Athens Institute for Education and Research
ATINER

ATINER's Conference Paper Series
ANT2017-2236

Anthropology of Education and the Understanding of Cultural Diversity

Jarema Drozdowicz
Assistant Professor
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
Poland

An Introduction to
ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ATINER started to publish this conference papers series in 2012. It includes only the papers submitted for publication after they were presented at one of the conferences organized by our Institute every year. This paper has been peer reviewed by at least two academic members of ATINER.

Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos
President
Athens Institute for Education and Research

This paper should be cited as follows:

Anthropology of Education and the Understanding of Cultural Diversity

Jarema Drozdowicz
Assistant Professor
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
Poland

Abstract

Anthropology of education is regarded as a relatively new sub discipline combining theory and methods of anthropological and ethnographic studies with those of pedagogy and educational studies. This paper deals with the problem how the anthropology of education and also anthropology in general might be applied towards the issue of cultural diversity and the category of cultural difference. It is important to NATO that those problems gain a new meaning and seem to be crucial in the context of the transformation that occurs today in Western societies. This very change could be described as the transition of the nation state into a multicultural state and society. The debate surrounding the idea and praxis of multiculturalism raises further questions on how we are able to create patterns of integration applied to minorities, migrants, refugees etc. In the light of the recent processes and events in Europe this question seems to be significant more than ever and the anthropology of education could serve here as a partial answer to the raised issues.

Keywords: anthropology of education, educational ethnography, diversity, cultural difference, multiculturalism, migration

Introduction

The relation between cultural anthropology and the issue of education is being made by a long story of mutual fascination and significant turns. However, the anthropological perspectives on schools, upbringing or the process of enculturation may vary due to different theoretical backgrounds but they also share a common denominator of a deep interest in delivering the answer to the question - how does culture is being formed, transmitted and transformed in diverse conditions of human living? The dynamics of the cultural processes are investigated often in an ethnographic manner, which is through grounded and long lasting research within the selected communities. The outcome of this investigation might certainly shed some light on the above questions, but what is much more important that it highlights also a more significant issue of diversity and difference. Thus the heterogeneous character of culture comes to light mostly in the various ways people handle it, through given cultural means, their own experience and relate it to the experience of others. It becomes clear that the structural relations which emerge in that process form a basis that humans use to not just reproduce the existing structures, but furthermore to improve them and change in accordance with their own needs or due to some external conditions. In effect, we are being delivered a very wide array of cultural expressions of these fundamental characteristics of human beings joined in the common struggle for self-articulation within the framework of culture.

Most anthropologist and other social scientists agree today that there is no unified definition of culture which could explain the above phenomena and furthermore, how and why they are being practiced in different cultural contexts in such a different manner. In fact, the lack of such explanatory ambitions makes the anthropological approaches more open to non-anthropological theoretical and methodological inspirations from other disciplines which also show their interest in the issues of diversity and education. We may recall here contemporary developmental psychology of Jerome Bruner or the cultural studies as practiced today in the anglosaxon world. Anthropology is therefore more about understanding how culture works than leaning towards the popular demand for explanations. This very Weberian approach contributes also to a shift in the anthropological toolset and makes for example interpretation of the cultural praxis more complex than ever - a fact of a truly postmodern nature. This notion is being incorporated for example in the formula of the "thick description" as presented by Clifford Geertz, along with other approaches grounded in textualism, where many perspectives of the same social practice are acknowledged simultaneously and with the same careful attention to the ethnographic detail. Nevertheless, the category of cultural difference makes the anthropological *raison d'etre* since the very beginning of this discipline in a historical sense. On the other hand we have to remember that the early attempts in conceptualizing this category were closely bound to the definitions of culture itself and were in the beginning set in the intellectual milieu of evolutionary natural sciences and positivist sociology.

