To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Denise Shannon Woodall Wilkinson entitled "An Assessment of Anthropology in the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum in Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Anthropology.

Fred H. Smith, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

AN ASSESSMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM IN TENNESSEE

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Denise Shannon Woodall Wilkinson

December 1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to those individuals who were of great assistance to me in the completion of this research. First, I would like to thank the members of my committee who supported me with their guidance and encouragement. A special thanks goes to the chairman of my committee, Dr. Fred Smith, for his continuing encouragement, and for his professionalism and enthusiasm as a teacher and advisor.

I would like to thank Dr. Dean Roberts at Tennessee State University, Nashville, Dr. Alma Harrington at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, and Dr. Dorothy Reeves at Western Kentucky State University, Bowling Green, for their suggestions in the construction of the questionnaire used in this research.

I would like to thank Dr. Michael Logan at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, for his editorial suggestions and interest in my research.

To those teachers who took the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me for analysis, I would like to express my gratitude. Without them, this research would not have been possible.

Finally, I want to express a special thanks to my husband, Walter, for his continued support and interest in my research. His encouragement and assistance were invaluable to me in this endeavor.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which anthropology is presently included in public elementary schools in Tennessee and to identify factors which tend to favor or disfavor its inclusion. Six factors were proposed as being likely influences determining whether or not anthropology is taught in Tennessee's public elementary schools. A questionnaire was devised in relation to these six factors and was sent to 302 randomly selected elementary schools across the state.

Of the 302 questionnaires which were sent, 163 (54%) were returned and analyzed. It was determined that 62% of those teachers in the sample are teaching anthropology as part of the elementary curriculum. The results reflected a significant degree of interest in anthropology among teachers in the sample. However, many teachers indicated that they do not think anthropology should be taught as a separate subject, but rather, should be included in the overall curriculum.

The results suggested that teachers' lack of knowledge of anthropology and lack of anthropological materials are perceived to be major reasons why anthropology is not being taught in elementary classrooms in Tennessee.

Suggestions for making anthropology more easily accessible for both elementary teachers and students were offered in the conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Discussion of Hypothetical Statements	3
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
III.	METHODOLOGY	18
	Limitations	20
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	22
	Hypothetical Statement #1: Teacher Knowledge of Anthropology	24
	Hypothetical Statement #2: Student Comprehension	27
	Hypothetical Statement #3: Time	30
	Hypothetical Statement #4: Instructional Materials	32
	Hypothetical Statement #5: Textbooks	35
	Hypothetical Statement #6: Teachers' Opinions	38
	Part IV of Questionnaire	39
	Discussion of Hypothetical Statements	41
	Teacher Profiles	47
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY		54
APPENDICES		58
Appendix A		59
Appendix B		65
VITA		67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Summary of Responses to Question 7, Part I of Questionnaire	22
II.	Summary of Responses to Questions 1, 2, and 14, Part III of Questionnaire	23
III.	Summary of Responses to Questions 8 and 9, Part I of Questionnaire	25
IV.	Summary of Responses to Question 9, Part III of Questionnaire	27
V.	Summary of Responses to Questions 3 and 10, Part III of Questionnaire	28
VI.	Summary of Responses to Questions 6 and 11, Part III of Questionnaire	31
VII.	Summary of Responses to Questions 5 and 15, Part III of Questionnaire	33
VIII.	Summary of Responses to Questions 8, 12, and 13, Part III of Questionnaire	36
IX.	Summary of Responses to Question 14, Part III of Questionnaire	39
X.	Results of Part IV of Questionnaire	40
XI.	Comparison of Self-Contained and Departmentalized Responses to Question 7, Part I of Questionnaire	45
XII.	Comparison of Responses: Those Who Teach and Those Who Do Not Teach Anthropology	48

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research is to determine the extent to which anthropology is presently included in the social science curriculum of elementary schools in Tennessee and to assess factors which tend to favor or disfavor its inclusion. The ultimate objective of determining these factors is to identify and possibly implement feasible ways of incorporating anthropology into the elementary curriculum on an expanded scale.

In order to assess the status of anthropology in the elementary curriculum in Tennessee, a questionnaire was designed and sent to 302 randomly selected elementary schools in Tennessee. This questionnaire was completed by an elementary teacher at each school. The responses reveal that 62% of the teachers surveyed teach anthropology while 38% do not. Six hypothetical statements regarding what factors were important in influencing whether or not anthropology is included in the elementary curriculum were examined through the questions asked in the questionnaire. Analysis of the data is discussed in relation to those six hypothetical statements.

Statement of the Problem

The present research was designed to investigate the status of anthropology by examination of the relative interest among a sample of Tennessee's elementary teachers toward the incorporation of anthropology into the elementary school curriculum. Furthermore, the research was designed to elicit what elementary teachers perceive to be the greatest limitations concerning the inclusion of anthropology. It is likely that a variety of factors are discouraging or preventing many teachers from teaching this subject. Based primarily on this author's experience as an elementary teacher, six factors were suggested to be the most important. These six, listed below in the form of hypothetical statements, were then examined through the formulation of specific questions in the questionnaire.

Elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because:

1. They are largely unfamiliar with the subject.
2. They assume their students would not comprehend anthropological concepts.
3. They think there is not sufficient class time for its inclusion.
4. They assume there are no or few instructional materials available.
5. They report that this subject is not included in elementary social studies textbooks.

6. They feel that anthropology is inappropriate for elementary students.

Discussion of Hypothetical Statements

The first hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers are largely unfamiliar with anthropology and, therefore, do not teach it. Although it is often suggested as a social science elective, anthropology is not a required part of the teacher education program in most colleges and universities in Tennessee. Thus, the majority of elementary teachers in Tennessee have had only minimal exposure to this subject.

The second hypothetical statement proposes that elementary teachers do not think their students would comprehend anthropological concepts. Because of the nature of anthropological principles and terminology, many teachers may feel that anthropology is too complicated and abstract for students at the elementary level. Perhaps because teachers find anthropology difficult to understand at the college level, they feel that it would certainly be too difficult for their elementary students. However, this decision may be made without attempting to make anthropology appropriate and meaningful for elementary students.

The third hypothetical statement suggests that limited instructional time may prevent teachers from teaching

anthropology. In Tennessee, many elementary level instructors teach in self-contained classrooms. Therefore, they are responsible for teaching all subjects. Some must prepare lessons for and teach daily four separate reading classes, two separate mathematics classes, language, spelling, science, social studies, health, and often music, art, and physical education as well. This is not an uncommon situation.

Additionally, there has also been a recent emphasis towards concentrating on reading and mathematics at the elementary level, due primarily to poor performance in these subjects by state students on college entrance exams. With such pressure to cover all subjects and the movement back to the "basics," it is likely that many elementary teachers feel they cannot devote much preparation or instructional time to what they feel are esoteric subjects, like anthropology. Perhaps those who teach in departmentalized settings would feel differently about this matter. This possibility will be examined to some extent in this thesis.

The fourth hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they assume there are no or few instructional materials available. A review of the literature indicates that anthropological curriculum materials have been developed, implemented, and tested in elementary schools. Furthermore, research suggests

that they are appropriate for elementary schools and beneficial to students. Yet it is uncertain whether or not these materials are available for teachers and students in elementary schools. Moreover, budgets are often inadequate to supply anthropological materials. Also, teachers who do not really understand anthropology may not be aware of the materials to which they really do have access.

