropological topic of his/her choice guided by the school and teacher; and to answer questions on it in an externally marked conventional written examination. In arriving at this formulation, issues concerning ethics, supervision and safety, authenticity and the risks of plagiarism, have had to be confronted and addressed. In making the case for the feasibility of a personal investigation carried out by students of this age-group, a long illustrative list was compiled of potential topics that would be within the students’ capacity and meet the above concerns, as well as drawing on taught material from across the specification. The rationale for students’ own engagement in anthropological activity has been clearly articulated by the RAI, and is supported by the awarding body (AQA). It has now been accepted by the regulator as an ‘investigation’ about which the student will be asked questions in the external examination, rather than through an internally assessed ‘personal study’. In summary, it was successfully

argued that a ‘taster’ of the conditions and difficulties of actual research is central to students’ understanding of the empirical foundations of anthropology and the issues of reflexivity, objectivity, framing and representation encountered in all research in the subject. Whether based on a social, physical or museum-based topic, engagement by students in doing anthropology, as well as reading about it from sources and textbooks, is central to what is often termed the ‘epistemological shift’ in which the discipline is grounded. Through even a small-scale study of this kind, such a shift entails stepping back from taken-for-granted experiences and looking at them in new ways. The argument made is that taking this step is of deep educational benefit, and forms one of anthropology’s distinctive potential contributions to 16–19 provision.

Strategic and Tactical Issues

The most important of these have involved:

- Positioning the qualification as differentiated from other (adjacent) subjects while showing that the anthropology A-Level will complement them. This has been less problematic than might have been expected. For example, the AQA’s Chief Examiner for sociology has been very positive about the introduction of an anthropology course alongside sociology, seeing the two subjects as complementary. It was deemed likely that teachers in schools where students already chose sociology would see anthropology as combining well with it, offering a more international and ethnographically based perspective on the study of social life. A large number of teachers of sociology at A-Level have also endorsed this view. Likewise, both school teachers and Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)

tutors in English have responded positively to the introduction of an anthropology programme, seeing (for instance) the complementary interest of ethnographers and of novelists in issues of representation, cultural diversity and identity (Street forthcoming). Many of the themes in Units 1 and 2 (AS) are prominent in contemporary fictional writing also. This complementarity has been especially recognized in the provision within the anthropology A-Level for students to ‘read texts and view films/videos, both anthropological and non-anthropological (including fictional materials) which offer representations of their own and other cultures and societies; and to learn how to identify and apply criteria for critical evaluation of visual or written representations’.

- Future-proofing the design. While future government-driven shifts in the structure of 16–19 provision cannot be predicted with any accuracy, the Committee has worked to ensure that the thematic content of the A-Level will lend itself as smoothly as possible to successor formats, such as the possible advent of academic diplomas in succession to A-Levels.
- Navigating the project through the multiple levels and sometimes conflicting agendas of the various national-level bodies whose approval is needed. This has entailed dealing with the organizational and bureaucratic dimensions of the bodies responsible for curriculum development in the U.K., in our case the AQA (the awarding body), QCA (subsequently QCDA) and, in the final stages of the process, the newly created Office of the Qualifications and Examinations Regulator (Ofqual). Within the AQA we have had three different Subject Managers, all of whom have been extremely committed and helpful, but whose departures left hiatuses in the way the Education Commit-

tee could link with the QCA. A positive continuity in this organizational complex has been the presence of the aforementioned AQA Chief Examiner for sociology, whose awareness of common issues, such as those associated with personal study in cognate disciplines, has been especially helpful. The QCDA tends to keep itself at arm’s length from the awarding bodies and subject proposers such as the RAI, and we have encountered it mainly through its written responses to our draft programmes. In particular, the debate over students engaging in an anthropological investigation has been lengthy and complex, especially so when conducted through written documents themselves designed to fit wider bureaucratic requirements concerning equivalence, ethics and the like.

These issues and decisions, culminating in the successful accreditation of the A-Level, have brought the Education Committee and colleagues on the RAI’s Film and Publications Committees to a point where we are now working with colleagues in schools, as well as in the AQA awarding body, to implement the curriculum and pedagogy now approved. We will all be monitoring closely the outcome of this activity, and can anticipate both problems and changes that will be of significance for the discipline as a whole and not just those working in this particular sector. We round off this article, then, by considering the broader implications for the discipline and for the associations concerned with its visibility and role in the wider public sphere.

