REVISITING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ETHNOGRAPHY, DISCOURSE AND EDUCATION

REVISITANDO A RELAÇÃO ENTRE ETNOGRAFIA, DISCURSO E EDUCAÇÃO

Judith L. Green
judith.green@gmail.com
Maria Lúcia Castanheira
lalucia@gmail.com

Abstract: *The question of the relationship between ethnography, discourse and education has been an area of an ongoing development for the last four decades. This paper addresses a series of questions proposed by the editors of this special issue of Calestrocópio Journal. These questions led us to a reexamination of key arguments by Shirley B. Heath, Brian V. Street and Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, who have influenced how ethnography can inform epistemological approaches to studying language in use in everyday settings in and out of school. In addition, we revisited the distinction between ethnography in and of education, proposed by Green and Bloome (1997), in the light of a recent reformulation focused on Anthropology in Education, of Education and for Education. This article focuses on the logic of inquiry central to understanding ethnography as epistemology.*

Keywords: *Ethnography in and out of school; logic of inquiry; discourse; education.*

Resumo: A discussão sobre a relação entre etnografia, discurso e educação tem sido, nas últimas quatro décadas, uma área em desenvolvimento. Este artigo aborda um conjunto de questões que foram propostas pelos editores deste número especial da *Revista Caletroscópio*, que nos levou a uma reavaliação dos argumentos principais feitos por Shirley B. Heath, Brian V. Street e Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, que têm contribuído para a compreensão de como a etnografia embasa abordagens epistemológicas para o estudo da linguagem em uso em contextos dentro e fora da escola. Além disso, revisitamos essa distinção entre etnografia dentro e fora da escola, como proposta por Green e Bloome (1997), a partir de uma reformulação recente com foco na Antropologia em Educação, da Educação e pela Educação. Este artigo baseia-se na importância da lógica de investigação para o entendimento da etnografia como epistemologia.

Palavras-chave: Etnografia dentro e fora da escola; lógica de investigação; discurso; educação.

When I (Judith L. Green) received the invitation from Adail Sebastião Rodrigues-Júnior and Clézio Roberto Gonçalves, the *Editors-in-chief* of this journal, to share my view of ethnography *in* and *of* education, I saw this as a unique opportunity to *step back* and to (re)think where my understanding of ethnographic research *in* and *of* education that David Bloome and I proposed in 1997 is over two decades later. In framing this as an interview, the editors provided a series of questions to guide my understanding of their goals for this interview.

Question 1: Prof. Green, could you share with us your own view of ethnography in and of education?

Question 2: And, how can ethnography inform research on language and discourse in the fields of teaching and learning children and adults in schools and universities?

Question 3: In the prologue of the wide-known book *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*, Shirley Brice Heath (1983) reported an in-depth ethnographic research she had carried out in Roadville and Trackton communities. In the text she wrote things such as:

> "In the years between 1969 and 1978, I lived, worked, and played with the children and their families and friends in Roadville and Trackton." (p. 5).

> "I spent many hours cooking, chopping wood, gardening, sewing, and minding children by the rules of the communities." (p. 8).

It is clear, at least to us, that Heath informed her research on the essentials of ethnography *per se*, the method adopted by anthropologists in their investigations. **In your opinion, is it possible to adopt the *same method* – ethnography – in educational research, as Heath did? Why?**

Question 4: In her text *Ethnography*, Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt (2006: 279) claimed that "ethnography is really a philosophy of research rather than a specific method; it depends primarily on the two broad methods of participant observation and open-ended interviewing."

To respond to these questions, I invited Maria Lucia Castanheira , from the Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, with whom I have worked collaboratively over the past two and a half decades,[5] to join me for this interview. My goal, in inviting her to join me in responding to the editors' questions, was to create a *reflexive dialogue* for this interview in order to *step back* (Heath & Street, 2008) from what I assumed I know about ethnographic research in order to (re)examine the roots and current directions of ethnography-*in*-education and how it relates to ethnography-*of*-education.

