Toward Common Ground: The Uses of Educational Anthropology in Multicultural Education

Peter Demerath
Allison Mattheis
University of Minnesota
U. S. A.

This article reviews advances of interest to multicultural educators and researchers in the complementary disciplines of multicultural education and educational anthropology including the culture concept; biological and sociological conceptions of "race;" postmodern understandings of identity and subjectivity; and ethnographic accounts of how students' school experiences are shaped by globalization, immigration, class culture, neoliberalism, and popular culture. We further consider ways that teachers can support students from diverse backgrounds and identify sociocultural approaches to understanding educational policy impacts and appropriation. Our hope is to narrow the distance between these two fields so that common aims can be even more effectively realized.

Multicultural Education in the United States
Anthropological Understandings of Culture and Human Difference
Anthropology and Multicultural Education in Practice
Conclusion
Notes
References

During a Presidential Session at the 2012 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting entitled, "To Know and to Act: The Dimensions of Multicultural Education 20 Years On," Gloria Ladson-Billings' presentation on culturally relevant pedagogy as equity pedagogy included a lamentation that most teacher education programs do not have an educational anthropology course. She observed that this has led many teacher candidates to leave their programs with insufficient understandings of culture—especially their own. We had heard her express similar sentiments in a talk in Minneapolis four years earlier. Though multicultural education and educational anthropology are closely allied fields with many shared ontological assumptions, epistemological frameworks, and ideological commitments, there has been relatively little explicit exchange between them (notable exceptions include Gibson's 1976 guest-edited issue of *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, which included Goodenough's important piece "Multiculturalism as the normal human experience"; Brock Johnson, 1977; and Feldman, 1992). This is regrettable given multicultural education's character as a "metadiscipline" dedicated to "increased educational

equity for all students" and made up of "content, concepts, principles, theories, and paradigms from history, [and] the social and behavioral sciences" (Banks, 2007, pp. 117-118). This article reviews recent theoretical, empirical, and practical advances in cultural and educational anthropology that can contribute to multicultural education theory and practice. Our hope is to narrow the distance between the two fields so that common aims can be even more effectively realized.

Recent collaborative efforts to synthesize a Foundations of Education course with a multicultural education course at our university provide an example of the ways in which we have sought common ground. This was part of a larger project to redesign the entire teacher education program to ensure that our teacher candidates have more sophisticated understandings of cultural processes, the needs of immigrant learners, and effectively partnership with parents and local communities. Our local state demographics reflect many of the trends that have been noted by multicultural educators for some time, including the increasing diversity of children under age 18 relative to the overall population. At the same time, most teachers in the state and in our teacher preparation program are middle-class White women. The process of synthesizing these courses in this context has highlighted both the distinctiveness and mutual complementarity of these perspectives and the growing need for teachers to develop capacities to work with students from multiple backgrounds.

This article begins by introducing contemporary definitions and missions of multicultural education and educational anthropology in the United States. We then discuss recent advances in anthropology—including educational anthropology—that we believe are of interest to multicultural educators and researchers, including recent evolution of the culture concept and cultural hybridity; differences between biological and sociological conceptions of "race"; postmodern understandings of identity and subjectivity; and ethnographic accounts of how students' school experiences are shaped by globalization, immigration, class culture, neoliberalism, and popular culture. We conclude by considering the work of educational anthropologists in policy and practice by discussing sociocultural approaches to understanding policy impacts and appropriation and classroom strategies to help teachers learn about and support the academic efforts of students from diverse backgrounds, including Funds of Knowledge and Youth Participatory Action Research.

Multicultural Education in the United States

Multicultural education in the United States has historically reflected particular commitments to democracy, equity, and social justice. Most broadly, it is informed by a moral imperative, stated concisely by Sonia Nieto, that it is "the right thing to do" (1991). At about the same time as Nieto made this statement, Banks developed the "Five Dimensions of Multicultural Education," which have since become widely known: Content Integration; Knowledge Construction;

Equity Pedagogy; Prejudice Reduction; and an Empowering School Culture (1991). The National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) developed a definition of multicultural education, which is excerpted here:

> Multicultural education is a philosophical concept built on the ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity, and human dignity as acknowledged in various documents, such as the U.S. Declaration of Independence, constitutions of South Africa and the United States, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations. It affirms our need to prepare students for their responsibilities in an interdependent world. It recognizes the role schools can play in developing the attitudes and values necessary for a democratic society. It values cultural differences and affirms the pluralism that students, their communities, and teachers reflect. It challenges all forms of discrimination in schools and society through the promotion of democratic principles of social justice…. (NAME, 2010)

Anthropology has also been characterized in various ways. June Helm, President of the American Anthropological Association (AAA), once defined anthropology very succinctly as “the study of being human” (Helm & Oestreich, 2005). Such a broad understanding of the field recognizes the essential “unity” of humankind (Brock Johnson, 1977). In spite of this tenet, anthropology developed largely as the study of human groups under colonial control, and in many ways was complicit with colonialism (Rosaldo, 1989; Vidich & Lyman, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 2012a).