Some Implications for the Visibility of Anthropology, and the Role of Anthropological Associations

One implication of the move towards an anthropological presence in pre-university courses

might be that the overall visibility of the discipline will change. A previous publication by one of us (Callan 2006) drew attention to a peculiar opacity, or impaired visibility, which seems to characterize contemporary anthropology within the U.K. For a number of reasons, it was argued, anthropology as perceived in this country has a blurred and indeterminate identity rather than a clear one. This opacity can be traced to a variety of causes, which include anthropology's virtual absence from the formal pre-university curriculum combined with biases and distortions that are widespread in representations of the subject throughout the public sphere. It is not the same thing as marginality, in the sense of a field attracting minority interest, or of which few people have heard. On the contrary, 'anthropology' as a term of reference (often, sadly, a term of dismissal) is in prominent and widespread general use; but the uses to which it is put in common Anglophone discourse relate more to deep-seated stereotypes of the 'exotic', the 'primitive' or the 'natural' than to the work anthropologists actually do. In the face of such stubborn filters to perception, anthropologists themselves have had remarkably little success in conveying their interests accurately or convincingly to the broader public. The discipline, it seems, faces endemic barriers in 'explaining itself outside itself' – an issue signalled in Eriksen's frequently referenced concern regarding 'engaging anthropology' (Eriksen 2006). As well as publicly held stereotypes, these barriers reflect long-standing tensions within the subject itself, some of which are historically rooted in arguments between 'mandarin' and 'missionary' camps (Mills 1999) over whether anthropologists should direct their work primarily to other anthropologists, or should take part in wider public conversations and educational agendas.

One consequence of the subject's impaired visibility in the U.K. has been the absence of clear routes and signposts for prospective students into undergraduate study of anthropol-

ogy. Until recently, the paths through which those on undergraduate degree courses have found their way into the discipline have been an under-researched topic, but at an anecdotal level some patterns have been discernible: a book recommended, a TV programme seen, an interest caught from a parent or teacher, personal change through gap-year travel or voluntary work, university prospectuses trawled for subject ideas outside a student's prior experience, anthropology seen as an extension or recombination of other subjects studied at school, or a change of degree course to anthropology resulting from a 'taster' of the subject within another programme (Basu and Coleman, this issue; see also Bennett, this issue). Research associated with the development of the A-Level has identified many anthropology graduates who say that they wish they had heard of the discipline earlier and that they would certainly have taken such a course before their university degree if one had been available. While actual uptake of the A-level may be modest – at least initially – its presence offers a signpost into the subject that may have an influence disproportionate to the numbers actually taking the course. An expanding presence of the subject in pre-university education, of which the A-level will be a marker even if on a small scale, can be expected to bring about more general shifts in the public ground on which anthropology stands in the U.K. How these shifts will be received within and outside the discipline, and what longer-range transformations may come about, only time will tell.

The visible presence of anthropology in pre-university education may thus have implications for the ways in which the discipline is seen from the 'outside' by the wider audiences with which it finds itself engaging by choice or default. Discipline-based associations have a particular role in making these connections possible. As noted above, the RAI as a U.K.-centred academic body played a key part in the education initiatives of the 1980s and earlier. In the altered conditions of the 2000s, it contin-

ues to do so and the fundamental aims remain constant. One of the lessons to be drawn, in our view, from older and current efforts and their outcome is the important contribution that discipline-based learned associations can make to anthropology's engagement with education at all levels of analysis. Such associations are of many kinds and purposes, and they include not only the RAI and other discipline-specific bodies such as the Association of Social Anthropologists (ASA) but also those like the Association for Teachers of Social Science, which played a significant role in the earlier moves to include anthropology in the school curriculum (cf. Dufour 1982; Breslin and Dufour 2006). One characteristic they have in common is that they can bring together individual scholars and teachers whose normal work environment is the university, into forms of belonging and solidarity located outside the university institutional structure – at the same time bringing pre-university teachers into the discussion and broadening the base for what counts as 'teaching anthropology'. Such liaisons can also create the conditions for research and practitioner constituencies to find common ground. By bringing academic specialists into professional contact with practitioners and policy-makers, non-university and trans-university associations can help to transcend the traditional barriers between theory and practice; and foster the emergence of new forms of professionalism and professional allegiance.