Endnotes

[5] For examples of our collaborative publications related to defining *interactional ethnography* and issues in ethnography see: Castanheira, Crawford, Dixon & Green, 2000; Castanheira, Green & Yeager, 2008; Green, Castanheira & Yeager, 2011; Castanheira & Green, 2012; Green, Castanheira, Skukauskaite & Hammond, 2015; Yeager, Castanheira & Green, in press; Bloome & Green, in press; Green & Bloome, in press. For published collaborative work in Portuguese see: Castanheira, Green & Dixon, 2007a; b.

As we will make visible throughout this interview, this *dialogic process* led us to (re)engage with the authors of texts the editors framed in their questions. It also led us to select additional texts these authors have published in the period following Green & Bloome (1997): Bloome, Beauchemin, Brady, Beuscher, Kim & Shey (2018), Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto & Shuart-Faris, 2005 and Heath & Street (2008). This *reflexive* process led us to uncover further distinctions that we will make visible in this interview that expanded our understandings of ethnography as a logic-of-inquiry, not a method, for studying language and discourse within and across disciplines at the intersection of anthropology and education.[6]

On the Goals of Ethnography: An Anthropological Perspective

At the center of our ethnographic perspective are a set of goals guiding ethnographic research that Heath & Street made visible in their book, *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research.* By beginning this interview with a statement of these goals, we introduce readers to the approach we took to (re)engage with the distinctions framed in Green & Bloome (1997) between ethnography *in* education and ethnography *of* education. As framed by Heath & Street from their anthropological perspectives – linguistic anthropology of Heath (US) and social anthropology of Street (UK), these goals guide the ethnographer in:

- Suspending known categories to construct understandings of local and situated categories and referential meanings of actions being developed by participants;
- Acknowledging differences between what they as ethnographers know and what the actor(s) in the context know;
- Constructing new ways of knowing that are grounded in local and situated ways of knowing, being and doing the processes and practices of everyday life within a social group or configuration of actors;
- Developing ways of representing what is known by local actors and what the ethnographers learn from the analysis at different levels of analytic scale.

Throughout this interview, we will make visible (i.e., transparent) how these principles of

---

[6] For a distinction between anthropological and sociological goals of ethnographic research, see Corsaro & Heise (1999) and Walford (2007) Atkinson, 1990; Atkinson, Coffey, Delamont, Lofland & Lofland, 2001; Delamont, 2011; Beach, Bagley, & Marques da Silva, 2018.

conduct of ethnographic research (Green & Bridges, 2018) provided a foundation for our responses to the editors' questions. As part of our process, given that this is an interview, to create a dialogic approach, not only with the editor, but also with readers, we adopted one additional practice of Heath & Street (2008) -- the use of first names.

Throughout the interview, we refer to ourselves as Lalu and Judith to make visible our actions and understandings that developed as we sought to respond to the editors' questions and their goals for this interview. We also hope the approach will lay a foundation for further explorations with readers, formally and informally, about conceptual issues that arise from engaging with our interview text.

On Framing Our Approach to *Theoretical Reflexivity*

At the center of the principles of conduct presented above is the concept of *reflexivity.* Heath & Street (2008) define *reflexivity* as a central goal of ethnographers:

> *Reflexivity,* a process by which ethnographers reveal their self-perceptions, methodological setbacks, and mental states that often includes broad general critiques of the field. Reflexivity enables ethnographers to see their research within historical and structural constraints that result from asymmetrical power distributions. Foley (2002) considers reflexivity to be of four types: confessional, theoretical, interpersonal and deconstructive (p. 123)

While a complete discussion of these different forms of reflexivity are not possible here, we focus on two Heath & Street (2018) identify with Green & Bloome (1997), *theoretical reflexivity* and *intertextual reflexivity*.

> A less visible type of reflexivity is what Foley terms "theoretical reflexivity," referring to the kinds of demand that Pierre Bourdieu, a French sociologist, put on his colleagues. Bourdieu insisted that his colleagues make explicit the theoretical basis of their claims, providing a kind of sociology of sociology. For the ethnographer, this demands a loss of "empiricist innocence"; that is, whatever they saw in the field and whatever they say about it in their writing will be rooted in theoretical assumptions that need to be made explicit. Most anthropologists would take these points as crucial to "doing ethnography."