So, how did anthropology defined difference in its formative years? Defining culture through diversity of its expressions results in this context in what Edward Tylor describes in 1871 as the vast array of effects of human agency in diverse spheres of life such as knowledge, art, technology, values, symbols etc. (Tylor 1920:1). This evolutionist approach doesn't however tackle directly the main category of difference itself, but instead Tylor is simply referring in an implicit ethnocentric way to the diversity of possible articulation fields of the very same cultural system conditioned by an universal imperative of progress. It also implies three main consequences. Firstly, it is impossible to translate directly cultural differentiation into racial taxonomies. Such equalization of the heterogeneous character of culture with biology is irrelevant from many standpoints, but the most important of them highlight the necessity of having in mind that diffusion of elements might occur between two or more cultures as well is a basis natural for all communities allowing for certain cultural creativity. Secondly, we may assume that societies being at the same level of development will present similar cultural traits. Thirdly, the idea of uniformitism (which Tylor was referring to) allows us to reconstruct the processes that lead to the creation of some patterns of cultural predispositions. These three conditions situate the early evolutionist attempts in defining culture in plural terms in the area of the discourse on human nature, which was already tackled for example in the works of philosophers like Jean Jacob Rousseau and David Hume. It is however understandable from the historical point of view due to the idea shared by social evolutionists like Edward Tylor, John Lubbock or Herbert Spencer, saying that science is obliged to deliver an explanation in development processes of various forms of life.

As the question of diversity, this case is closely bound to the evolutionist typologies of existing cultures it becomes obvious that difference is to be found more between the stages of the general and singular evolution process rather than between dynamics of cultures seen as independent cultural systems of values, aesthetics, social rules or technological achievements. The latter aspect being commonly taken for granted as the basis of difference between more and less developed societies heterogeneity wasn't in the 19th century evolutionism perceived as something one should take into consideration in no other way than europocentric. The "cultural other" was in that time nothing more than an exhibit in London's and Paris museum's showrooms placed there to entertain and reassure us in our Western right to rule and divide. Despite the colonial domination and power issue in the debate on difference anthropology (both in the United States and Europe) entered the 20th century with a strong emphasis on the order to explain how the world of human cultures in a geographical and historical sense, becomes so differentiated and what eventually could lead us to answering the following questions - what makes people different in the first place and what is being shared by all human beings culture

Cultural Differences and Universals as the Object of Interest in Anthropology

The anthropological debate on cultural universals and differences is rooted in a long lasting philosophical tradition of seeing the human being on one hand as an object of external conditions and influences (biological or historical determinism) or on the other as the subject of creative agency (theory of social change). It is quite clear that these two paths of thinking on man had led us today to a fierce debate whether these factors (and if yes to what extent) shape the current reality. The main breakthrough came in the 20th century along with the so called linguistic turn. Language, at first understood in a very narrow sense as a set of communication skills, was taken into account in scientific investigation by many anthropologists representing various intellectual currents. The structures of language were seen for example by functionalists like Bronisław Malinowski, as an extension of social institutions designed to serve a higher purpose of human needs. According to the Polish scholar as people tend to invent new social instruments to deal with the environment culture becomes more complex, i.e. more differentiated as a particular system. What is significant however is the fact that culture in general serves in this case as a pragmatic, yet common and natural, answer to the existential obstacles and needs in all kinds of societies. So did the Trobriand islanders use the Kula system in order to strengthen the integration of social relations through extensive economic exchange. The picture that emerges here of the man as a culture creating animal might be put in the context of the transformation within anthropological discipline itself. By abandoning the former naturalistic perspective of evolutionism, functionalist anthropologists like Malinowski or Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown moved away from cultural and racial typologies and taxonomies of difference towards a more systematic view with the strong emphasis on social structures and the local forms they may have.