The Council on Anthropology and Education (CAE) was established as a section of the AAA in 1968. Its mission is to “advance anti-oppressive, socially equitable, and racially just solutions to educational problems through research using anthropological perspectives, theories, methods, and findings.” The Council advocates for:

- Research that is responsive to oppressed groups.
- Research that promotes practices that bring anthropologists, scholars from other disciplines, and educators together to promote racial and social justice in all settings where learning takes place (Council on Anthropology and Education, 2012).

It is clear that multicultural education and educational anthropology are both committed to research and teaching that support positive educational outcomes for students – particularly those who have been historically disadvantaged. By highlighting common goals and contributions, we hope to encourage an expansion of dialogue between practitioners and scholars in the two fields.

Anthropological Understandings of Culture and Human Difference

Ladson-Billings (2006) has called attention to the irony that though teacher education programs are dominated by psychology, “culture” is used to explain

too many things without developing an adequate understanding of what the term itself means. Though the concept of culture has been central to anthropology for nearly a century, over the last several decades its utility has been vigorously examined. The result has been a set of more complex and nuanced understandings of how the concept can usefully capture the diversity of human experience. Anthropologists have historically assumed that culture is made up of learned patterns of behavior that make up a kind of "blueprint" for perceiving the world and acting in it; and that these blueprints consist of systems of meanings, ways of being, and even ways of feeling and moving one's body. Historically, anthropologists have often tried to understand these ways of being through notions of holism and relativity. These underlying principles were best expressed by Margaret Mead over 50 years ago: "[C]ultural relativity demands that every item of cultural behavior be seen as relative to the culture of which it is a part, and in that systematic setting every item has positive or negative meaning and value…"(1964, pp. 93-94).

Through this chain of reasoning, generations of anthropologists have tried to get at the *emic*, or insider point of view, constantly asking themselves: how could it make sense, from these people's perspectives and apprehension of the world, to believe *this*, say *this*, feel *this*, or do *this*? More recently, this process has been referred to as "problematizing" local practices and behaviors. Another longtime guiding principle of anthropology is that we know best about something when we can see it in comparative perspective: by bringing the cultural basis of specific beliefs or actions into sharp relief, we can locate ourselves relative to other groups and ultimately identify potential prospects for change (Peshkin, 2000; Sanday, 1998). It is in this way that anthropologists frequently use comparison to "make the familiar strange and interesting again" (Erickson, 1986, p. 121).

Gonzalez (2004) provided one of the most lucid and well-informed discussions of how anthropologists have interrogated the culture concept. In this piece she reviewed several important formulations, including how daily improvised decisions often eclipse cultural scripts in guiding action (Abu-Lughod, 1991); how culture is best seen not as the property of individuals but rather as emerging through their dialogic interaction with one another (Varenne & McDermott, 1998); and how culture may best be seen as a set of inquiries "which may be destined to never be resolved" (Stolzenberg, as cited in in Gonzalez, 2004, p. 444).

Perhaps most importantly, anthropologists and other social scientists have come to acknowledge the increasing importance of hybridity within so-called cultural groups, and interculturality between them (see Gonzalez, 2004, p. 21). Levinson (2000) offered a very clear caution against a "billiard ball conceptualization of culture" (where cultural groups have such clearly recognizable borders that they, in effect, bounce off one another). He illustrated the point by considering the "meanings that a middle-class Japanese department store manager shares with a middle-class Argentine department store manager" (p. 5). Especially in a globalized era, it is important not to assume that two people

living in the same “society” share the same meanings: some may overlap; others may not.

On “Race:” The Limitations of Genetic Explanations for Differences across Human Populations

In the Eighth Annual Brown Lecture in Education Research, Ladson-Billings pointed out the multiple, and damaging, ways in which various conceptions of race have shaped education research, policy, and practice (2012b). In this spirit, it seems worthwhile to relate how both biological and cultural anthropologists regard race. For some time, cultural anthropologists in the United States and elsewhere have put quotation marks around the term “race” in order to call attention to the extent to which it is socially constructed. As such, they have differentiated between biological and sociological conceptions of human difference. A biological conception of race takes into consideration the role of genetic inheritance in human variation by acknowledging, for example, the fact that genetic variations help protect some people from, and predispose others to, diseases ranging from malaria and smallpox to diabetes and cancer. Biological anthropologists (notably Stephen J. Gould in his 1981 book *The Mismeasure of Man*) have helped to discredit racial assumptions about intelligence and ability. Contemporary genetic theory contributes the following ideas to our understanding of the word "race":

- Differences between human populations are graded, rather than abrupt, and follow clinal distributions associated with geographic location.
- Although some biological traits tend to be associated with certain human populations, the co-occurrence of particular traits cannot be assumed for individuals, due to immense variation within populations.
- Skin color is based on no more than a few of the 20,000-30,000 genes contained in the human genome (Barsh, 2003). So, for example, the genes of people in groups described as "African American" and "European American" are vastly more similar than they are different.
- There is more genetic variation within so-called "racial" groups than between them. What this means is that "racial" differences can't possibly explain variation in human behavior or intelligence because they are based on social constructions rather than biology (Cohen, 1998).