Having framed this as a principle for anthropologists, they, then, take this into education:

> In education, such reflexivity is perhaps less the norm but becoming so, as the accounts cited above by Green and Bloome (1997) and Jeffrey and Troman (2004) make clear. The rhetorical use of representational practices evident in this kind of reflexivity also points in the direction of another type. "Intertextual reflexivity" refers primarily to historical accounts that locate the data not in a supposedly overarching "ethnographic present" but instead in a developing and moving "past" (Foley 2002).

While this argument is but a small excerpt from their presentation of *reflexivity*, we included

these definitions to frame two of our processes in this interview, the use of *theoretical reflexivity* and *intertextual reflexivity.* By focusing on the theoretical perspectives guiding different ethnographic logics-of-inquiry, we make visible that even within a particular intellectual community, there may be a range of theories guiding the ethnographic epistemological process.

By addressing *intertextual reflexivity,* we make visible our process of addressing the editors' questions and how this process led us to construct the position of *reader-as-analyst from an ethnographic perspective* (Green, Castanheira, Skukauskaite & Hammond, 2015). By assuming this position, we sought to *step back* from what we remembered and learned through earlier readings, to (re)engage with the author(s) through their texts and to (re)examine the *theoretical perspectives* inscribed in these texts.[7] In later sections of this interview we will expand the principles of conduct that Heath and Street framed in their *reflexive dialogue.*

To further frame our approach to theoretical reflexivity, we now turn to a conceptual approach to studying programs of research by Educational philosopher Kenneth Strike (1974; 1979; 1989). Strike, drawing on arguments in philosophy of science by Kuhn (1962), Toulmin (1972) and Lakatos (1970), argued that underlying a program of research are *governing assumptions.* These governing assumptions make visible the *expressive potential* of a conceptual language and epistemological processes that frame what can be known. That is, they make visible what a particular theoretical perspective as a *language* of inquiry enables a researcher to create a particular language to express what they learned about the phenomena under study in particular ways, and not others. The governing assumptions guiding our approach to developing understandings of different configurations of ethnography are captured in Table 1:

Table 1: Governing Assumptions of Different Theoretical Perspectives

---

[7] A similar call for transparency was framed by American Educational Research Association (2006) in their Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research in their journals, given the diverse perspectives and methodologies undertaken by educational researchers across their divisions (12 sub-divisions) (https://www.aera.net/Publications/Standards-for-Research-Conduct). Judith, as a member of the taskforce that led to these Standards gained a deep understanding that without the theories grounding different perspectives for research, she (and other members of the taskforce) could not (re)construct the logic of inquiry or assess the basis of the claims made based on the "methodological" approach to particular studies.

On the Expressive Potential of Language
Drawing from the work of Kuhn (1962), Toulmin (1972), Lakatos (1970) and others, Strike describes a set of *governing assumptions of research programs* in education as playing the following roles:
• They enable us to distinguish relevant from irrelevant phenomena. That is, they inform us as to what phenomena a given enterprise is expected to deal with. And they tell us what sorts of questions are appropriate to ask about them.
• They tell us what is to count as a well-formed or appropriate account of phenomena. Some proposed accounts will be excluded at the outset because they are not properly structured or because they do not fulfill the conception of a proper account within the field.
• They provide the standards of judgment that we use to evaluate proposed accounts, and they tell us what is to count as evidence for proposed accounts.
• They provide the context in which theoretical and empirical terms are defined. Indeed, they provide the characterization of what is to count as a theoretical and an empirical term.
• They provide the perceptual categories by means of which the world is experienced.
• They specify the problems that require solution. A problem will be a conflict between the intellectual aspirations of a research program and its current capacity.

These governing assumptions of research programs, therefore, when integrated with Heath and Street's set of goals for ethnography, required us to *step back* from what we assumed about ethnography, which Anderson-Levitt (2006) framed as a philosophy of research.