Functionalism paved way in this context for structuralism and in some cases both orientations shared a common aim, i.e. the search for the universal nature of culture hidden in plain sight behind the complex structures of kinship, power relations or religious beliefs. This notion of structure is being expressed for example by Edmund Leach and Raymond Firth, as long as these scholars are being considered as very unorthodox representatives of functionalism. Firth seems however to differentiate anthropological praxis and theory and dividing this discipline more into theoretical and applied anthropology. Nevertheless no matter how anthropology is being practiced it always was and still is interested in presenting the existing cultural diversity to the general public and the processes that shape the meaning these differences actually have (Firth 1965: 21). According to this scholar the task of anthropology lies upon comparative studies in how people behave in diverse social circumstances. These circumstances change constantly due to systematic transformations of local cultures or the diffusion of particular elements between selected systems resulting from cultural contact. The functionalist investigations in social change that followed came to the conclusion that social change itself is not the object of anthropological research as it is itself not empirically graspable, but it

is rather the effect of it that shapes the foundations of human behavior. Social change might be therefore regarded as a scientific construct deriving directly from fieldwork observations of human actions. This is also the basic stage of research in which anthropology is able to isolate key differences between societies (Firth 1961: 1). Firth's statement entangles anthropological theory with the act of collecting empirical data in the field and combines ethnographical practice with the general theory of culture by pushing the debate on difference and universals in the direction of structural interconnections between various spheres of life.

A similar vision is to be found in the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss, as well in the views of other prominent structuralists. French author reflects on the field of anthropology in the context of a transition that occurs in the assumption shared until now by many anthropologists that we are able to deliver a description of cultural reality solely through empirical data. This assumption contributes to the fetishization of fieldwork taken for granted along with the necessary fieldwork methodology as the ultimate barrier dividing "real anthropology" and the discourses only simulating it. According to the author of *La Pensée Souvage* the problem of uncovering the universal mechanisms that rule over particular cultures and culture in general makes one of the main issues modern human sciences are forced to deal with. It is a difficult task if we take into account the fact that the modern world became very much decentralized in the sense of power and scientific authority. If we speak of contemporary anthropological research placed in such environment we will see that we will be faced with many different approaches towards the question of the aims of this discipline. In fact, the lack of a commonly shared and universal view on the object of study might be seen as a distinction of cultural anthropology among other academic disciplines. It is not my task to go into detail in distinction between these approaches. What is however significant in this case is the anthropological awareness of the existence of rules and codes of conduct, deeply rooted in every culture. The normative aspect of cultural structures is being expressed among others through religious beliefs and mythology or kinship, both a personal *"idée fixé"* of Lévi-Strauss. As culture tells us what to believe in and what makes a blood relative beside blood itself this assumption of the involvement of universal deep structure rules affects the modality of specific surface structures that we, as social scientists, are able to grasp through given means. Revealing such dual affection between these two levels of socio-cultural order seemed too many followers of Levi-Strauss as a true revelation. That very step had two major consequences in perceiving cultural diversity more as an effect of human complex, but at the same time universal, nature rather than a standalone phenomenon with no relation to the general characteristics of culture. It lifted also the traditional dichotomy between theory and praxis in a very appealing manner; what on the other hand explains the huge popularity of structuralism within the human and social sciences throughout the 1950's and 1960's.

Other structuralists of that time, like Jean Piaget in the field of psychology for example, followed this path of thinking and pointed out in their own

research what Claude Lévi-Strauss had presented in *Tristes Tropiques* before – the simple truth of an eternal clash between cultural oppositions affecting every single sphere of our life, among them cognitive processes and the perception of reality. For Piaget positive sides of the social structure include at least two aspects shared by all versions of structuralism (Piaget 1972: 32). The first one is being made by an ideal of inner rationality placed in the thesis that structures are self-sufficient and no elements alien to its nature are needed to be considered in its analysis. Secondly, the results of research in the extent we were able to get into particular structures and bring into the light their general characteristics and visible features we see in all their otherness. This approach as we might see is placed by Piaget within his own research project of personal intellectual development and argued by the thesis expressed by the Swiss thinker that the character of a whole we find in every structure opposes structures to the parts that they consist of in the sense of their independence from the whole. This leads to the effect that the greater whole gains the features which are significantly different from the features of its elements despite the relation binding them together (Ibidem: 34). To Piaget an evidence for such relations is the form (*Gestalt*) of how social classes are conceptualized.