A Sociological Conception: Racial Disadvantage and Advantage

A sociological conception of race accounts for the fact that skin color has, nevertheless, been used throughout world history as a basis to colonize, enslave, and in general degrade particular groups of people. John Ogbu differentiated

between two primary different types of minority groups in the United States: “involuntary minorities,” who came to their minority status through enslavement, or becoming the subjects of colonial territories; and “voluntary minorities,” who regard themselves more or less as immigrants (Ogbu, 1987, 1990)[1]. Researchers have also called attention to how non-majority group members may be “othered” by being treated or represented in less than fully human terms (Fine, Powell, Weiss, & Mun Wong, 1997). Other work seeks to understand how race (as well as gender) may also serve to advantage certain members of pluralistic societies, by conferring upon them unearned privileges that ease their navigation of everyday life (Fine, 1997; Fine et al., 1997; Sleeter, 2009).

Postmodern Understandings of Race, Ethnicity, and Identity

Scholars working from post-foundational frameworks have sought to complicate relationships between race, ethnicity, and identity. One emphasis has been to address the tendency to essentialize, or uncritically attribute, particular characteristics to members of certain “racial” groups. Scholars have elucidated the problem of treating race as a singular or fixed category (McCarthy, 1998), and observed that every person “embodies a range of categorical commitments such as race, sexuality, generation, class, and so on” (Britzman, 1993, p. 26). Hall states this view as follows:

> The point is not simply that, since our racial differences do not constitute all of us, we are always different, negotiating different kinds of differences—of gender, of sexuality, of class. It is also that these antagonisms refuse to be neatly aligned; they are simply not reducible to one another; they refuse to coalesce around a single axis of differentiation. We are always in negotiation, not with a single set of oppositions that place us always in the same relation to others, but with a series of different positionalities. Each has for us its point of profound subjective identification…. (1992, pp. 30-31)

Anthropologists have also conceptualized the development of self-hood in contexts of rapid and contentious social change, often drawing on Foucault's work on the making of the subject (1983, 1988), as well as Bakhtin's notions of how selves are "authored" (Bakhtin, 1986, 1990). For example, McRobbie (1994) portrayed young people in such contexts as “cultural innovators who negotiate competing discourses and constraining social structures” (p. 179), while Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain’s (1998) "practice theory of self" focused on how people "orchestrate" such discourses and practices in constructing their subjectivities. These perspectives regard subjectivities as multiple, and as the basis for partial, overlapping, and possibly dispersed senses of self-hood (Comaroff, 1996; Yon, 2000). Researchers working in this area have shown how local people demonstrate great imagination and resilience in how they configure local and global relations (Appadurai, 1996) and abilities to create "syncretic" identities which combine seemingly contradictory "modern" and "traditional" themes in complex, textured layers (Luykx, 1999; Stambach, 2000; White, 1991).

The next section of the article draws connections between these understandings of the complexities of youth identity and more explicitly identifies elements of anthropological research with applications to educational settings.

Class Culture, Neoliberalism, and Schooling

Originally advanced by Hollingshead (1949), the concept of class culture imbues class theory with an anthropological view, one that has recently been drawn on by anthropologists concerned with equity in educational opportunity. Foley (1990) wrote, "The class culture concept is a way of focusing class analysis on the cultural politics of how economic classes are culturally reproduced and resisted" (p. 170). Today, class culture refers to class-based practical logics that guide everyday ways of life. Lareau (2000) has done compelling empirical work to show how middle-class parents draw on their class-based resources and skills to improve their child's performance in school and ultimately reap "educational profits." In focusing on both Black and White families in a large metropolitan area in the northeastern United States, she observed that middle-class parents sought to actively "develop" their children by engaging in a process of "concerted cultivation" (Lareau, 2003).

Other scholars in the United States, United Kingdom, and Asia have more recently examined the effects of neoliberal ideology on educational processes. In his synthesis of conceptualizations of globalization, Mochida (2005) argues that neoliberalism, with its adherence to market-based logics and tendency to naturalize individualistic competition, has taken hold as a global ideology. While Mochida examines the possibility of collaboration taking precedence over competitive educational policies and practices in the United Kingdom, in the United States the neoliberal *status quo* seems well entrenched. This article's first author produced a study of a class cultural system in a suburban U.S. community that was devoted to personal advancement (Demerath, 2009). The system included a highly specific local class cultural achievement ideology (The "Wilton Way"); cultural scripts for parents to follow in "pushing" their children and intervening in school on their behalf; the school institutionally "sponsoring" its students through practices of hypercredentialing; and students' self-conscious acquisition of psychological capital. The study documented the negative effects of such an emphasis on academic credentialing on lower achieving students as well as students from minority backgrounds.