These *governing assumptions,* therefore, provided a conceptual framework for *theoretical reflexivity* as well as for *intertextual reflexivity.* That is, they provided a basis for stepping back to first explore the theoretical arguments guiding the logic-of-inquiry of other researchers and then to examine how that logic related to, or differed from, our own logic of inquiry. This approach, therefore, makes transparent how engaged with the work of others ethnographically to make visible how we understand the distinctions today between ethnography *in* and *of* education. It also supported us examining recent developments in ethnographic perspectives guiding research on discourse and language in the fields of teaching and learning in educational contexts. (e.g., Green, Castanheira, Skukauskaite & Hammond, 2015; Green, Chian, Stewart, Brooks, Sevari, Couch, Stewart & Yeager, 2017).

Framing Our Approach to the Interview Process: Developing Anchor Texts

Our process of (re)engaging with these texts is presented in four sections. In each section, we make visible what we learned from these texts as we (re)engaged with particular excerpts from

them. Additionally, by including these excerpts, we make transparent how our process of *readers-as-analyst* led to further understandings of the authors' perspectives on what is entailed in undertaking ethnographic studies of language, discourse and we add, literacy in educational contexts. Another reason for including the excerpts that we engaged with is that these excerpts are from published books that might not be accessible to readers in different national contexts. In this process, we seek to bring forward, and thus make transparent, the author(s)' arguments as we (re)engaged with, and interpreted, their texts.[8]

Anchor Texts and Processes: Addressing the Editors Questions

In this section, we outline four phases that we undertook to address and respond to the editors' questions. Each is grounded, as stated previously, in an *anchor* text. These anchor texts constitute an *intertextual web of texts* (Bloome, 1992; Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Fairclough, 1992) that enabled us to trace the roots of key programs at the intersection of anthropology and education (as framed by Bloome et al, 2018). That is, by (re)engaging with these texts, we identified conceptual issues framed by the authors.

By examining the governing assumptions that framed principles of conduct for ethnographic research in each section, we make visible how *theoretical, intertextual and interpersonal reflexivity* are central processes for *ethnography.* Additionally, we draw on these arguments to make visible how this conceptual perspective is central to understanding *ethnography is guided by particular logics-of-inquiry*, and thus is *not a method.*[9] Through this *reflexive approach,* we make visible contributions of different researchers to our current understandings of ethnography *in* and *of* education. This process also supported our understandings of developments since the initial set of distinctions among programs identified Green & Bloome (1997).

---

[8] This process is based on our awareness that often state of the art or emerging arguments are often not visible in a journal but are first provided in books. It is also based on our growing awareness that readers may not be aware of the range of on-line encyclopedias that provide syntheses of traditions and perspectives in particular areas of research unlike journals where research studies are often the focus of the published articles. Today, across disciplines there are a number of *handbooks for research* that are generally not accessible on-line, further limiting contact to new directions or developments in particular areas of study. Therefore, we have included excerpts to make visible key arguments that we encountered that made us step back and (re)consider our own perspective in light of these developing arguments.

[9] Green & Bloome, 1997; Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Baker & Green, 2007; Heath & Street, 2008; Green, Skukauskaite & Baker, 2012; Walford, 2012; Bloome et al, 2018; Green & Bridges, 2018; Kelly & Green, 2019

- **Anchor Text 1**: We (re)engage with the distinctions framed in Green & Bloome (1997) given that this text made visible the differences in the roots of ethnography *of* education and ethnography *in* education. The former, as framed by Green & Bloome (1997), was the goal of research conducted by scholars whose questions and theories were grounded in disciplines within the social sciences (e.g., anthropology and sociology). The second perspective, *ethnography in education* was conceptualized to capture research that addresses questions of concern to educators. This *anchor text*, therefore, forms a foundation for understanding the roots of where we (Lalu and Judith) are today in relationship to these programs of research. By (re)engaging with Green & Bloome, we make visible one additional distinction that we had not recognized previously: *collaborative research* undertaken by scholars from education with those in anthropology (or other disciplines).[10]