Being considered the "last great anthropological narration" structuralism's ambition to explain the above issue of universalism in social and cultural terms had lost its charm at last with the publication of the special issue of *L'Homme* in 1986 (Dosse 1999: 477). The articles gathered in this volume presented an overview of contemporary anthropological knowledge and clearly showed the end of this intellectual current in its classical shape. The debate on universalism and relativism wasn't nonetheless over in social sciences and late postmodernism turned the table in an obvious favor of difference. Postmodernism in anthropology, but also postmodernism in general, cannot be defined in simple terms. It never had a unified form and most of its advocates do not agree on main problems tackled within this approach. Affected by the postmodern doubt, anthropological thinking on culture is characterized today by the assumption that cultural reality's heterogeneous nature mustn't be explained in a holistic manner and is just a part of the human condition. Similarly as postmodernism in philosophy, its anthropological variant, represented among others through the works of George Marcus, James Clifford or Vincent Crapanzano, gained momentum thanks to the proliferation of the thought that new frames of the scientific description have to be coined as the old ones became obsolete and eroded. The moving of the anthropological field from objectified social reality of institutions and material culture to an inner subject world of people investigated. The critical approach towards existing models of explanation in social sciences became thus a popular tool in the deconstruction of cultural definitions, terms, narratives and histories. The contexts in which anthropological knowledge is produced and distributed became also themselves a metareflexive object of study. Such a deep transition in the theory and methods had obviously involved other movements. What Clifford Geertz called euphemistically "blurred genres" is on one hand a sign

of the rising popularity of interdisciplinary, and on the other an effect of a widened interest in the topic of culture visible today across all human sciences. Both factors had certainly founded the undermining of main paradigms in anthropology. The alleged crisis of the anthropological authority, the fading object of research of classical ethnographic monographers and a standing out change of generations among scholars had influenced the violation of theoretical and methodological basis that once forced us to treat culture as locally modified, but still a general mode of existence. The rising discontent and the lack of trust expressed towards the holistic and systematic approaches came also from the change in the social and political context, which since the 1960's was shaped by the emergence of new emancipatory movements, counterculture or the Cold War rivalry between the West and the Soviet Block.

The unwillingness today in social sciences to identify with a project or an attempt to deliver universal definitions of culture combines postmodernism in anthropology with similar stands in other disciplines. The postmodern fascination with difference and repetition, to paraphrase Giles Deleuze, still works as a signifier to many contemporary anthropological debates on the issue how this discipline should deal with diversity and its placement in greater social wholes like *par excellence* nation states. It influences also the diversification itself in views on the problem. As Rosemary J. Coombe states: "If differences within cultures are becoming apparent or are finally given voice, differences between cultures seem to be simultaneously proliferating and more difficult to locate" (Coombe 1991: 192). The postmodern contestation of universal propositions in this matter relocates the debate and puts it often in the field of politics, language or aesthetics. The narratives of these fields are presented thanks to the ethnographic description of social practices which may reveal how people treat and see others. The textual metaphor that emerges, as used for example by Clifford Geertz in his "thick description" concept, finds it very difficult to accept any thought systems that are reductionist or excluding, which was obviously the case of structuralism to many postmodernists. However, text and literature becomes through the postmodern account a constant companion in contemporary "reading" of culture. Particular cultural cases are therefore brought into light as self-sufficient and interesting in their uniqueness and singularity. It cannot be surprising that the ethnographic method has witnessed a renaissance along with cultural relativism spreading as a dominant paradigm. Postmodern anthropology is therefore placed within this relativist approach as a wider and more critical set of views on the processes that lead to cultural diversity. In fact, cultural criticism is here highlighted as the main and obligatory perspective on issues like power and dominance, comprehension of now-Western worldviews or interpretations of historical facts. It lifts traditional concepts and ideas by deconstructing their points of reference rooted in certain cultural systems, revealing that the reality we understood until now as static and non-questionable is in fact based on a limited and ethnocentric basis. In the light of the above we might ask a question brought to attention by Alan Barnard - is postmodernism a critique of all modern ways of understanding culture (Barnard 2006: 232)?