From a U.K. perspective, then, there are many ways in which academic associations can complement the traditional role of universities in supporting anthropology's efforts to achieve a visible public identity. They can mobilize the solidarity of a disciplinary community, intervene politically on occasion, and speak 'for' the discipline in the public sphere in ways that universities sometimes cannot. They can be quick on their feet, creating 'trading zones' for knowledge and practice (Mills and Huber 2005) in a more agile way than is sometimes possible for universities, burdened

as the latter are by their regulatory framework and their heavier investment in the infrastructure of courses and programmes. Such associations can also be very good at inclusiveness. By enabling those trained in a discipline but working outside it, or who have become institutionally marginalized in other ways, or are formally unqualified in an area but fascinated by it, to have a connection with their subject, associations can function as a clearing-house of knowledge, and can enrich the total intellectual capital of the fields in which they operate. In many ways this is what has happened in the creation of the anthropology A-Level, as members of the Education Committee have been drawn from both practising university teachers of anthropology – across social and biological fields, and material culture as indicated above – and those working in other areas of education such as FE, schools, the International Baccalaureate and the national institutions concerned with curriculum development and assessment.

As this experience has demonstrated, such associations can foster the unconventional at an early stage of change in what counts as the mainstream of a field of study. They can nurture the proverbial 'green shoots' of growth at the boundaries of traditional knowledge systems by giving a home to informal networks and ad-hoc interest groups, where knowledge is created that may later travel into the academic mainstream and reach beyond it. In these ways, academic associations can compensate to some degree for something which the university sector is progressively losing in many national Higher Education structures: namely the capacity to take intellectual risks at the boundaries between knowledge systems and between knowledge, policy and practice. We therefore argue that, as measured by experience in the U.K. and reflexively by the 'thick ethnography' of the Education Committee's own work, non-university or trans-university associations have a key role to play in engaging anthropology with education and with

public spheres more broadly. Our case study of pathways to anthropology is also a case study of the critical brokerage and connection-making function of a discipline-based association. With the challenges that lie ahead to consolidate the anthropology A-Level and establish it on a sustained footing, this role will surely take new forms and bring in new players.

Conclusion: Anthropology *in* and Anthropology *of* Education

We have discussed in this chapter the role of anthropology in new educational contexts, beyond its traditional place in the university, with particular reference to the development of an A-Level programme for U.K. schools. And we have considered the implications of this for the place of anthropology in the wider public sphere. We conclude by considering also the implications of such moves for an anthropology *of* education.

We referred briefly at the beginning of this article to Green and Bloome's (1997) distinction in the U.S. context between anthropology *of* and anthropology *in* education. With respect to anthropology *of* education, they suggest, anthropologists tend to take a cross-cultural and international perspective, making use of ethnographic methods to consider what it means to learn in different kinds of social institutions and contexts; and thereby locating our own cultural assumptions about education in a broader frame. Green and Bloome have proposed that educationalists and others could learn from this anthropological approach without themselves having to become anthropologists. Researchers could adopt an ethnographic perspective, by which they mean that it is possible to take a more focused approach (i.e. do less than a comprehensive ethnography) to study particular aspects of everyday life and the cultural practices of a social group. 'Central to an ethnographic perspective is the use of theories of culture and

inquiry practices derived from anthropology or sociology to guide the research'. Whilst such a perspective has not been particularly prominent in U.K. anthropology, it has informed the work of both anthropologists and educationalists in the U.S., whilst in the U.K. it has mostly been associated with sociologists, educationalists and cultural studies specialists. For instance, the annual Ethnography and Education Conference at Oxford has tended to be organized by sociologists from the Department of Education there, whilst the journal *Ethnography and Education* is run by similar teams. A recent book by Geoffrey Walford, also based in Oxford, *How to do Education Ethnography* (2008), provides a classic view of the uses of 'ethnographic perspectives' that do not necessarily involve anthropologists. A recent paper by Jeffrey and Troman (2004), 'Time for Ethnography', claims that educationalists and sociologists can move beyond the time frames that constrained anthropologists in their uses of ethnography in traditional fieldwork where the annual agricultural cycle required in-depth continuous ethnography. The ethnographer of education, instead, uses a more selective 'ethnographic perspective', calculating which time frame is appropriate for the particular questions regarding learning and education that s/he is researching.

There has recently been a move by U.K. anthropologists towards a more comprehensively anthropological view of education. Recent conferences are testimony to the growing interest in education as a subject of inquiry amongst anthropologists: for example, 'After Ethnography: Anthropology, Education and the Knowledge Economy', organized by Richard Ratcliffe and David Mills at the Department of Education, Oxford, in 2006; 'Teaching Anthropology Today', organized by David Mills and Dimitrina Spencer at Keble College, Oxford, in 2008; 'Pathways to Anthropology', organized by Paul Basu and Simon Coleman at Sussex University in 2007; and 'Learning, Livelihoods and Social Mobility: Anthro-

logical Perspectives on Formal and Informal Education', organized by Peggy Froerer at Brunel in 2009.