- **Anchor Text 2**: We then engage with a recent (re)conceptualization of the difference in programs of research at the intersection of *anthropology and education*. This text was developed by Bloome, Beauchemin, Brady, Buescher, Kim & Frey (2018) as an entry for the *International Encyclopedia of Anthropology* (Callan, 2018) entitled: *Anthropology of education, anthropology in education* and *anthropology for education.* As indicted in their title, they framed the distinctions as forming a field of study that reflect the goals of different intellectual communities as well as the theoretical perspectives guiding each approach to ethnography. When this entry, is contrasted with the original distinctions in Green & Bloome (1997), two differences were identified. First, rather than focus on ethnography, they (re)framed the focus to bound their discussion from the intersection of anthropology and education. Second, through a (re)analysis of research within this developing field, they identify current directions and contributions developed by those engaged in *anthropology of education* and *anthropology in education*. Additionally, they introduce a third distinction, *anthropology for education*.

- **Anchor Text 3.** We then turn to exploring the governing assumptions that form principles of operation (Heath, 1982; 2012) for ethnography guiding the work of Shirley Brice Heath and Brian Street (Heath & Street 2008). In their book, *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research,* Shirley and Brian make visible how their histories as ethnographers supported a novice ethnographer (as well as readers) in learning how to engage in ethnography of a juggler on the streets of a city in Rhode Island.

As we will show, their dialogic approach constitutes a form of *interpersonal reflexivity,* that makes visible the *governing assumptions* that guide their individual and collaborative approaches to studying *languages* and *literacies* in educational and community contexts. Through these dialogues, they also make visible the different intellectual roots that each brings to their common focus on language and literacy as ongoing constructions in different national and international contexts.

---

[10] The following collections and articles provide examples focusing on ethnography from an anthropological perspective in which social scientists and educations worked collaborative to address issues related to language, literacy and education: Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Green & Wallat, 1981; Gilmore & Glatthorn, 1982; Zaharlick & Green, 1991; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; 2005; Egan-Robertson & Bloome, 1998; Sheridan, Street & Bloome, 2000; Green, Dixon & Zaharlick, 2003; Mercer & Hodgkinson, 2008; Grenfell, Bloome, Hardy, Pahl, Rowsell & Street, 2012; Kaur, 2012; Baker & Daumer, 2015; Green & Bridges, 2018.; Bloome, Castanheira, Leung & Rowsell, 2019;

The reason for selecting this text, *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research,* is two-fold. First, it was invited by the National Conference for Research in Language and Literacy (NCRLL), thus serving as a resource for researchers interested in language and literacy in community and school contexts. Second, in our selecting this international dialogue, we draw on their inscriptions of process and theoretical perspectives on ethnography in different national contexts to respond to the editors' question for this phase of the interview: *How can Heath's approach to ethnography inform research on language, discourse, and literacy in the fields of research on teaching and learning in and across educational contexts?*

By (re)engaging with this text and the other two, we once again make visible how assuming the role of *reader-as-analyst from an ethnographic perspective* supported us in exploring how the principles framed by Heath & Street (2008) converge with the logics-of-inquiry grounded in *theoretical reflexivity* in different intellectual communities that draw on particular theoretical traditions (e.g., Cognitive Anthropology, Ethnography of Communication, Social Anthropology and Linguistic Anthropology).

By focusing on the *principles of conduct* inscribed in and through the dialogues that Shirley and Brian engaged in with a novice ethnographer, we address the editors' question about how Heath's approach to ethnography in the 1983[11] book can inform studies of language and discourse in educational contexts. Given that educational spaces are bounded differently than community contexts, at one level the answer is no. However, on another level, if by approach the editors mean the *logic-of-inquiry*, the answer is yes.

The following argument about ethnography as a way of theorizing processes and practices within particular social contexts, captures how Heath's, and then Heath and Street's principles guiding ethnographic study can, and has, informed studies of language and discourse in educational fields of teaching and learning across educational sites (early through adulthood). Mitchell, whose conceptual work Brian Street introduced to Lalu, Judith and our colleagues (e.g., Sheridan, Street & Bloome, 2000), frames the concept of ethnographic inquiry as constructing *telling case studies,* not illustrative (of theory) or representative case studies. In the following, Mitchell provides a way of understanding how Heath's conceptually driven approach to *reflexivities* inscribed in her 1983 text (and in Heath & Street, 2008) can support research on language and discourse in educational settings.