Multiplicity and Hybridity of Youth Identities and Schooling

Scholars have for many years demonstrated the complex ways that race, culture, and identity are intertwined and the impact on young people's school experiences. Research in this area acknowledges that students' behavior and adaptations are strongly driven by their images of self and that a primary activity in school is "becoming somebody" (Hemmings, 1996; Lesko, 1988; Wexler,

1992). The institutionalized individualism of modern schools and their emphasis on competition, meritocracy, and autonomy have fundamentally different effects on students from different cultural and class backgrounds (Boli, Ramirez, & Meyer, 1985; Carnoy & Levin, 1985; Rival, 1996; Stanton-Salazar, 1997). Ogbu's (1978, 1990) "multi-level" analyses showed how specific groups' experiences with dominant social, political, and economic structures shaped their "cultural models" of schooling and in some instances resulted in oppositional approaches that may pose barriers to school success.[1] Other research based on "cultural difference" theory seeks to understand the extent to which communication practices, values, worldviews, or accepted ways of being that are appropriate in the home are either compatible or incompatible with those in school. The role of school leaders in effectively addressing such gaps between home and school has been studied explicitly by Auerbach (2007, 2009).

The complex ways in which immigrant students are categorized by racial, ethnic, and language status can be both reinforced, confirmed, or contradicted by experiences in school, as chronicled by the work of authors such as Lee (2002) and Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, and Todorova (2008). In an ethnography of southeast Asian student identity construction in an urban high school, Ngo (2010) showed how, despite the complicated interplay of elements of identity (such as race, ethnicity, linguistic and cultural background, religion, gender and sexual orientation), adults often use just one or two of these to categorize students and apply their own frames and constructions of "good" or "bad" students. Mirroring West's (2002) proposal that cultural differences are signs of struggle that represent social contexts and illuminate power relations (p. 1), Ngo described how her subjects are marginalized by a variety of factors, some of which operate both within and outside of the school setting. Large cultural distance between home and school may cause students from more communalistic home environments to value identities grounded there in order to preserve self-worth in school environments that threaten to marginalize them (Cummins, 1997; Deyhle, 1986; Gibson, 1982; Phelan, Davidson, & Yu, 1993). For example, many of the high school students studied by Fordham and Ogbu perceived academic success as “acting White,” and responded to pressures in school to conform to a dominant culture as a threat (Fordham, 1996; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Ogbu, 1978, 1990).[2]

Other researchers have shown how some young people are able to use their agency to foreground different aspects of their racial identity depending on the specific setting. For example, Willie’s (2003) work on African American college students showed how they self-consciously acted “White” in certain settings and “Black” in others, regarding race as “sets of behaviors that they could choose to act out—or perform” (p. 125). Willie’s work importantly shows how race can be “flexible” as a social identity, both a “structural imperative and malleable” (p. 125), and as a site of human agency (Bourdieu, 1977). The important ways in which power dynamics between authority figures in schools (who often do not reflect the diversity of the students in these same buildings) and youth are created and negotiated must be examined for practices that either

constrain and limit opportunity or open up possibilities to reduce the impact of stereotypes.

Anthropologists of education have learned a great deal about the extent to which academic learning, classroom language, and social identification are deeply intertwined (Wortham, 2005). Research across national settings has demonstrated that there is in general a close relationship between young people's identities and their first language and that this relationship can mediate their engagement with school. More specifically, research has shown that the most effective approaches to bilingual education, or second language acquisition, involve the affirmation or reinforcement of the native language during learning of the second language. This, for example, is the approach of Canadian French immersion programs for the English-speaking majority, where native English speakers are able to maintain their English-speaking skills and add proficiency in French (August & Hakuta, 1998). In addition, "paired" bilingual approaches that teach reading in a student's native language and English simultaneously have also been shown to be more effective than "immersion" programs (Slavin & Cheung, 2003)[2]. Dual immersion, two-way bilingual programs, give students the opportunity to learn reading, writing, and speaking in two languages rather than receiving all instruction in English. Such programs are fundamentally different in intention and offer more possibility for culturally inclusive pedagogy than those designed primarily to help non-native speakers "catch up" with their English-speaking peers (Education Commission of the States 2009). The role of language in developing inclusive or exclusive spaces should not be overlooked.

Mindful of these cumulative understandings, many anthropologists of education support policies and practices that are informed by a position of "additive acculturation" (Gibson, 2012):

- A healthy disrespect of aspects of achievement ideology;
- An affirmation of cultural identities;
- Acknowledgement of necessity of academic achievement for occupational success.

Bartlett and Garcia have recently provided an excellent example of a school-level approach to additive acculturation (2011). The central message of this body of research is that students do better in school when they feel strongly anchored in the identities of their families, communities, and peers (Deyhle, 1995; Gibson, 1997; Mehan, Hubbard, & Villanueva, 1994). Teachers need to connect meaningfully with their students, establish trusting relationships with them, and, to the extent possible, reference their out-of-school experiences and backgrounds in the classroom (Phelan et al., 1993; Stanton-Salazar, 1997). The challenge for teachers of adolescent students from minority backgrounds is to help them manage their lives in multiple worlds (New London Group, 1996; Stanton-Salazar, 1997)[3]. If it is truly the "in-between spaces" where individual identities and society as a whole are defined (Bhabha, 1994), then these in-between spaces merit deep exploration.