The fifth hypothetical statement proposes that anthropology is not taught because it is not included in elementary social studies textbooks. In the past this was, in fact, often the case. However, it appears that this situation may be changing. This researcher examined ten different fifth grade level social studies textbooks published in 1979 for the presence of anthropological material. Eight of the ten publishing companies were found to include anthropology in the texts they published. Those companies including anthropology were Silver Burdett; Scott Foresman; Addison Wesley; McGraw Hill; Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich; Macmillan; Houghton Mifflin; and American Book Company. Anthropology was included by way of information on the peopling of the New World, the concept of culture, cultural pluralism, case studies of various cultures, and various other subjects.

However, if elementary teachers do not really understand anthropological concepts, they may not be able to recognize the presence of anthropology in the textbooks. Nevertheless, anthropology is beginning to be included in social science texts at the elementary level, and this should have a positive effect on the frequency of its instruction.

The sixth hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers feel anthropology is inappropriate for elementary students. Some teachers may simply be of the opinion, for various reasons, that anthropology should not be taught at the elementary level. If there are patterns for this type of reasoning, they need to be identified and discussed.

As stated previously, the main objective of this research, apart from determining just how frequently anthropology is taught, is to determine what factors enhance or prevent the inclusion of anthropology in elementary schools in Tennessee. It is hoped that the determination of these factors will make possible the suggestion of feasible ways to include more anthropology in the elementary curriculum.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent years there has been growing emphasis on incorporating anthropology into the public school social studies curriculum. Various research projects have been undertaken to develop and test anthropological materials for use at the elementary level. This chapter will deal with published information regarding anthropology in the elementary curriculum.

The idea of including anthropology in the elementary school curriculum came into being a number of years ago. In 1931, Aleš Hrdlička outlined a plan of anthropological instruction for elementary age students beginning in first grade (Hrdlička 1931). Hrdlička's suggested curriculum included selections from folklore, cultural history, comparative anatomy and physiology, demography and pathology. These selections were to be adapted and presented in such a manner that elementary age students might understand their meaning. For example, the second grade student might learn the cultural development of such things as the pencil, paper, or the school itself. He envisioned this program as a gradual enlightening procedure which would provide greater human understanding.

In 1946, George D. Spindler called for the inclusion of anthropology in all levels of the educational curriculum (1946). In his article, Spindler discussed the conflicts between nations and ideologies and stressed the potential danger of human misunderstandings. He cited characteristics which he felt would make anthropology a valuable addition to the educational process. Among those characteristics mentioned were: "the study of man's physical origin and development; the growth and spread of culture"; and the history of races of mankind stressing their similarities (1946:130).

Shortly after Spindler's research, Ethel Alpenfels presented her views regarding how anthropology would be valuable to education. Alpenfels had been an elementary teacher who later became interested in anthropology. She felt that anthropology would be valuable in teaching students the scientific method (Alpenfels 1952).

In the 1960's, a greater emphasis was placed on including anthropology in the elementary education curriculum. This can be observed by the number of programs which were organized to develop and test anthropological curricula for use in public elementary schools. Perhaps the best-known of these programs is Man: A Course of Study (MACOS), developed by the Education Development Center of Cambridge, Massachusetts. MACOS is a year-long study designed to answer three questions

posed by Jerome Bruner: "What is human about human beings? How did they get that way? How can they be made more so?" (Pratt 1972:742-743).

The course, which was originally designed for fifth grade, began in 1962 and was completed in 1969. The core discipline is anthropology organized around the concepts of "life cycle, adaptation and natural selection" (Pratt 1972:743). To answer the question "What is human about humans," a comparative study is made of the life patterns of a series of animals—salmon, herring gulls, baboons—then the study moves to an examination of the Netsilik Eskimo (Gearing 1970:29). The focal concern of MACOS is animal and human adaptations (Gearing 1970).

Materials for the course consist of 22 student booklets, two records, six filmstrips, 23 maps, posters and photomurals, three educational games, Eskimo cards, animal studies, observation projects and worksheets (Pratt 1972). In 1972, individual classroom packets cost approximately $11.00 per student; however, several purchase options were also available (Pratt 1972). In addition, there were 27 films for use with a super-8 optical sound cartridge projector. In 1972, the cost of the films was $1,750.00. The films were also available in 16mm, but their cost was double the aforementioned amount (Pratt 1972).

Upon its completion, MACOS was hailed as an important breakthrough in helping children understand what it means to be human (Dow 1976). However, shortly thereafter, controversy began. MACOS came under fire from a group of teachers, parents, congressmen, and a section of the press (Weber 1975). The principal voice of opposition to the new program was that of Arizona Congressman John B. Conlan (Dow 1976). Conlan criticized MACOS as having the intent to "mold children's social attitudes and beliefs along lines that set them apart and alienate them from the beliefs and moral values of their parents and local communities" (Conlan 1975:2585).

Certain aspects of the program were taken out of context and dramatically criticized. MACOS was also criticized for being federally funded through the National Science Foundation (Conlan 1975b). Due to this strong opposition, the fate of MACOS remains uncertain.

Another and less controversial program producing anthropological materials for use in elementary grades is the Anthropology Curriculum Project (ACP), produced in 1964 at the University of Georgia. The ACP materials are designed as independent anthropological units to be incorporated into an already existing social studies program and are based on a deductive approach to learning (Charles 1972). The position is taken that anthropology can best

be taught as a distinct discipline (Bailey and Clune 1965). The unit materials are based on the belief that it is important to introduce anthropological concepts to students at a very early age in order that they might learn how to live more effectively within our complex society (Bailey and Clune 1965).

The materials introduce anthropological concepts in a "spiral curriculum." That is, each topic appears twice, first at a very elementary level and then again several grades later in a more complex manner. For example, the Concept of Culture unit at the first grade level is basically concerned with getting across the idea that "all people do the same thing but in different ways." At the fourth grade level, this unit continues the above mentioned concept but adds "cultural variation, enculturation, and cultural dynamics" (Bailey and Clune 1968).

Apparently a major problem with these materials is that the vocabulary and concepts used are far too difficult for fifth graders (Kalso 1973). Other problems regard poor physical quality of the materials and lengthy preparation time on the part of the teacher (Charles 1972). Despite these problems, evaluative data indicate that students gain a significant amount of anthropological information after studying these materials (Charles 1972).

There are a number of other programs which have dealt with adapting anthropological concepts for use in elementary social studies curriculum. The MATCH Box Project of the Children's Museum, Boston; the Taba Curriculum Development Project at San Francisco State College (in connection with the Contra Costa County Schools); and the Social Science Program of the Educational Research Council for Greater Cleveland, are among the better known programs (Rice 1968).

The question has often been asked, "Why teach anthropology in the elementary school?" Perhaps Joseph Francello (1965:272-274) best answered this question with his statement of seven contributions which he believed anthropology could make to the public school social studies curriculum. In sum they are:

1. Clearing up the concept of race.
2. Repudiation of "instinctive behavior" and human nature" as explanations for human behavior.
3. The rejection of the concept of superior and inferior cultures.
4. The concept of cultural variability.
5. Greater tolerance toward other people and other ways of life.
6. Better understanding of ourselves.
7. Increased consistency with our role as a world leader—where we hope to inspire confidence among peoples of many different cultures.