---

[11] Heath, in her book, Heath, Shirley. 2012.Words at Work and Play: Three Decades in Family and Community Life. New York: Cambridge University Press makes visible how tracing roots and developments provides a ground for constructing deeper understandings of life within particular communities.

For Mitchell (1984) a *telling case study* is

> …the detailed presentation of ethnographic data related to some sequence of events from which the analyst seeks to make some theoretical inference. The events themselves may relate to any level of social organization: a whole society, some section of a community, a family or an individual. (p. 238).

Mitchell's view of ethnographic telling cases, therefore, provides understandings of how Heath (1983) (and the other texts) forms a foundation for developing an ethnographic perspective for research in different social, and cultural contexts as well as cultural processes and practices in particular educational contexts.[12]

- **Anchor Text 4.** We end this interview by addressing the editors' question of how language and discourse in educational settings can be informed by ethnographic research, and how to understand the ways in which Heath and Street's approach (as well as that framed by other researchers) can and does support ethnographic studies of language and discourse in different educational settings. The text that forms an anchor for this section is by Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto & Shuart-Faris (2005), given its focus on the question of discourse and language in educational contexts focusing on teaching and learning processes. Additionally, Brian Street provided the preface to this text to situate their approach to micro-ethnography within the larger field of anthropology and education.

Before (re)engaging with these anchor texts, we present one additional process that we developed to support readers in exploring further different ethnographic traditions and their intellectual roots. Throughout this interview, we include endnotes that we view as resources for readers as they seek to explore further the roots of approaches to ethnography (both those cited and other traditions). By including endnotes, therefore, we create *double text process* that Agar (1994) framed for us in his book, *Language Shock,* written for a general audience. The endnotes in his book were provided for those interested in deeper understandings of theoretical issues and directions. The endnotes that we include will provide further references as well as clarify or extend particular conceptual issues raised in the interview as it develops.

Anchor 1:

---

[12] For a recent exploration of ethnography as undertaken in Latin America, see Anderson-Levitt & Rockwell (2017), *Comparing Ethnographies: Local Studies* of Education across the Americas, published by the American Educational Research Association (AERA). For volumes focusing on exploring multiple perspectives of the same record in classrooms, see Green & Harker, 1988; Wyatt-Smith & Cummings, 2000; Cole & Zuengler, 2007; Wyatt-Smith, Elkins & Gunn, 2011.

(Re)engaging with distinctions framed by Green & Bloome (1997)

As indicated previously, the editors framed the initial question in their invitation as a request of Judith [now Judith and Lalu] to "share with us your own view of ethnography *in* and *of* education".[13] Given that Judith was the co-author of the Green & Bloome (1997) text, Lalu served as a support for our process of *theoretical reflexivity* as we assumed the roles of *readers-as-analysts* with this text. The importance of starting our response to the editors' initiating question with Green and Bloome's distinctions between ethnography *in* and *of* ethnography as a basis for tracing developments over time is captured in the following excerpt by Greg Kelly (2006) from Green et al. (2015).[14]

> He [Kelly, 2006] argues that epistemological perspectives are not frozen in time but rather are continuously being reformulated through the ongoing "developmental and definitional work regarding the creation, specification, and extension of research groups' central theories, assumptions, and ontological commitments" (p. 41). These extensions, he argues, result, not from a linear progression within the group, but from debates both within a particular community as the tradition is extended to further questions of interest as well as from debates and dialogues within and across traditions. (p.29-30)

In framing this argument, Kelly (2006) challenged us to consider not only our present (re)reading of this text but to trace the *roots and routes* of our own developing logic-of-inquiry as well as that of those with whom we have (re)engaged through their published texts. This process, we argue, also captures what Agar's (1994; 2006a)[15] conceptualized as an iterative, recursive, and non-linear process of abductive reasoning from an anthropological perspective, a process that we undertook as we (re)engaged with the issues inscribed by Green & Bloome (1997) as well as Bloome et al. (2018) (See discussion in Anchor Text 2 and in Heath & Street. (2008) in Anchor Text 3).