Popular and Commodity Culture

Another area of relevance for multicultural educators in diverse national contexts is popular culture. There has been a great deal of research in the United States, Asia, and Europe on the implications of youth engagement with popular culture for identity and schooling. Willis(1990) boldly predicted years ago that school-centered systems of representation "will become almost totally irrelevant to the real energies and interests of young people and no part of their identity formation" (p. 47). Children are becoming one of the most prized targets of "niche marketing" (Buckingham, 2000, p. 147), and Willis has asserted that it is the market that "supplies the most attractive and useable symbolic and expressive forms that are now consumed by teenagers and early adults" (2003, p. 403). He terms this commodity-related expressive consumption "common culture" and encourages ethnographers to understand how young people experience and respond to it, especially in relation to school culture.

An important task for educators and educational research is to understand how young people are "grappling with the contradictions engendered by distinct regimes of capital, nation and the legacies of historical particularity"—in other words, how students make sense of population movements, market expansion, technological change, and flows of mass culture (Smaill, 2008, p. 6). In general, what seems to have emerged from youth engagement with mass culture and technology is a vast array of cultural forms. Some of these are new; some are amplifications of pre-existing forms, experiences, and values. All serve as evidence of the creative powers of youth and, as such, underscore their agency.

Some scholars express concerns about the vulnerability of young people to these global flows. Indeed, the late anthropologist Stephens (1995) said that our task as educators is to understand and address "the role of the child in the structures of modernity" and "the high price children must pay when their bodies and minds become the terrain for adult battles" (1995, p. vii). Other scholars who study youth engagement with popular culture are more optimistic. Ramesh Srinivasan (2006) observes that the challenge today is for all youth to have a chance to become a part of an information society that "accommodates multiple epistemologies, contexts, and cultural realities" (p. 364). Similarly, Dolby (2003) holds that the relevance of popular culture for education is in the potential role it can play as a site for engaging all youth in processes of democratic practice.

Anthropology and Multicultural Education in Practice: Applications for Schools, Teacher Education, and Policy

This final section summarizes several practices drawn from anthropology that have been shown in U.S. contexts to enhance the educational opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds, including anti-racist pedagogy, culturally

relevant teaching, teacher autobiography, funds of knowledge research, and youth participatory action research.

Anti-Racist Pedagogy

Though most educators would agree that U.S. schools have made progress over the last 40 years in terms of becoming more multicultural communities, there is still a strong need for explicit anti-racist educational practices. Pollock (2008) described one such set of strategies for teachers, based on her call to move beyond "colorblindness" and adopt an especially keen awareness of race in their classrooms. She advocates an "everyday anti-racism" that contains four mutually-reinforcing elements:

- Rejecting false notions of human difference
- Acknowledging lived experiences shaped along racial lines
- Enjoying positive versions of such difference
- Challenging systems of racial inequality built upon these notions of difference

Teacher candidates who are familiarized with the research behind such work are more likely to be able to carry such an anthropological lens into their own classrooms and professionalization experiences in the field. Many school districts now routinely include cultural competence training in staff development plans and preparation courses that engage students with these issues early in their career path can help support such efforts beyond university settings.

Funds of Knowledge

"Funds of knowledge" refers to "historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (Moll, 1992, p. 133). Louis Moll, Norma Gonzalez, and other colleagues in the Southwestern United States developed this notion to describe the rich repertoire of cultural knowledge and competencies that Latino and Latina immigrant students bring with them to school and that may go unacknowledged by their teachers. The funds of knowledge approach calls for teachers to conduct small-scale ethnographic research through visits to their students' homes. By observing firsthand the knowledge and skills that young people draw upon to contribute to their households' domestic upkeep, family constructions of what it means to be a successful person, and to be an adult, can be investigated. Teachers are encouraged to enter their students' homes "with an open mind—not pre-judging, being totally receptive to everything you hear and see" (Moll, p. 137). They argue that these experiences enable teachers to come to know a given student as a "whole person" and that teacher findings from their ethnographic investigations constitute "ample cultural and cognitive resources with great potential utility for classroom instruction" (p. 134).

Youth Participatory Action Research

Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) is a systematic way for young people from all backgrounds to understand their subjective experiences and future options and to take action to address a problem in their communities that affects them personally. Indeed, Appadurai (2006) observed recently that the ability to conduct research on one's "social surround should be considered a basic human right" (cited in Cammarota & Fine, 2008, p. vii). The primary characteristics of YPAR are as follows:

- It is research conducted by youth, within or outside of schools or classrooms, with the goal of informing and affecting school, community, and/or global problems and issues.
- It is research that contributes to the positive development of a variety of academic, social, and civic skills in youth.
- Findings must result in actionable steps. Youth are involved in posing and answering significant questions that benefit them and the schools and communities of which they are members (Weiss & Fine, 2004).