Rogers (1967), among others, viewed anthropology as being useful in reducing ethnocentrism among elementary school students. This view was also held by Martin (1975), who used 23 fifth-grade public school classrooms in a suburb

of Boston, Massachusetts, to study the effects of two different anthropology treatments on the attitudes of students in the sample toward pre-Western Eskimo culture. Martin employed materials from Man: A Course of Study. His research concluded that exposure to a foreign culture may reduce negative attitudes toward that culture if the information is presented in such a way that shows a "behavioral pattern" rather than isolated cultural traits, and if a variety of media and instructional techniques are used (Martin 1975).

Frech (1975) also showed that anthropological study can facilitate a moderation of ethnocentrism in elementary age students. Frech used materials from the Anthropology Curriculum Project, Concept of Culture, as the treatment for the experimental group. The sample population was composed of 22 fourth-grade classes in four schools in the Savannah-Chatham County Public School system in Georgia.

In addition to reducing ethnocentrism, as observed on the posttest, Frech's study also showed that a moderation in ethnocentrism was observable on a delayed posttest. He further concluded that there was a significant correlation between the amount of anthropology a class learned and the degree of moderation of ethnocentric attitudes. This seems to imply that in some cases education can lower certain forms of ethnic prejudice. Finally it was concluded that

some ethnocentrism is the result of faulty or inadequate knowledge of other cultures (Frech 1975).

Potterfield (1968) conducted research to determine the ability of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students to learn the vocabulary, concepts, and abstract reasoning found in the anthropology materials developed by the Anthropology Curriculum Project at the University of Georgia. The unit used was the Concept of Culture, as developed for the fourth grade. His sample population consisted of three classes from each of grades four, five and six.

Potterfield concluded that fourth, fifth and sixth grade students can learn the anthropological vocabulary and concepts, and can develop facility in abstract reasoning as measured by the anthropology test used (Potterfield 1968).

However, conflicting results were reported by Wilson and Taylor (1979), who investigated the effect of MACOS on children's behavior, as evidenced by the responses to certain statements. Forty-eight students from Purcival, Iowa, were used in the experimental group and 71 students at the same grade levels from Thurman, Iowa, were used as members of the control group.

They concluded that "an in-depth study of a given culture did not necessarily lead to significantly more open attitudes toward culturally determined behaviors on a wider scale" (Wilson and Taylor 1973:364). In other words, more positive

attitudes toward a particular culture did not mean that positive attitudes would be generalized to all behaviors of that particular culture, or to other cultures not being studied. However, there is no mention of teacher preparation prior to using the MACOS materials, and obviously lack of proper training on the part of teachers could have a profound effect on the reported results.

According to Kam (1978), elementary social studies are being influenced by two new trends—ethnic studies and anthropology. She views ethnic studies as being concerned primarily with the history and culture of ethnic groups, while anthropology provides a vehicle for studying their culture. Apparently the combination of the two subjects provides a means for increased student knowledge and a better understanding of minority and ethnic groups.

Drawing from materials entitled How to Study a Culture, Kam tried "to evaluate the influences of classroom instruction using these materials on the change in knowledge about anthropological concepts and techniques and in knowledge about culture" (Kam 1978:406). The sample was composed of 157 students in eight sixth-grade classes in five schools of the Des Moines Independent Community Schools, Des Moines, Iowa. The materials were designed to provide a means for gathering information about a minority culture existing within the students' community. In a sense the students were

learning to be anthropologists and, ideally, were learning something of the culture of the minority group. These curriculum materials differ from others in that instead of providing foreign cultural data, the students are given the opportunity of investigating, first hand, minority cultures within their own community.

The research of Martin, Frech, Potterfield, and Wilson and Taylor strongly suggests that anthropology can moderate extreme forms of ethnocentrism among elementary school students. Moreover, Kam's research demonstrates that elementary students can also use anthropology to better understand the culture of local populations.

A question basic to the present research is to what degree is anthropology being used in the elementary curriculum in Tennessee. Recently the Tennessee Anthropological Association (TAA), in conjunction with the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, conducted research to determine how many members of the Tennessee Council for Social Studies were teaching anthropology in their classes. The results showed that the Tennessee Council for Social Studies was in support of making anthropology an area of certification within the social sciences. However, support for anthropology came primarily from middle and high school teachers, not from teachers at the elementary level (Van Fleet and Denney 1979).

Unfortunately, this research did not deal with the reasons why anthropology was being included in, or omitted from, the social studies curriculum at various levels.

While it is clear that appropriate anthropological materials are available, their use in Tennessee remains to be examined. The present research, then, will attempt to evaluate what factors influence the inclusion of anthropology in Tennessee's elementary social studies curriculum. The methodology underlying this research is discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to assess the status of anthropology in the elementary curriculum in Tennessee, a questionnaire was sent to 302 randomly selected schools across the state. The questionnaire, along with a cover letter (see Appendix A), was sent to the principal of each school in the sample, asking that it be given to a resident teacher. The teacher was instructed to complete the questionnaire and to return it in a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

The questionnaire was designed according to the suggestions and comments given by a number of elementary school teachers, a committee of four experts in the area of anthropological and educational research (see Acknowledgements), and by the first hand experiences of this researcher as an elementary teacher.

The purpose of this questionnaire was twofold. It was designed to determine what percentage of elementary teachers in Tennessee are presently teaching anthropology and also to determine what factors prevent anthropology from being taught. The questionnaire was structured in relation to the six hypothetical statements proposed for why anthropology is not taught.

The sample of schools to which this questionnaire was sent was drawn from all public elementary schools in Tennessee. There are 147 county and city school systems in the state, which administer approximately 1,200 elementary schools. In order to get a representative sample, one questionnaire was sent for every 100 elementary teachers in each school system. If a system employs between one and 100 elementary teachers, that system was sent one questionnaire. The questionnaire went to a randomly selected elementary school in that system. For example, the Metro-Nashville School System received 14 questionnaires because they employ approximately 1,400 elementary teachers. In Metro-Nashville, each of the fourteen questionnaires went to fourteen randomly selected schools. A table of random numbers was used to determine which schools were included in the sample.

Information for choosing the sample was found in the 1978-1979 edition of the Directory of Public Schools issued by the Tennessee State Department of Education. This Directory listed all public schools in Tennessee and their addresses. It also included other information such as name of principal, number of teachers, and grades included at each school.

Because this research deals with teachers' perceptions regarding anthropology in the social studies curriculum, it

was classroom teachers, rather than superintendents and principals, who were asked to complete the questionnaire. Furthermore, since it is ultimately the teacher who determines what will or will not be taught in the classroom and how it will be taught, answers from administrative personnel would have been largely meaningless.

The 163 returned questionnaires were analyzed in relation to the six aforementioned hypothetical statements. Most of the analysis was made by dividng the data into two groups—those teachers who reported teaching anthropology and those who reported not teaching anthropology. Additional data taken from the questionnaire were also analyzed and discussed. Tables illustrating that information are also included in the following chapter.

The Chi-square statistic, as described in Thomas (1976), was used on several of the tables in order to determine whether or not the results were significantly different from a random response pattern. Notations are made below each table where this statistical technique was used. The level of significance accepted in this study is $p < .05$.