---

[13] For a discussion of the how our logic-of-inquiry relates to the nature of claims from different research traditions in education see Heap, 1995.

[14] Greg Kelly has been instrumental in bringing conceptual issues in epistemology within and across tradtions in education in the *Handbook of Complementary Methods in Education Research* (Green, Camilli & Elmore, 2006) as well as in research in across disciplines (Kelly, Luke & Green, 2008) and science science and engineering education (Kelly, 2008a; b; 2016a; 2016b; Kelly & Licona, 2018; Cunningham & Kelly, 2017). He has also been a major contributor to directions in *interactional ethnography* (Kelly & Green, 2019).

[15] For an example of how arguments in anthropology informed our research perspective grounded in anthropology *in* education, see the following articles by anthropologist Michael Agar focusing on *language (Agar, 2005), culture (2006b) and ethnography (2006a)*. Agar in 2004-2005, engaged with faculty and students from The Ohio State University (David Bloome and colleagues), UFMG (Castanheira and colleagues), and UC, San Diego (Olga Vasquez and colleagues) in a virtual set of meetings hosted by the Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group at UC, Santa Barbara (Judith Green and colleagues).

As we stated previously, as we (re)engaged with Green & Bloome, we assumed the position of *readers-as-analysts* from an ethnographic perspective in order to explore potential new understandings of what the chapter made visible that were beyond the dichotomy between ethnography *in* and *of* education. As we (re)read this text, we identified a third way of viewing the relationship between the ethnographic research in social sciences and education: the *collaborative work* between social scientists and educators that informs both fields of study. This distinction framed a collaborative process that has led to the publishing of interdisciplinary volumes that make visible developments in both the social sciences and education through such collaborative work.[16]

This collaborative work led us to identify an important argument about how education researchers as well as social scientists can move beyond the debates of what counts as ethnography. Green & Bloome (1997) frame this direction by drawing on conceptual arguments by Louis Smith (1990)[17], an ethnographer whose work examined four changes in administration in one school and district between 1914 and the 1970s. This research brought historical inquiry and anthropology together in the conduct of a study that he called, *An Anatomy of an Educational Innovation: An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School* (Smith, 1971). Green & Bloome (1997) frame Smith's (1990) argument for the field as follows:

> For Smith, what counts as ethnography varies with different sites and actors: national sites, university groups, conceptual and theoretical perspectives (i.e., philosophical positions, and purposes for doing ethnography)... Viewed in this way, there is no single place to go to define what counts as ethnography, only local sites inhabited by particular groups. Smith sees the differences as problematic, as fracturing the field, but he also argues that if we understand these differences, we can construct a productive dialogue among perspectives (p. 182-183)

Smith's vision of ethnography is further captured in the following quote by Green & Bloome (1997) that "ethnography has become a resource for a broad range of people including social scientists, teachers, students, and everyday members of society" (p. 181), a state of affairs that has expanded over the past two plus decades as will be described in the discussion of Bloome et al (2018) in the next phase of our analysis that focuses on Anchor Text 2.

In Table 2, we present questions that Green & Bloome (1997) framed to capture the

---

[16] For a history in collaborative research focusing on language, discourse and literacy studies that have influenced our developing logic of inquiry, see: Cazden, John & Hymes, 1972; Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Mehan, 1979; Scribner & Cole, 1981; Green & Wallat, 1981; Cook-Gumperz (1985; 2005), Green & Harker, 1988; Egan-Robertson & Bloome, 1998; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2006; Grenfell, Bloome, Hard, Pahl, Rowsell & Street, (2012); Green, Dai, Joo, Williams, Liu & Lu (2016); Cazden, 2017; Bloome; Castanheira, Leung & Rowsell, 2019).

[17] See an overview of this project in Smith & Jeffrey in Theory Into Practice (1987) in their article Kensington Revisted. This body of work is viewed as an Anatomy of an Educational Innovation (Smith & Keith, 1971).

developing complexity of perspectives as well as people engaging in ethnography *in* and *of* education. These questions focus not on what individual authors inscribe in their texts that were framed at the beginning of this interview, but as ways of exploring the debates as well as directions about what *counts as ethnography* within and across intellectual sites.