YPAR has been acknowledged to have multiple benefits. For students, these include building important academic skills, building social capital, and developing empowered civic identities (Cammarota & Fine, 2008). For school leaders, it includes opportunities to consider issues from an often-overlooked perspective and tapping into students' ideas for school and community improvement. When effectively implemented, YPAR offers exciting and positive ways for young people in schools to engage with their communities and establish closer relationships with adults in their lives, particularly their teachers. Student ethnographers go beyond documenting and reflecting on existing cultural conditions (including observations conducted in virtual spaces) to action and reflection, making this approach especially relevant to educators' efforts to support youths' explorations of their citizenship. Indeed, Appadurai (2006) argues that full citizenship today demands the ability to make "strategic" and "continuous" inquiries on an array of issues, from health and labor market issues to migration possibilities. YPAR can be used to investigate larger issues in the community (as well as virtual communities) and can address issues related to belonging—something so important to youth across cultural settings. This is an opening for investigating potential supports and barriers to citizenship. These sorts of projects can connect students' self-formation processes with the socialization and education of future citizens.

Anthropology of Educational Policy

Anthropology is "particularly suited to analyzing how ideologies infiltrate the institutions and practices of everyday life," due to its awareness of multiple points

of view and capacity to problematize the “taken for granted” (Shore & Wright, 1997, p. 24). From a sociocultural perspective, policy can be viewed as both “a practice of power” and a “contested cultural resource” (Levinson & Sutton, 2001). Analyzing policy implementation from a sociocultural perspective involves incorporating an anthropological lens in order to understand cultural assumptions inherent in educational policy design and to identify how problems are defined and addressed. Educational policy research can also explain the mechanisms by which power is distributed, wielded, and maintained by using an anthropological approach to expose how these hidden cultural assumptions drive the development of legislative mandates and their implementation. Understanding such power dynamics is essential to defining what policy does rather than merely what policy is and to investigating processes of policy *appropriation*, or ways that particular actors use policy to promote or advance their own interests (Levinson & Sutton, 2001, Levinson, Sutton & Winstead, 2009).

The political nature of all education was noted by Rios (2007) in an article in the first issue of this journal. Anthropological investigations of educational policy necessarily connect the local to the global, and the individual to the group. In so doing, particular ways in which inequalities and inequities are perpetuated within systems of schooling can be identified, as can opportunities for change and the promotion of social justice as called for by multicultural educators. Educational outcomes in the United States are increasingly scrutinized by state and federal levels of government, while continuing to be seen as a local concern. Studies that seek to investigate the ways in which community values impact decision-making on educational issues can highlight discordant rhetoric. An anthropological approach can deconstruct the competing influences of competition and comparison on one hand, and calls for equal opportunity and diversity in schools on the other can demonstrate the impact of such policies on the lives of students and teachers. For example, Koyama’s (2010) aptly titled *Making Failure Pay* exposes NCLB’s hidden public-private “liaisons” in New York City public schools that enable companies to profit from the provision of substandard and poorly regulated services that perpetuate student failure.

Conclusion: Multicultural Education, Citizenship, and Shared Humanity

This article contributes to this 5th Anniversary Issue of the *International Journal of Multicultural Education* by forging stronger bonds between multicultural education and one of its sister fields – educational anthropology. We have identified several areas in which theoretical and empirical advances in the anthropology of education can enhance the multicultural education project writ large, including recent conceptions of culture and cultural hybridity; sharper distinctions between biological and sociological conceptions of “race;” postmodern understandings of identity and subjectivity; and ethnographic accounts of how young people’s schooling experiences are shaped by globalization, immigration, class culture, neoliberalism, and popular culture.

In addition, Bennett's (2001) typology of research foci that appear in multicultural education literature identified several areas in which an anthropological perspective could be fruitful (p. 172). An anthropological attention to comparison can help teacher candidates identify "cultural" aspects of their own identities and daily lives, as they attempt to "come to grips with their own personal and cultural values and identities in order for them to help students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural groups develop clarified cultural identities and relate positively to one another" (Banks, 1997, p. 107). Cultural relativism, for example, can provide an important perspective to understand contestations of knowledge from the perspective of hegemonized groups and thereby disrupt the normalization of Eurocentric curricula. Anthropological analysis of the impacts of globalization can elucidate the ways in which transnational flows of cultural beliefs, artifacts, and practices can provide expanded resources for individual and group identity and aspirations (Appadurai, 1990). Finally, we have discussed how anthropologists of education are conducting sociocultural research on how policies change in the course of their adaptation in schools and how they are developing anti-racist pedagogies and other tools such as Funds of Knowledge and YPAR to help teachers learn about and support students from diverse backgrounds.

We hope that our efforts here can contribute to closer affiliation between these two fields, which are both dedicated to Banks' well-stated mission of "increased educational equity for all students" (Banks, 2007, pp. 117-118).