Limitations

There are at least three limitations of this research which need to be discussed. First, the purpose of the present study was to describe the current status of anthropology

in Tennessee elementary schools and to determine what a sample of elementary teachers perceive to be the greatest limitations to making anthropology a part of the curriculum. Since it surveys a specific group in a specific area, its results should not be generalized beyond the sample population.

Second, the sampling procedure required that a principal ask a teacher to complete the questionnaire and return it to the researcher. This may have created a bias—the principal may have asked a teacher who he or she deemed to be more interested in anthropology than other teachers in the school. However, it might be argued that in a survey of this nature, only the more interested teachers would have responded anyway. Nonetheless, this possible bias needs to be recognized.

The third limitation has to do with a problem inherent in questionnaire surveys—misinterpretation of questions (Mouly 1963). According to Mouly, these misinterpretations are almost impossible to detect. Some of the results of this study may appear contradictory and confusing. Although possible explanations are offered, perhaps the source of the problem lies in the various interpretations which individual teachers had for certain questions. This problem should be taken into consideration, especially when reading Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is concerned with an analysis and discussion of the questionnaire data and is structured in relation to the six hypothetical statements proposed for why anthropology is not included in the elementary school curriculum in Tennessee. Before turning to these, however, several general statements concerning the results need to be discussed. First, it is important to note that 62% of the respondents reported that they do teach anthropology as part of the social studies curriculum, while 38% reported that they do not teach anthropology (see Table I).

TABLE I

Summary of Responses to Question 7, Part I of Questionnaire

Response	Number	Percent
Q 7. Do you teach anthropology as part of your social studies?		
Yes	101/163	62
No	62/163	38

Further analysis indicates that 60% of all respondents think that anthropology should be included in the elementary

social studies curriculum. Eighty-eight percent of all respondents think anthropology is interesting, and 69% think that their students would enjoy learning anthropology (see Table II). These results reflect a significant degree of interest in anthropology among the teachers in the sample. It appears that attitudes are favorable toward the prospect of including anthropology in the elementary curriculum.

TABLE II

Summary of Responses to Questions 1, 2, and 14, Part III of Questionnaire

Question		A	U	D
Q 1.	I think anthropology is interesting.	88%	10%	2%
Q 2.	I think my class would enjoy learning anthropology.	69%	22%	9%
Q 14.	I think the elementary social studies curriculum should include anthropology.	60%	25%	15%

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

It is important to mention here that although the questionnaire (see Appendix A), was designed with five levels of responses (Strongly Agree, Agree, Uncertain, Disagree and Strongly Disagree), the tables beginning with Table II represent only three response categories. The responses have been combined so that there is only a category for Agree,

Uncertain, and Disagree. These combinations were made in order to run the Chi-square statistic to determine whether or not the results represent random responses. Results of the Chi-square statistic are listed below each table on which it was calculated. Most Chi-squares were found to be significant. Those which were not significant are pointed out in the following discussions.

The remainder of this chapter is concerned with a discussion of the six hypothetical statements proposed for why anthropology is not taught in elementary schools in Tennessee. To facilitate consideration of these hypotheses, most of the data were divided into two groups: those teachers who do and those who do not consider themselves to be teaching anthropology. However, some questions were answered only by those teachers not teaching this subject. Tables presenting these responses are also included.

Hypothetical Statement #1: Teacher Knowledge of Anthropology

The first hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they feel they do not know enough about the subject. Questions 8 and 9 in Part I and Question 9 in Part III dealt with this area as they concern the academic exposure of this sample of teachers to anthropology. The data indicate (see Table III) that most teachers in the sample (69%) have never taken anthropology

courses. More teachers (60%) in the sample, however, indicated that anthropology was mentioned in their social science methods courses.

TABLE III

Summary of Responses to Questions 8 and 9, Part I of Questionnaire

Response	Are Teaching Anthropology		Are Not Teaching Anthropology		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 8. Have you ever taken anthropology courses?						
Yes	38/50	76%	12/50	24%	50/162	31%
No	62/112	55%	50/112	45%	112/162	69%
9. Was anthropology mentioned in any of your social science methods courses?						
Yes	71/95	75%	24/95	25%	95/159	60%
No	27/64	42%	37/64	58%	64/159	40%

By comparing responses of those who do teach anthropology as compared to those who do not teach anthropology, several inferences can be made. Those teachers who are exposed to anthropology during their educational training are more likely to teach it. In fact, 76% of those who have taken anthropology reported that they are teaching it. Furthermore, the data show that teachers who have no exposure in their methods courses are the least likely to teach anthropology.

Based on these results, it is apparent that teacher exposure to anthropology at the college level is effective

in getting anthropology included in the social studies curriculum at the elementary level. However, the large number (55%) of those teaching anthropology who have never taken anthropology courses raises important questions regarding anthropology as a part of teacher training. The results imply that although teacher training enhances the likelihood of anthropology being included in the elementary social studies curriculum, other factors must also be influencing its inclusion.

The questionnaire further revealed that of those teachers not teaching anthropology, 31% indicated they would teach anthropology if they knew more about it, while 27.6% indicated that they would not teach anthropology even if they knew more about it. A significant 41.4% remained uncertain as to whether or not their own knowledge of the subject would influence them to teach anthropology (see Table IV). This large degree of uncertainty again raises questions regarding the effect which teacher training in and understanding of anthropology has on its inclusion in elementary social studies. As mentioned previously, the influences of other factors may be causing this large degree of uncertainty.

TABLE IV

Summary of Responses to Question 9,
Part III of Questionnaire

Respondent Group	A		U		D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 9. I would teach anthropology if I knew more about it.								
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	18	31.0	24	41.4	16	27.6	58	100

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

Hypothetical Statement #2:
Student Comprehension

The second hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they think their students cannot comprehend anthropological concepts. Questions 3 and 10 in Part III dealt with this statement. An analysis of the responses to Question 3 (see Table V) indicates that of those teachers who do teach anthropology, 65% think their students can comprehend anthropological concepts. Only 7% think their students cannot comprehend anthropological concepts, and 28% remained uncertain. Of those teachers not teaching anthropology, 44% indicated that they feel their students can understand anthropological concepts, while 37% responded that their students cannot understand anthropological concepts, 19% remained uncertain.

TABLE V

Summary of Responses to Questions 3 and 10, Part III of Questionnaire

Respondent Group	A		U		D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 3. I think my class could comprehend anthropological concepts.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	64	65	28	28	7	7	99	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	25	44	11	19	21	37	57	100
Q 10. I would teach anthropology if I knew my class could comprehend it.								
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	23	40	20	35	14	25	57	100

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

Q 3. $X^2_2 = 22.6$; $p < .001$.

The responses to this question indicate that many teachers who do not teach anthropology feel their students could understand anthropology if given the opportunity. It appears that other reasons have more effect on preventing anthropology from being taught in elementary schools than do teachers' opinions regarding their students' ability to comprehend anthropology. It is important to note that of those teachers who reported teaching anthropology, only 7% responded that their students could not understand anthropological concepts.

The responses to Question 10, Part III, indicate that of those teachers who are not teaching anthropology, 40% would teach it if they knew their students could comprehend anthropological concepts; 35% remained uncertain; and 25% indicated that they still would not teach anthropology.