The answer to this question doesn't come easy. It's mostly due to the fact that postmodernism as a philosophical standpoint has little common denominators shared between various authors and schools of thought. We might even under certain circumstances agree with Ernest Gellner by saying that postmodernism not just in anthropology, but also taken in general terms is long gone and could be regarded as just a short lasting intellectual fashion. Critical anthropology isn't also synonymous with the postmodern milieu and uses a vaster array of methods and theoretical concepts. Nevertheless it is cultural criticism that is a notable distinction of these propositions in the study of cultural diversity that comes today in the main public discourses as a social fact. This critical imperative allows us to look at the phenomenon of diversification, reproduction and creation of culture from the perspective of the processes leading to the increasingly heterogeneous character of contemporary societies. These processes are not solely related to modern migration (obviously it is an important factor as well), but also to the diversity occurring in the various ways people learn certain competences and gain knowledge. The educational aspect of cultural diversity becomes thus more significant if we want to understand how to deal with the problems of modern societies coined in the context of nation states and industrial capitalism of the 19th century and now shifting towards a new and more inertly diverse, but still not really quite defined, form.

Anthropology of Education and the Issue of Multiculturalism

If Alain Touraine provokes to "think differently" on the contemporary model of the society it is also plausible to "act differently" in the sense of tools and methods in the analysis of culture. The French intellectual's attempt to redefine the object of sociological studies in order to introduce "a new rule of legitimization and evaluation of the subject" (Touraine 2007: 223) tackles the issue of multiculturalism and multicultural societies by focusing on the development of a new kind of social science that would be able to grasp the elusive nature of contemporary social and cultural processes of change. A similar perspective is being shared by Michel Wieviorka, who speaks on multiculturalism in relation to the alleged crisis of the multicultural idea. The author of *Neuf leçons de sociologie* speaks on this issue from a very up to date perspective of European debates on the integration of Muslim communities. By raising this problem and placing it within a wider context of political and social discontent with current patterns of the multiculturalist praxis he acknowledges that it cannot be any longer reduced and related to the idea of the state and nation. Nowadays it is usually based on the lesson we had learned from Immanuel Kant that three fundamental plans are necessary to make the distinction - the actual analysis of cultural differences, making and evaluating judgments on them (often in the register of morality) and finally the proposal of working institutional solutions grounded in our judgments on what is right and wrong (Wieviorka 2011: 104). Each of these fields should be according to

Wieviorka approached by different academic diciplines. The first one is the domain of social sciences and anthropology, the second of political philosophy and the third one of political sciences and legal studies. Although these disciplines have different competences and follow different research steps we should seek a general unification for all of these three problematic fields. Wieviorka's enthusiasm in forging a common front of science against the challenges of multicultural reality seems to be very encouraging. He isn't the only scholar who points out the importance of the debate surrounding multiculturalism, which is now presented by many critics as a failed political enterprise and the source of demise for traditional forms of group identities.

A similar voice is raised by Tariq Modood, who critically reconstructs the influence of politics in modern multicultural discourses, especially in his home Great Britain. British experience with diversity is overcast today by the same factors that we may see in other European countries - populism and anti-immigrant sentiments. Thus Madood's question if multiculturalism has a reason for further existence in the 21st century seems to be not so out of its place. As he argues that multiculturalism had been "hijacked" by the political discourse and stopped to relate directly to the social reality it divides the terms integration and multiculturalism further defining both. In Modoods opinion multiculturalism differs from integration in the sense that it is an accomodation of difference (minorities for example) and it recognizes groups and not just individuals on the level of identity, community, belonging, behavior, culture, religious practices etc. (Modood 2014: 61). Be recalling Will Kymlicka's view on this issue, Modood reminds us that multiculturalism is based on two way integration but it also acknowledges the fact that integration works differently among various groups. Integration itself on the other hand is to be found where we see this bilateral effort to work together between the dominant group and the minorities. In effect the debate leads theoretically and politically to the idea of equality understood widely and incorporates pluralism as the main direction to head for multicultural societies.