Notes

1. See Gibson's critique of this typology (1997).
2. High school students in Manus, Papua New Guinea referred to such behaviors as acting "extra" (see Demerath, 2001).
3. See Wang and Phillion's argument that minority education policy and practice in China would be more effective if it were contextualized in a comprehensive multicultural education approach (2009).

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (1991). Writing against culture. In R.G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present* (pp. 137-162). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity* (pp. 295 – 310). London, UK: Sage.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Appadurai, A. (2006). The right to research. *Globalisation, societies, and education, 4*(2), 167-177.

Auerbach, S. (2007). Visioning parent engagement in urban schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*, 699-736.

Auerbach, S. (2009). Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools. *The School Community Journal 19*(1), 9-23.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1998). *Educating language minority children*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1990). *The dialogic imagination* (C. E. A. M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Banks, J. (1991). The dimensions of multicultural education. *Multicultural Leaders*, *4*, 3-4.

Banks, J. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York, NY: Teachers College Record.

Barsh, G. S. (2003). What controls variation in human skin color? *PLoS Biology.* 1(1): e27. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0000027

Bartlett, L., & Garcia, O. (2011). Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the Heights. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research*. *71*(2), 171-217.

Bhabha, H. (1994).*The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Boli, J., Ramirez, F., & Meyer, J. (1985). Explaining the origins and expansion of mass education. *Comparative Education Review, 23*(2), 145-170.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Britzman, D. (1993). Beyond rolling models: Gender and multicultural education. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.). *Gender and education* (pp. 25-42). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Brock Johnson, N. (1977). On the relationship of anthropology to multicultural teaching and learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *28*(10), 10-15.

Buckingham, D. (2000). *After the death of childhood: Growing up in the age of electronic media*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Carnoy, M., & Levin, H. (1985). *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cohen, M. (1998, April 14). Culture, not race, explains human diversity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. 1-7.

Comaroff, J. (1996). Ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of difference in an age of revolution. In E. N. Wilmsen & P. McAllister (Eds.), *The politics of difference* (pp.162-205). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Council on Anthropology and Education. Website. Retrieved from http://www.aaanet.org/sections/cae/sample-page/cae-mission/

Cummins, J. (1997). Minority status and schooling in Canada. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 28*(3), 411-430.

Demerath, P. (2001). The social cost of acting "extra:" Students' moral judgments of self, social relations, and academic success in Papua New Guinea. *American Journal of Education, 108*(3), 196-235.

Demerath, P. (2009). *Producing success: The culture of personal advancement in an American high school.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Deyhle, D. (1986). Break dancing and breaking out: Anglos, Utes, and Navajos in a border reservation high school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 17*, 111-127.

Deyhle, D. (1995). Navajo youth and Anglo racism: Cultural integrity and resistance. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(3), 403-444.

Dolby, N. (2003). Popular culture and democratic practice. *Harvard Educational* Review. *73*(3), 258-284.

Education Commission of the States (2009). *Bilingual/ESL.* Denver, CO: Author.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Feldman, K. (1992). Multicultural education and anthropology: "The rise of civilization" as a foundation course. *Human Organization*, *51*(2), 185-186.

Fine, M. (1997). Witnessing whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Powell, L. Weiss & M. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on society, race, and culture* (pp. 57-65). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fine, M., Powell, L., Weiss, L., & Mun Wong, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Off White: Readings on society, race, and culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Foley, D. E. (1990). *Learning capitalist culture*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity, and success at Capital High*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White.' *The Urban Review, 18*, 176-206.

Foucault, M. (1983). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed., pp. 229-252). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1988). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom. In J. Bernauer & D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The final Foucault* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gibson, M. (1976). Anthropological perspectives on multi-cultural education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly 7*(4), 1-4.

Gibson, M. (1982). Reputation and respectability: How competing cultural systems affect students' performance in school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 8*(1), 3-27.

Gibson, M. (1997). Complicating the immigrant/involuntary minority typology. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 28*(3), 431-454.

Gibson, M. (2012). Remarks made at CAE Business Meeting. Annual Meetingof the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, November 16, 2012.

Gonzalez, N. (2004). Disciplining the discipline: Anthropology and the pursuit of quality education. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(5), 17-25.

Goodenough, W. (1976). Multiculturalism as the normal human experience. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *7*(4), 4-7.

Hall, S. (1992). What is this "black" in black popular culture? In G. Dent (Ed.), *Black popular culture* (pp. 21-33). Seattle, WA: Bay Press.

Helm, J., & Oestreich Lurie, N. (2005). That uniquely human pleasure. *Anthropology News*, *46*(1), 4-6.