These results seem to suggest that students' ability to comprehend anthropology does not greatly influence whether or not teachers are willing to teach it at the elementary level. However, teachers often differ greatly in their assessment of student ability at any given age level, thereby making this a very subjective topic. Only 40% of those not teaching anthropology indicated that they would teach it if they felt their students could comprehend the concepts. Apparently other factors have more effect on the inclusion or exclusion of anthropology in the elementary curriculum in Tennessee.

Hypothetical Statement #3: Time

The third statement hypothesizes that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they feel they do not have time to include it. Questions 6 and 11 in Part III dealt with this perception.

An analysis of the responses to Question 6 (see Table VI) reveals that of those teachers who do teach anthropology, 34% feel they have time to include it, but 40% indicated that they really do not have time. Of those teachers not teaching anthropology, 27% indicated they have time, while a majority (60%) indicated that they do not have time to include anthropology; 13% remained uncertain.

Because these results seem contradictory, it is necessary to discuss some possible underlying explanations. It is a common feeling among elementary teachers that there is just not enough time to teach everything they are required or would like to teach. Because of this pressure, the very mention of time can become an emotional subject. Therefore, these results could reflect an emotional response to the topic of time. Obviously, if a teacher is teaching anthropology, he or she is making the time necessary to include it. Those teachers who indicated both that they teach anthropology but that they do not have enough time may actually be implying that they do not have time to do as much with anthropology as they would like. Also, the

TABLE VI

Summary of Responses to Questions 6 and 11, Part III of Questionnaire

Respondent Group	A		U		D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 6. I have time during the day to teach anthropology.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	33	34	25	26	39	40	97	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	15	27	7	13	34	60	56	100
Q 11. I would teach anthropology if I had time to include it.								
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	22	39	24	42	11	19	57	100

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

Q 6. $X^2_2 = 6.71$; $p < .05$.

seemingly contradictory responses may be due to various interpretations of the question as suggested by Mouly (1963).

The results of Question 11, Part III (see Table VI) indicate that of those teachers not teaching anthropology, 39% would teach anthropology if they had time, 19% responded that they would not teach anthropology even if they had time; and a significant 42% remained uncertain. The fact that 42% remained uncertain on this question seems to indicate that factors other than lack of time play an important role in preventing anthropology from being included in the elementary curriculum.

Hypothetical Statement #4:
Instructional Materials

The fourth hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they feel they do not have access to anthropological materials. Questions 5 and 15 in Part III dealt with this reason. The results of Question 5 (see Table VII) indicate that 30% of those teachers who teach anthropology have access to anthropological materials; 41% indicated that they do not have all the anthropology materials they need; and 29% were not certain. Of those who do not teach anthropology, 13% responded that they have access to anthropological materials, while 66% responded that they do not have access to the materials they need for teaching anthropology;

TABLE VII

Summary of Responses to Questions 5 and 15, Part III of Questionnaire

Respondent Group	A		U		D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 5. I have access to the materials I need to teach anthropology.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	29	30	28	29	40	41	97	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	7	13	12	21	37	66	56	100
Q 15. My school system would supply me with anthropology materials if I asked for them.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	30	31	46	48	20	21	96	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	12	21	34	60	11	19	57	100

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

Q 5. $X^2_2 = 9.67$; $p < .01$. Q 15. $X^2_2 = 2.34$; $p = NS$.

21% remained uncertain. The results of Question 5 imply that lack of materials is a significant factor preventing anthropology from being taught in elementary schools.

An analysis of Question 15 indicates that 31% of those who teach anthropology believe that their school system would supply anthropology materials, 21% indicated that their school system would not supply the necessary anthropological materials; and 48% were uncertain. Of those who do not teach anthropology, 21% reported that their school system would supply them with anthropology materials; 19% reported that their school system would not supply them with anthropology materials; while a majority (60%) remained uncertain.

The fact that such a large percentage of teachers are uncertain whether or not their school system would supply them with anthropological materials may indicate that a large number of teachers are not actively involved in trying to enrich their classrooms with instructional materials. If this is indeed the case, then a list of anthropological materials needs to be readily available in each school throughout the state; otherwise available anthropological materials may never be noticed or used.

It is important to note that the Chi-square statistic revealed that response patterns both for those who teach and those who do not teach anthropology were not significantly

different from a random response pattern. It appears that a number of teachers answered Question 15 in a random manner.

Hypothetical Statement #5: Textbooks

The fifth hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they do not recognize it as being included in their social studies textbook. Questions 8 and 12 in Part III dealt with this statement. Question 13 provided added information regarding the importance of the textbook.

Regarding Question 8 (see Table VIII), 83% of those who teach anthropology responded that anthropology is included in their social studies textbook. Only 13% reported that anthropology is not included, and only 4% were uncertain. Of those not teaching anthropology, 23% indicated that anthropology is included in their textbook, while 69% indicated that anthropology is not included in their textbook. These results strongly imply that the inclusion of anthropology in the social studies textbook is a significant factor determining whether or not anthropology is included in the elementary curriculum.

Analysis of the responses to Question 12 indicates that 55% of those teachers who do not teach anthropology would teach this subject if it were included in the textbook, while only 12% indicated that they would not teach

TABLE VIII

Summary of Responses to Questions 8, 12, and 13, Part III of Questionnaire

Respondent Group	A		U		D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 8. Anthropology is included in my social studies textbook.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	79	83	4	4	13	13	96	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	13	23	5	8	39	69	57	100
Q 12. I would teach anthropology if it were included in my textbook.								
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	31	55	19	33	7	12	57	100
Q 13. I use the textbook more often than any other tool in teaching social studies.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	64	65	3	3	31	32	98	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	23	42	6	11	26	47	55	100

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

Q 8. $X^2_2 = 54.03$; $p < .001$. Q 13. $X^2_2 = 9.4$; $p < .01$.

anthropology even if it were included. However, a substantial 33% remained uncertain. The large number indicating uncertainty may be due to the influences of other factors, such as lack of time and materials. At this point, it is difficult to determine the cause of uncertainty. However, it is interesting to note that the large degree of uncertainty lies with those teachers who do not teach anthropology. This has also been the case with other questions.

Examination of the responses to Question 13 indicates that of those teachers who teach anthropology, 65% use the textbook more often than any other tool in teaching social studies; 32% indicated that they do not use the textbook more often; and 3% remained uncertain. Of those teachers not teaching anthropology, 42% use the textbook more often than any other tool; while 47% indicated that they do not use the textbook more often; 11% were uncertain. While the difference between those teaching and those not teaching anthropology is not as marked as with the previous question, teachers of anthropology use the textbook more than those who do not teach anthropology.

These results clearly illustrate how important it is that anthropology be included in the textbook. If anthropology is included in the textbook, it has a much greater chance of being taught in elementary social studies.

Hypothetical Statement #6:
Teachers' Opinions

The sixth hypothetical statement suggests that elementary teachers do not teach anthropology because they do not feel that it should be taught in elementary grades. Question 14 in Part III dealt with this possibility.

The results indicate that 78% of those teachers who teach anthropology felt that it should be taught as part of elementary social studies. Only 7% of this sample felt that anthropology should not be taught in elementary social studies, and 15% remained uncertain. Of those teachers who do not teach anthropology, 39% indicated that they feel anthropology should be included in elementary social studies, 27% indicated that they do not feel anthropology should be included in elementary social studies; and 43% were not certain. Here again is a large percentage which indicated uncertainty (see Table IX).