How the theoretical account briefly summarized here and developed more extensively at those conferences (some of which we hope to see published) links with the work described earlier regarding anthropology *in* education, particularly the advent of the A-Level in the U.K., remains to be worked through. But it is evident that this process has both been informed by, and has in turn affected, the ways in which anthropology *of* education is now being addressed in the U.K. The process of developing the A-level, for instance, emerged out of theoretical discussion about the role of an anthropological perspective in 'educating' young people about the world they are growing up into – notably regarding questions of diversity, personhood, representation, reflexivity, global and local issues – that are addressed in the course units in ways that might help students move beyond the somewhat cruder perspectives and stereotypes evident in much popular journalism.

In our view, the discussions that have culminated in adoption of the A-Level pose questions that extend theoretical debates in the field of anthropology of education, and will certainly help to reinforce the significance of education as a subject of inquiry in the discipline as anthropologists find themselves addressing more closely issues regarding the relationship between knowledge and learning that these debates raise. For instance, the issue signalled above regarding the role of professional associations in developing common ground for research and practitioner constituencies in the field of education and anthropology will play out further here, as educational matters take a more prominent role. At the same time, the debates about what counts as anthropology and the relationship between 'doing ethnography' and adopting an 'ethnographic perspective', raised by Green and Bloome above, will be to some extent re-framed

in terms of their implications for what it is appropriate for pre-university students to learn. The individual investigation included in Unit 4 of the A-Level has already raised questions for different members of the Education Committee as to what it is appropriate for 'non anthropologists' to learn about the discipline and its methods. These debates will filter in turn into the teaching and examining teams concerned with the A-Level, and find their way also into university anthropology departments. And the relationship anthropology wants to have to the wider public, including how to overcome its 'impaired visibility' or the stereotypes it would wish to challenge, will also raise questions of an educational kind. The questions asked by Eriksen (2006) regarding how anthropologists might 'engage' with the wider public will demand a more focused discussion on how the 'public' have 'learned' about anthropological issues, and how a more professional input might help to challenge dominant and distorted perceptions. An anthropology *of* education will have a significant role to play here, and this role will in fact have to be closely linked with the work of anthropology *in* education that has been the main subject of this article.

The account here, then, provides a classic example of the 'case study' approach whereby anthropologists attempt to provide rich description of key features of cultural activity in order to draw out more general principles (Mitchell 1984). We are, however, acutely aware that we have cut across one moment in an ongoing process, and that we have raised more questions than we have answered. Our case study has led into a complex of questions surrounding anthropology *in* and *of* education; the capacity of anthropology to intervene in education policy and curricula and in the public sphere; and the role of professional associations in brokering connections and conversations across the various boundaries. Issues such as these will surely require us to consider, over a longer timescale and in greater depth, the implications

for the discipline as a whole of the initiatives described here, as they develop and spread. Along the way – as with all anthropological research – yet more questions will be raised and new concepts need to be fashioned to make sense of the experience of locating anthropology in pre-university sites, as it emerges in the next few years.

Acknowledgments

While this chapter appears under our joint names as authors, we wish to acknowledge the collective work of the RAI's Education Committee, which is present in our account in ways that would be impossible to disentangle. We also thank the ESRC and HEFCE for their financial support for the education programme; and our successive Education Officers, Gemma Jones and Nafisa Fera, for their academic contribution to the programme as well as their logistic support. With regard to the anthropology A-Level, we thank AQA for its patience, technical support and expertise in guiding the specification successfully through the lengthy accreditation process.

Hilary Callan has been Director of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland since 2000. Prior to this she was for seven years Director of the European Association for International Education, with headquarters in Amsterdam. An anthropologist by training, she has held academic appointments in the U.K., Canada and the Middle East, and is the author of a number of publications in anthropology and international education. She is co-editor and contributing author to Early Human Kinship (2008) published by Wiley-Blackwell.