Hemmings, A. (1996). Conflicting images? Being black and a model high school student. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 27*(1), 20-50.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W. J., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hollingshead, A. B. (1949). *Elmtown's youth*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). It's not the culture of poverty, it's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 104-109.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2012a). *Equity pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching, learning and action in schools.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2012b). Through a glass darkly: The persistence of race in education research & scholarship. Eighth annual *Brown* lecture in educational research. *Educational Researcher, 41*, 115-120.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lee, S. (2002). Learning "America": Hmong American high school students. *Education and Urban Society*, *34*(2), 233-246.

Lesko, N. (1988). *Symbolizing society: Stories, rites, and structure in a Catholic High School*. New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Levinson, B. A. (2000). *Schooling the symbolic animal: Social and cultural dimensions of education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Levinson, B. A., & Sutton, M. (2001). Introduction: Policy as/in practice--A sociocultural approach to the study of educational policy. In Sutton, M., & Levinson, B. A. *Policy as practice: Toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy (*pp. 1-22). Stamford, CT: Ablex Pub.

Levinson, B. A., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power. *Educational Policy*, *23*(6), 767-795.

Luykx, A. (1999). *The citizen factory: Schooling and cultural production in Bolivia*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McCarthy, C. (1998). *The uses of culture: Education and the limits of ethnic affiliation*. New York, NY: Routledge.

McRobbie, A. (1994). *Postmodernism and popular culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Mead, M. (1964). *Anthropology: A human science*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Mehan, H., Hubbard, L., & Villanueva, I. (1994). Forming academic identities: Accommodation without assimilation among involuntary minorities. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *25*(2), 91-117.

Mochida, K. (2005). From competition to collaboration in education: A shift away from the neoliberal agenda? *Kyushu University Research Bulletin, 8*, 1-22.

Moll, L. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2),132-141.

National Association for Multicultural Education (2010). Definitions of multicultural education. Retrieved from http://nameorg.org/names-mission/definition-of-multicultural-education/

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60-92.

Ngo, B. (2010). *Unresolved Identities*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Koyama, J. (2010). Making failure pay: For-profit tutoring, high-stakes testing, and public schools. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority responses to schooling: Nonimmigrants vs. immigrants. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad* (pp. 255-278). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ogbu, J. (1990). Cultural mode, identity and literacy. In R. S. J. Stigler, & G. Herdt (Ed.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 520-541). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Peshkin, A. (2000). *Permissible advantage? The moral consequences of elite schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Phelan, P., Davidson, A. L., & Yu, H. C. (1993). Students' multiple worlds: Navigating the borders of family, peer and school cultures. In P. P. A. Davidson (Ed.), *Renegotiating cultural diversity in American schools* (pp. 52-88). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Pollock, M. (2008). Introduction. In M. Pollock (Ed.), *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school (*pp. xvii-xxii). New York, NY: The New Press.

Rios, F. (2007). La casa de esperanza: The house that multicultural education built. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *9*(1), 1-15.

Rival, L. (1996). Formal schooling and the production of modern citizens in the Ecuadorian Amazon. In B. Levinson, D. Foley & C. Holland (Eds.), *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice* (pp. 153-168). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Sanday, P. (1998). *Defining a public interest anthropology.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1997). Towards an anthropology of policy. In C. Shore & S. Wright (Eds.), *Anthropology of policy: critical perspectives on governance and power* (pp. 3-29). New York, NY: Routledge.

Slavin, R., & Cheung, A. (2003). *Effective reading programs for English language learners*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University.

Sleeter, C. (2009). Diversity vs. white privilege. In W. Au (Ed.), *Rethinking multicultural education* (pp. 37-44). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Smaill, B. (2008). Introduction. In U. Rodrigues & B. Smaill (Eds.), *Youth, media and culture in the pacific region* (pp. 177-194). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Srinivasan, R. (2006). Where information society and community voice intersect. *The Information Society, 22(5), 355-365*.

Stambach, A. (2000). *Lessons from Mount Kilimanjaro: Schooling, community, and gender in East Africa*. London, UK: Routledge.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children and youths. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(1), 1-40.

Stephens, S. (1995). Children and the politics of culture in "late capitalism." In S. Stephens (Ed.), *Children and the politics of culture* (pp. 3-48). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M.M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

University of Colorado. (2006). *Understanding career choices among teachers of color*. Research report, Denver, CO: University of Colorado.

Varenne, H. & McDermott, R. (1998). Successful failure: The school America builds. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Vidich, A., & Lyman, S. (1994). Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 23-59). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Weiss, L., & Fine, M. (2004). *Working method: Research and social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

West, T. R. (2002). *Signs of struggle: The rhetorical politics of cultural difference.* New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Wexler, P. (1992). *Becoming somebody: Toward a social psychology of school*. London, NY: Falmer.

White, G. (1991). *Identity through history*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Willie, S. S. (2003). *Acting black: College, identity, and the performance of race*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Willis, P. (1990). *Common culture: Symbolic work at play in the everyday cultures of the young*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Willis, P. (2003). Footsoldiers of modernity. *Harvard Educational Review, 73*(3), 390-415.

Wortham, S. (2005). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yon, D. A. (2000). *Elusive culture: Schooling, race, and identity in global times*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.