Of those teachers who are teaching anthropology, 22% are not sure they should be. Although these results seem illogical, the Chi-square statistic indicates that responses to Question 14 are not random ($p < .001$). More important to notice here is the fact that 78% of those teaching anthropology feel that it should be taught.

TABLE IX

Summary of Responses to Question 14,
Part III of Questionnaire

Respondent Group	A		U		D		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Q 14. I think the elementary social studies curriculum should include anthropology.								
Teachers who teach anthropology	75	78	14	15	7	7	96	100
Teachers who do not teach anthropology	17	30	24	43	15	27	56	100

A—Agree, U—Uncertain, D—Disagree.

$X^2_2 = 33.91$; $p < .001$.

Part IV of Questionnaire

The fourth part of the questionnaire was completed only by those teachers who did not consider themselves to be teaching anthropology as part of their social studies curriculum. They were to choose the three most critical factors which they feel are preventing them from teaching anthropology. Their three choices were to be made from the list of the hypothetical statements discussed previously (see Table X). They were given a seventh choice termed "Other" and were asked to explain that reason (see Appendix). They were to rank their responses in order from highest to lowest with (1) being the reason of greatest importance, (2) being next, and (3) being of lesser importance.

TABLE X

Results of Part IV of Questionnaire

Statement	Points
1. I do not have time to include anthropology.	73
2. I do not know enough about anthropology.	63
3. I do not have access to any materials to teach anthropology.	54
4. I do not think my class could comprehend anthropology.	50
5. Anthropology is not included in our social studies textbook.	39
6. I do not think anthropology should be taught in elementary schools.	19
7. Other reasons. Explain. _____	15

Points—sum of responses calculated by values: 1st choice = 3 points; 2nd choice = 2 points; 3rd choice = 1 point.

In order to analyze Part IV of the questionnaire, each response was given a weighted value. If a statement was marked with (1), that choice was given a score of 3 points; a response of (2) was given a score of 2; and a response of (3) was given a score of 1 point. The responses to each of the seven choices were tallied. The choices were then ranked from highest to lowest according to value of responses. The results of this section are listed in Table X. The statements are listed in rank order from highest to lowest according to their weighted value.

Table X clearly indicates that lack of time is considered to be the most important factor preventing teachers from teaching anthropology. Following time are lack of teacher knowledge of anthropology and lack of anthropological materials which make up the three most important reasons preventing anthropology from being taught in the elementary curriculum.

See Appendix B for a list of responses written beside the answer marked "Other" in Part IV of questionnaire.

Discussion of Hypothetical Statements

After analyzing the data, it is apparent that there is significant interest among the respondents toward including anthropology in the social studies curriculum. Although most of the respondents (69%) have never taken anthropology courses, a large number (60%) still indicated that

anthropology should be included in the elementary curriculum. It should be mentioned here that a number of respondents wrote on the questionnaire that they are not in favor of a separate course in anthropology at the elementary level. They suggested, instead, that anthropology should be incorporated into the overall social science curriculum. As will be discussed later, having anthropology included in the textbook would be the most effective means of accomplishing this goal. From the results of this questionnaire, it appears that college level social studies methods courses are including anthropology, because 60% of the respondents indicated that anthropology had been mentioned in their college methods courses.

The results of this research further indicate that teachers' lack of anthropological knowledge is a significant factor preventing anthropology from being included in the elementary social studies curriculum. According to Part IV of the questionnaire, teachers' lack of anthropological knowledge ranks as the second most important reason why teachers do not teach anthropology in the social studies. This compares reasonably with Part III. Of those responding in Part III that they do not teach anthropology, 31% said they would include it if they knew more about the subject, 27.6% indicated that they would not teach it, and a significant number (41.4%) were uncertain. The large

percentage of uncertainty may reflect the influence that other factors have in preventing anthropology from being taught.

Most of the respondents felt that their students can comprehend anthropological concepts—65% of those who reported teaching anthropology and 44% of those who do not teach anthropology. Furthermore, 40% of those not teaching anthropology indicated that they would teach this subject if they knew their students could comprehend it. According to Part IV of the questionnaire, this reason ranked fourth in importance as being a factor preventing the inclusion of anthropology in the elementary curriculum. This hypothetical statement did not prove to be highly effective in preventing the inclusion of anthropology in the elementary social studies. There was a noticeable degree of uncertainty (35% among those not teaching anthropology) regarding this statement, and at this point, it is difficult to determine why.

The results of Part IV show that teachers perceive time to be the most important factor preventing them from teaching anthropology in elementary social studies. Analysis of the data in Part III indicates that 40% of the respondents teaching anthropology felt they do not have time to teach this subject. Sixty percent of those who do not teach anthropology indicated that they do not have time.

Furthermore, 39% of those who do not teach anthropology reported that they would teach it if they had time, 42% remained uncertain. In Part IV of the questionnaire, teachers not teaching anthropology ranked lack of time as being the most important factor preventing them from including anthropology in the social studies curriculum.

By means of providing some further explanation for this response pattern, it is important to note that elementary teachers in a self-contained classroom are required to teach diverse subjects. Therefore, little time can be allotted to any one subject, and at present there seems to be little solution for this dilemma. Research is needed comparing the status of social studies and anthropology in the self-contained classroom versus their status in a departmentalized school. Perhaps those teachers required to teach only social studies would be more likely to have more preparational and instructional time to include anthropology at the elementary level. However, the results of this research do not seem to support that supposition. Of the 101 respondents who reported teaching anthropology, 66% teach in self-contained classrooms and 34% teach in departmentalized settings. Of the 62 respondents not teaching anthropology, 67% teach in self-contained classrooms and 33% teach in departmentalized settings (see Table XI). The results

are obviously quite similar. However, the sample size does not permit a generalization of these results. Chi-square was run on these results, and the responses were found to be nonsignificant (see Table XI). More research is needed in this area.

TABLE XI

Comparison of Self-Contained and Departmentalized Responses to Question 7, Part I of Questionnaire

Response	Self-Contained #	Self-Contained %	Departmentalized #	Departmentalized %
Q 7. Do you teach anthropology as part of your social studies?				
Yes	67/101	66%	34/101	34%
No	42/62	67%	20/62	33%

$X^2_2 = 0.034$; p = NS.

The results further indicate that 40% of the respondents teaching anthropology do not have access to anthropological materials for use at the elementary level, while 66% of the respondents who do not teach anthropology indicated that they do not have access to anthropological materials. Most of the respondents (48% of those teaching anthropology and 60% of those not teaching anthropology) were uncertain whether or not their school system would provide them with materials for teaching anthropology if the materials were requested.

In Part IV of the questionnaire, lack of anthropological materials ranked as being the third most important reason preventing teachers from teaching anthropology in elementary social studies.

Due to the large percentage of uncertainty as to whether or not school systems would supply materials, one wonders if teachers are actively involved in trying to obtain instructional materials. Perhaps a list of available anthropological materials should be constructed and made available to teachers throughout the state. Teachers might then realize they have access to more materials than they at first realized. It appears that availability of materials is important to a large number of respondents.