Brian Street did his PhD in Anthropology at Oxford in 1970, taught Anthropology at Sussex University for over 20 years and is currently Professor of Language in Education at King's College, London University. He has a commitment to link-

ing ethnographic-style research on the cultural dimension of language and literacy with contemporary practice in education and in development. He is currently involved in development projects in South Asia and Africa using ethnographic perspectives in training literacy and numeracy teachers. Recent books include (with Shirley Heath) On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research (2008), (NCRL; Teachers College Columbia) and (with Rafat Nabi, and Alan Rogers) Hidden Literacies: Ethnographic Case Studies of Literacy and Numeracy from Pakistan (Uppingham Press: Bury St Edmunds). In 2009 he was elected Vice-President of the Royal Anthropological Institute and has been Chair of the Education Committee of the RAI since 2004.

Notes

1. The 'Swann Report' (Department of Education and Science 1985) was the final report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. The report advocated a multicultural education system for all schools, regardless of institutions, location, age-range or ethnicity of staff/students.
2. In August 2009, the QCA was replaced by the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA), the role of which is to 'develop the curriculum, improve and deliver assessments, and review and reform qualifications' (www.qcda.gov.uk/aboutus.aspx). In England, QCA's regulatory role has been taken over by the Office of the Qualifications and Examinations Regulator (Ofqual).

References

- ATSS (1978), 'Anthropology and Education', special issue of *Social Science Teacher* 7(4).
- Basu, P. (2008), 'Extending the Educational Reach of Anthropology? Reflections on London Anthropology Day 2008', *Anthropology Today* 24(5): 2–3.
- Breslin, T. and B. Dufour (2006), *Developing Citizens: A Comprehensive Introduction to Effective Citizenship Education in the Secondary School* (London: Hodder Murray).

- Callan, H. (2006), 'Recognising Anthropology', in *Engagements with Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, (eds.) D. Carter and M. Lord (Birmingham: C-SAP, The Higher Education Academy), C-SAP Monographs No 4, 10–27.
- Department of Education and Science (1981), *West Indian Children in Our Schools* (The Rampton Report) (London: HMSO).
- (1985), *Education for All* (The Swann Report) (London: HMSO).
- Street, B. (1982), 'Developments in Teaching About Other Cultures in Schools', in *New Movements in the Social Sciences and Humanities*, (ed.) B. Dufour (London: Maurice Temple Smith), 178–185.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2006), *Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence* (Oxford: Berg).
- Green, J. and D. Bloome (1997), 'Ethnography and Ethnographers of and in Education: A Situated Perspective', in *A Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy through the Communicative and Visual Arts*, (eds.) J. Flood, S. Heath and D. Lapp (New York: Simon and Shuster Macmillan), 181–202.
- Heath, S. B. (1983), *Ways with Words* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hymes, D. (1996), *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Towards an Understanding of Voice* (London: Taylor and Francis).
- Jeffrey, B. and G. Troman (2004), 'Time for Ethnography', *British Educational Research Journal* 30(4): 535–548.
- Lassiter, E. (2005), 'American Anthropology, Local Publics and Collaborative Ethnography', *Current Anthropology* 46(1): 83–106.
- Leung, C. (1999), 'Teachers' Responses to Linguistic Diversity', in *Rethinking Language Education: From a Monolingual to a Multilingual Perspective*, (eds.) A. Tosi and C. Leung (London: CILT), (pp. 225–240).
- McCarty, T. and B. Brayboy (2009), 'No Anthropologist Left Behind? Reclaiming an Anthropological Voice in Education Policy Reform', *Anthropology News* Dec 2009: 14–15.
- Mills, D. (1999), 'Teaching for a Change: Hidden Histories of Disciplinary "Innovation"' (Birmingham: National Network for Teaching and Learning Anthropology), Occasional Paper No 3.
- Mills, D. and M. T. Huber (2005), 'Anthropology and the Educational "Trading Zone": Disciplinarity, Pedagogy and Professionalism', *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 4(1): 9–32.
- Mitchell, J. C. (1984), 'Typicality and the Case Study', in *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to Conduct*, (ed.) R. F. Ellen (New York: Academic Press), 238–241.
- Spindler, G. and L. Spindler (2000), *Fifty Years of Anthropology and Education, 1950–2000: A Spindler Anthology* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).
- Street, B. (2010), 'Advancing Anthropology in Schools; The Accreditation of the Anthropology A-Level', Guest Editorial, *Anthropology Today* 26(2): 1–3.
- Street, B. (forthcoming), 'What Counts as "Literacy" in English Curricula?', in *English: A Changing Medium for Education*, (eds.) C. Leung and B. Street (Bristol: Multilingual Matters),
- Walford, G. (ed.) (2008), *How to do Educational Ethnography* (London, Tufnell Press).