Also the mentioned Will Kymlicka agrees with the above, especially in the context of migration when he says that: "immigrants are no longer expected to entirely assimilate to the norms and customs of the dominant culture, and indeed are encouraged to maintain some aspects of their ethnic particularity. But this commitment to 'multiculturalism' or 'polyethnicity' is a shift in how immigrants integrate into the dominant culture, not whether they integrate" (Kymlicka 1995:78). Although his views expressed in *Multicultural Citizenship* didn't change much in recent years, he also is aware of an imminent threat to pluralism and multiculturalism seen today on many occasions only through multi-ethnic aesthetics that do not require the integration effort and conserve minorities in their status quo. Kymlicka shares the same point of view with Yasmin Alibhai-Brown and reminds that the "Three S" rule (*Saris, Samosas and Steeldrums*) is widely popular as an acceptable and no reflexive way of dealing with otherness reduced to ethnic fashion, cuisine and music (Kymlicka 2012: 4). To overcome such trends in the future the Canadian scholar recommends the strengthening of local multicultural policies in

particular countries as it strengthens at the same time the redistributive solidarity (Ibidem: 13). What emerges from this brief description of the transformation of multiculturalism as an idea and policy is the need for direct educational action in order to counteract the xenophobic discourse propagated by radical political parties and movements like Pegida in Germany or UKIP in the United Kingdom. This might be achieved among others through extensive education on the nature of cultural diversity and the study of cultural strategies of learning in a new cultural environment, i.e. how integration of migrants works in praxis.

From a historical and theoretical point of view anthropology is predestined to deal with cultural diversity more than any other discipline within social sciences. Thanks to the anthropological study of the enculturation process, upbringing in non-Western societies and formation of cultural and ethnic identity it also shows deep interest in the educational sphere. When speaking of anthropology of education in the meaning of its disciplinary identity as a subdicipline combining the anthropological and ethnographic theory and methods with those of educational studies and pedagogy it is worth mentioning that already early anthropological accounts from Franz Boas, Melville Herskovitz or the representants of the "Culture and Personality" school of thought could be placed within this intriguing current. It is however the 1950's that the groundbreaking work of George Spindler, Solon Kimball or Dell Hymes gave birth to its direct formation, at least in the Anglo-Saxon world. On the other side of the Atlantic the German tradition of pedagogical anthropology and the ethnographies of education in France served the same purpose. The theory and methods of anthropology of education in its general form nonetheless share a significant common denominator - the question on how culture shapes our experience and how this experience is being differentiated across various societies. This issue not only goes beyond a simple ethnography of differences but even more forces us to focus on the basic processes that lead to diversity. The dynamics of culture and its reproduction through institutions, as well the non-formal ways of learning cultural competences allow a reconstruction of the trajectories human experience is being changed, transformed and adapted to the historical, political or economic surroundings. Furthermore it creates what Paul Willis identifies as ethnographic imagination and by doing so allows to actually designing working models of multicultural schooling for example.

One of such models in anthropology of education is the cultural therapy postulated by George Spindler. This concept is to be placed within his own project consisting of two major manners in understanding anthropological studies of education. The first one emphasizes the relation between anthropological research and the educational domain, the other focuses on the use of this research in analyses of data on educational processes. This ideological rooting of cultural therapy allows us to better understand its pragmatic foundations and shifts the research object towards educational institutions placed in multicultural societies. By moving onto the field of schooling and school policies he defines cultural therapy as a demand that the

teachers should include a constant presence of their own culture in all of its diversity on a conscious level that allows them to include it as a potential source of biases in social interactions or the acquiring of knowledge and skills (Spindler 1999: 466). Anthropological knowledge becomes in this matter a tool for the mentioned therapy by delivering grounding in cultural facts and minimizing the effects of racial biases, ethnic stereotypes etc. The anthropological workshop and ethnographic data gathered thanks to extensive field work in educational institutions make it clear for us that all observations are always contextualized and that the socio-cultural knowledge makes the social behavior and communication sensitive to the presence of individuals and groups involved. That idea comes as a pragmatic answer to Touraine's question if we are able to live with the others.