The present research indicates that the textbook is considered by most respondents to be very important as a means of including anthropology in the elementary curriculum. Most of the respondents (83% of those who teach anthropology and 23% of those not teaching anthropology) indicated that anthropology is included in the social studies textbooks they are now using. More striking is the fact that 55% of the respondents who reported that they do not teach anthropology indicated that they would teach this subject if it were included in their social studies textbook. Furthermore, 65% of those who teach anthropology and 42% of those not teaching anthropology responded that they use

the textbook more often than any other tool in social studies instruction.

These results seem to indicate that anthropology has a better chance of being included in the curriculum if it is included in the social studies textbook. Perhaps anthropologists should influence textbook companies to include more anthropological information in their elementary level textbooks. No information other than that mentioned in Chapter I is currently available concerning the present status of anthropology in elementary textbooks. This is certainly an area which warrants research since the textbook is indicated to be relied upon so heavily for elementary social studies instruction.

Teacher Profiles

The profile of those teachers who teach anthropology shows that most (76%) have taken anthropology courses (see Table XII), most (75%) had anthropology mentioned in methods courses, and most (65%) felt that their students can comprehend anthropological concepts. Although they teach anthropology, 40% felt that they really do not have time. As mentioned earlier, the topic of time is often an emotional issue, because teachers very often feel that there is not enough time during the day to teach everything they feel is important. Many of these teachers (41%) felt

TABLE XII

Comparison of Responses: Those Who Teach and Those Who Do Not Teach Anthropology

			Teach +	Do Not Teach -	Difference d
1.	Taken anthropology	Yes	76 (%)	24 (%)	52
		No	55	45	10
2.	Mentioned in methods course	Yes	75	25	50
		No	42	58	16
3.	Comprehension	A	65	44	21
		U	28	19	9
		D	7	37	30
4.	Time to teach anthropology	A	34	27	7
		U	26	13	13
		D	40	60	20
5.	Have access to materials	A	30	13	17
		U	29	21	8
		D	41	66	25
6.	School system would supply materials	A	31	21	10
		U	48	60	12
		D	21	19	2
7.	Anthropology included in text	A	83	23	60
		U	4	8	4
		D	13	69	56
8.	Think anthropology should be taught	A	78	30	48
		U	15	43	28
		D	7	27	20

that they do not have access to the instructional materials they need for teaching anthropology. These results are also not as contradictory as they might appear. Teachers often feel that they need more instructional materials than they have. More (48%) indicated that they are uncertain as to whether or not their school system would supply them with anthropological materials if they were requested. Most (83%) indicated that anthropology is included in their textbooks. Finally, most (78%) felt that anthropology should be included in the elementary curriculum.

The profile which emerged of those who do not teach anthropology shows that more (45%) have never taken anthropology courses and 58% report that anthropology was not mentioned in their college methods courses. Regarding students' ability to comprehend anthropological concepts, the responses were fairly evenly distributed with more (44%) indicating that their students could comprehend anthropological concepts if given the opportunity. Most (60%) felt that they do not have time to teach anthropology, and most (66%) felt that they do not have access to anthropological materials. Furthermore, most of those teachers (60%) were uncertain whether or not their school system would supply them with anthropological materials if requested. Most (69%) reported that anthropology is not included in their textbooks. Finally, more (43%) were not

certain whether or not anthropology should be taught in elementary schools.

It is obvious that the responses of those teachers who do not teach anthropology exhibit the most confusing patterns. Perhaps there are underlying patterns which prevent anthropology from being taught, but the analysis technique used in this research does not provide many answers. Therefore, it is more important to emphasize the positive—those teachers who teach anthropology and the factors which enhance the teaching of anthropology.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this research indicate that there is considerable interest among elementary teachers in Tennessee toward including anthropology in the social studies curriculum. However, they do not think it should be taught as a separate course, but rather, it should be included into the overall curriculum.

Most teachers consider lack of time to be the greatest factor preventing them from teaching anthropology. A number of teachers wrote on their questionnaires that they are too busy trying to teach basic subjects such as reading and mathematics to include anthropology.

The results of this research also suggest that teachers' lack of knowledge of anthropology and lack of materials are perceived to be major reasons why anthropology is not being taught in elementary classrooms. Regarding teachers' lack of anthropological knowledge, this factor could be decreased be offering anthropology specifically for teachers as part of the teacher education curriculum in colleges and universities. Also a push to have anthropology included in methods courses in teacher education would help to expose anthropological concepts to future teachers.

Regarding teachers' perceptions that they have limited or no materials to teach anthropology at the elementary level, a list of free and inexpensive anthropological materials should be devised and circulated to all public elementary schools in Tennessee. Just sending the list to Boards of Education may not help because the list might not be forwarded to individual schools. Teachers who have no knowledge or understanding of anthropology are not likely to inquire about available anthropological materials. However, if a list is available at their school, many teachers might make good use of the materials, thus getting more anthropology into the elementary classrooms. Furthermore, a move should be made to encourage directors of the materials centers in the school systems throughout the state to purchase anthropological materials for elementary teachers in their systems. A letter and list of current materials compiled by the Tennessee Anthropological Association and sent to directors of materials centers in each school system might prove to be very effective in this respect.

The present research indicates that most teachers would teach anthropology if it were included in the social studies textbooks. Furthermore, most teachers in this study remarked that they rely more heavily on the textbook than any other tool for social studies instruction. From these results, it can be concluded that efforts should be made to have

anthropology included in the social studies textbooks. Publishing companies should be encouraged to incorporate anthropology not only into social studies textbooks, but into reading textbooks at all elementary levels as well.

In conclusion, this research has revealed that there is significant interest among public elementary school teachers in Tennessee toward including anthropology in the elementary curriculum. Also it has brought out several specific factors influencing teachers' decisions regarding the teaching of anthropology in elementary schools. It is now the responsibility of interested anthropologists and educators to attempt to correct those factors having a negative effect on the inclusion of anthropology and to continue to develop factors with a positive effect.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alpenfels, Ethel J.
1952 Anthropology—An Integrating Science for an Integrated World. Childhood Education. 28:341-4.

Bailey, Wilfred C., and Francis J. Clune
1965 Anthropology in Elementary Social Studies. Instructor. 75(3):48-50.

1968 Preparation of Elementary School Units on the Concept of Culture. Human Organization. 27:6-10.

Charles, C. L.
1972 University of Georgia Currciulum Project. Social Education. 36:746-8.

Conlan, John B.
1975a Congressional Record. April 9, 1975 (H2585).

1975b MACOS: The Push for a Uniform National Curriculum. Social Education. 39:388-92.

Dictionary of Education
1973 Carter V. Good, Editor. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

Directory of Public Schools
1978-1979 Tennessee Department of Education.

Dow, Peter B.
1976 MACOS: Social Studies in Crisis. Educational Leadership. 34:35-9.

Francello, Joseph A.
1965 Anthropology for Public Schools; Profits and Pitfalls. Social Studies. 56:272-5.

Frech, William P.
1975 The Effect of Cognitive Training in Anthropology on Ethnocentric Attitudes. Psychology in Schools. 12:364-70.

Friedl, John
1976 Cultural Anthropology. Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., New York.

Gay, L. R.
1976 Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Merrill Company, Columbus, Ohio.

Gearing, Frederick O.
1970 Toward a Mankind Curriculum from Kindergarten through Twelfth Grade. Today's Education. 59:28-30.

Hrdlička, Aleš
1931 Anthropology and Education. Progressive Education. 8:466-8.

Kalso, Milton L.
1973 Contributions from Anthropology to Elementary Social Studies Curricula. Social Studies. 64:254-7.

Kam, Jeanette V. Schnietz
1978 Influences of Anthropological Materials on the Knowledge of Sixth Graders about Blacks. Education. 98:406-9.

Martin, David S.
1975 Ethnocentrism toward Foreign Culture in Elementary Social Studies. Elementary School Journal. 75:380-8.

Mouly, George J.
1963 The Science of Educational Research. American Book Company, New York.

Potterfield, J. E.
1968 An Analysis of Elementary Children's Ability to Learn Anthropological Content at Grades Four, Five and Six. Journal of Educational Research. 61(7):297-99.

Pratt, R. B.
1972 Education Development Center, Inc. Man: A Course of Study. Social Education. 36:742-4.

Rice, Marion J.
1968 Materials for Teaching Anthropology in the Elementary School. Social Education. 32:254-6.

Rogers, Vincent R.
1967 Ethnocentrism and the Social Studies. Phi Delta Kappan. 49:208-11.

Spindler, G. Dearborn
1946 Anthropology May Be an Answer. Journal of Education. 129:130-1.

Thomas, David H.
1976 Figuring Anthropology. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Van Fleet, Alanson and David Denny
1979 Teaching Anthropology in Tennessee Schools. Tennessee Anthropological Association Newsletter. 4(2):34.

Weber, George
1975 The Case Against Man: A Course of Study. Phi Delta Kappan. 72:81-82.

Wilson, Jeannette and Bob L. Taylor
1978 The Effects of MACOS on Intermediate-Grade Children's Attitudes. Education. 98(3):359-64.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Route 5, Box 303
Portland, Tennessee 37148
March 15, 1979

Dear Principal:

I am presently writing a thesis in partial fulfillment for a Master of Arts Degree in Anthropology from The University of Tennessee at Knoxville. I am trying to assess the extent to which anthropology is presently included in the elementary social studies curriculum in Tennessee and identify the factors which prevent its inclusion.

Your school has been randomly selected as one of the sample population of elementary schools in Tennessee. You will help greatly in my research if you will give the attached questionnaire to one teacher in your school who teaches any grade from one through six. After he or she completes it, have him or her place it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope and mail it to me by April 1, 1979. If your school is departmentalized, please ask a social studies teacher to complete this form. I am interested in simple, honest responses. Respondents are not asked to sign their names unless they choose to do so.

I greatly appreciate both your time and that of the teacher at your school who completes this questionnaire. It would be impossible to conduct this research without your help. Again, thank you.

Sincerely,

Denise Wilkinson

Denise Wilkinson
Route 5, Box 303
Portland, Tennessee 37148

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Please answer the following questions:

1. What grade do you teach? _____

2. How many years of teaching experience have you had? _____

3. Is your classroom self-contained? _____

4. Is your grade level departmentalized? _____

5. How many subjects do you teach? _____

6. Do you teach social studies? _____

7. Do you teach anthropology as part of your social studies? _____

8. Have you ever taken any anthropology courses? _____

9. Was anthropology ever mentioned in any of your social science methods courses? _____

10. Where did you attend college? _____
_____

II. Please answer the following questions as briefly as possible:

1. What would you say a concise definition of anthropology is? _____
_____

2. Have you ever read about an anthropologist? _____
Is so, name him or her: _____

3. What anthropology books are available at your school for use with your class? _____

_____

For use by you: _____

_____

4. What audiovisual materials regarding anthropology are available for use with your class? _____

_____

5. Would you be interested in developing anthropology lessons or units of work for your class? _____

6. Do you know of other teachers in your school or in other public elementary schools in Tennessee who are teaching anthropology or archaeology? _____
If so, please list their name, school name, and school system. _____

_____

III. For each of the items below, put an X beside the appropriate response.
Strongly Agree—SA Agree—A Uncertain or No Opinion—U
Disagree—D Strongly Agree—SD

1.	I think anthropology is interesting.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
2.	I think my class would enjoy learning anthropology.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
3.	I think my class could comprehend anthropological concepts.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
4.	I think anthropology is important for children at the grade level I teach.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
5.	I have access to the materials I need in order to teach anthropology.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
6.	I have time during the day to teach anthropology.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )

7.	Anthropology is a recommended part of the social studies curriculum in my school system.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
8.	Anthropology is included in my social studies textbook.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
9.	I would teach anthropology if I knew more about it.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
10.	I would teach anthropology if I knew that my class could comprehend it.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
11.	I would teach anthropology if I had time to include it.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
12.	I would teach anthropology if it were included in my textbook.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
13.	I use the textbook more often than any other tool in teaching social studies.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
14.	I think the elementary social studies curriculum should include anthropology.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )
15.	My school system would supply me with anthropology materials if I asked for them.	SA( ) A( ) U( ) D( ) SD( )

IV. If you do not teach anthropology, please choose three reasons which are of greatest importance in preventing you from teaching anthropology. Indicate your first choice by placing a (1) in front of it, put a (2) in front of your second choice and a (3) in front of your third choice. Choose only three.

_____ a. I do not know enough about anthropology.

_____ b. I do not think my class could comprehend it.

_____ c. I do not have time to include it.

_____ d. I do not have access to any materials to teach it.

_____ e. It is not included in our social studies textbook.

_____ f. I do not think anthropology should be taught in elementary schools.

_____ g. Other reasons. Explain. _____
_____

V. If you would be willing to meet for an interview to discuss the idea of teaching anthropology in elementary school, please fill in the information below. Thank you.

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone: _____

Thank you for your time and sincere effort.

APPENDIX B

List of Teachers' Comments Describing Why They Do Not Teach Anthropology

1. Anthropology should not be taught as a separate subject in elementary school.

2. My students are not aware of their own place in the order of things to compare themselves to other groups.

3. It's very boring.

4. Reading skills, writing skills, math skills, map reading skills, basic scientific facts are more important to teach to elementary children than any facts dealing with anthropology.

5. It is difficult to find time to teach social studies at all. There are so many other basic things which are essentials at this level that anthropology is just not a practical topic to spend time on, except possibly incidentally as a "news" item.

6. The elementary curriculum is already loaded with too much content.

7. Basic subjects are more important at the elementary level.

8. I have not heard of anthropology being taught in elementary school, but I wouldn't object to the idea.

VITA

Denise Shannon Woodall Wilkinson was born in Franklin, Kentucky, on April 8, 1952. She attended elementary school in White House, Tennessee, and high school in Portland, Tennessee, where she graduated in 1970. She attended Austin Peay State University in Clarksville, Tennessee, during the academic year 1970-1971. In September 1971, she entered The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and in June 1974, she received a Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary Education. In June 1974, she began study toward a Master's degree in Anthropology. This degree was awarded in December 1980.

During the academic years 1975-1977, the author taught kindergarten and first grade, respectively, in Robertson County, Tennessee. During the academic years 1977-1979, she taught fifth grade in Sumner County, Tennessee. She is presently employed with American Hospital Supply Corporation in Memphis, Tennessee.

She is married to Walter Gilbert Wilkinson of Portland, Tennessee.