Conclusions

Anthropology of education is today a very diverse subdiscipline within the study of culture and came a long way from a specialized inquiry on the place of culture in educational field and processes. It is being practiced in many local variants throughout the globe and includes the use of specific theoretical and methodological patterns which include the interpretations of cultural practices within family structures or schools. As some researchers make a distinction between the anthropology of education and educational ethnography (Anderson-Levitt 2012: 5) it is the interest in combining these two and overcome that differentiation that makes this relatively new autonomous perspective so interesting in an academic and pragmatic sense. The focus on bringing the general study of man closer to the empirical application in a changing cultural context is not only an expression of the subjective turn in the social philosophy of the 20th century, but merely a reaction to the demand for a science that could be used in the project of building a new form of a multicultural society in the United States or Canada of that time. It is worth noting that since the publication of the first issue of the journal *Anthropology of Education Quarterly*, which is still one of the most established institutional platforms for research on culture and education, passed almost sixty years, but the evolution that took place on the journal's pages isn't over yet and takes sometimes unexpected turns. New directions in anthropology of education are therefore welcome and open to new perspectives in related disciplines like pedagogy, psychology or sociology. This applies also to more distant academic relatives like historiography, especially in the tradition of the German pedagogical anthropology. The reason for such a close encounter of the present with the past is placed in the process which had led to transformation of the historicity into plurality through the orientation of cultural studies on pedagogy (Wulf 2001: 203).

The mutual cooperation and exchange of ideas and research techniques of anthropology of education and other disciplines doesn't end there. If we take the plurality as a further and more political concept based on diversity we will

be also able to say that the category of difference is nowadays defined mainly through cultural terms and seen as a part of much larger processes that form multicultural societies. The ability of learning to cope with this change seems to be necessary for both - the dominant culture and the minorities. As the public debate on multiculturalism highlights more often the social discontent with current multicultural politics and paves way rather for demagogies of difference than padagogies it is more than important to present a strategy which is not just morally just but also empirically applicable and successful. Thus the scientific investigation on cultural differences present in the anthropological tradition of cultural research focuses on the question how is empirical data gathered through ethnographic methods in particular groups and situations says something more general about how culture works in all human conditions. The constant interaction between the universal and the particular in culture is being reflected by the history of anthropological reflection. As anthropology of education is clearly a part of this complicated history and focuses mostly on the procession aspect of culture it also formulates a suggestion that we are able to overcome the dichotomy through a dynamic and adaptive approach present in its own research.

References

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M. (2012), *Introduction. Anthropologies and Ethnographies of Education Worldwide*, In: Anderson-Levitt Kathryn M. (ed.), *Anthropologies of Education. A Global Guide to Ethnographic Studies of Learning and Schooling*, New York, Oxford: Berghain Books

Barnard Alan (2006), *Antropologia*, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy

Coombe, Rosemary J. (1991), *Encountering the postmodern: new directions in cultural anthropology*, In: Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie, Volume 28, Issue 2, May 1991

Dosse, Francois (1999), *Geschichte des Strukturalismus. Band 2: Die Zeichen der Zeit 1967-1991*, Frankfurt am Main

Firth, Raymond (1961), *Elements of Social Organization*, Boston

Firth, Raymond (1965), *Społeczności ludzkie*, Warszawa: PIW

Kymlicka, Will (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Kymlicka, Will (2012), *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future*, Migration Policy Institute

Modood, Tariq (2014). *Multikulturalizm*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje

Piaget, Jean (1972), *Strukturalizm*, Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna

Spindler, George, (1999) *Three Categories of Cultural Knowledge Useful in Doing Cultural Therapy*, In: Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 30 (4), 1999

Touraine, Alain (2007), *Myśleć inaczej*, Warszawa: PIW

Tylor, Edward (1920), *Primitive Culture*, London: John Murray

Wieviorka Michel (2011), *Dziewięć wykładów o socjologii*, Kraków: Nomos

Wulf, Christoph (2001), *Einführung in die Anthropologie der Erziehung*, Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Verlag