Table 2: On Identifying Differing Perspectives on Ethnography

Guiding Questions for Reading Across Disciplines (Green & Bloome, 1997)
• Where and by whom is ethnography being undertaken?
• What questions about ethnography are being asked?
• Who is doing the asking, when, for what reasons, and under what conditions?
• What significance(s) do the questions have?

These questions are designed to guide readers in developing their own inquiry into and understandings of the roots and developing directions (routes taken) undertaken at different points in time in particular intellectual communities.

A Closing: Framing the Transition Anchor Text 2

While there are a broad range of arguments remaining in this chapter, we decided to conclude this part of our interview with one further excerpt that provides a summary of key issues raised in this anchor text:

> While this distinction [ethnography *in* and *of* education] is useful heuristically in framing the difference, in actual practice, the boundaries are often blurred (Geertz, 1983). Social scientists of education often collaborate with researchers and practitioners in education and employ the many kinds of knowledge generated within the disciplines of education; and those in education often employ frames, modes of inquiry and findings from the disciplines within the fields of anthropology and sociology. Thus, rarely is any ethnography or ethnographic study only of education or only in education. Nonetheless, the distinction is useful in examining the intellectual sites within which ethnography and ethnographic studies on education have been located. (Green & Bloome, 1997, p. 185)

In this section, we sought to lay a foundational understanding of issues facing those seeking to engage with ethnographic research within and across *intellectual sites*. In the next section, we move forward from 1997 to 2018 to explore how Bloome, Bauchemin, Brady, Buescher, Kim and Frey (2018) have conceptualized current perspectives at the intersection of *anthropology and education*.

Anchor 2:

On (re)conceptualizing perspectives on anthropology and education

In their entry for the *Encyclopedia of Anthropology* (Callan, 2018), Bloome et al. (2018) trace developments in the earlier distinctions between ethnography in the social sciences, ethnography *of* education and ethnography *in* education to trace the developing relationship at the intersection of anthropology and education. In engaging with this anchor text, we once created an opportunity to *step back* from what we had learned from (re)engaging with the distinctions inscribed in Bloome & Green (1997) as well as what we learned through this our approach to *theoretical reflexivity* to engage with Bloome et al.'s (2018) conceptualization of the following distinctions: *Anthropology of education, Anthropology in education, and Anthropology for education.*

Additionally, as we engaged with the conceptual arguments in this entry, we were reminded of key roots of the intersection of anthropology and education: studies of socialization, cultural transmission, and race and culture. This intellectual history was visible in how they opened their entry:

> The intersection of anthropology and education has an intellectual history that can be traced back to the socialization studies of early anthropologists, early studies of cultural transmission, and early studies of race and culture. These early studies established a theoretical framework for viewing education as broader than schooling, with a definition later articulated by Spindler and Spindler (1987, p. 3) as a "calculated intervention in the learning processes."

In framing this entry with the work of Spindler & Spindler, they created for the audience (anthropologists) a conceptualization of the developing history of anthropology and education for those in anthropology and for those in education, whose *theoretical perspectives* draw on theories of culture and language in anthropology.

This way of framing this relationship led us to (re)visit Green & Bloome (1997) to explore further the intertextual relationships between the two conceptualizations, and to explore further these roots, particularly in relationship to the editors' question about the study of language and discourse in the fields of teaching and learning. One link to studies of *language* and discourse is visible in considering the text for which it was written is considered. Green and Bloome (1997) wrote this chapter for the *Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy Though the Communicative and Visual Arts* edited by James Flood, Shirley Brice Heath and Diane Lapp (1997) for the International Reading Association.

In this handbook, as in the current encyclopedia entry, Green & Bloome (1997) created a way of understanding the conceptual and theoretical grounding of the ethnographic studies of language and literacy, and how these relate to other forms of study on a broad range of social and cultural phenomena in educational settings. Together these two texts provide a basis for examining what Spindler & Spindler (1987) defined as *anthroethnography*. In Green & Bloome (1997) they capture the following statement by Spindler & Spindler (1987) on how they engage students in learning *anthroethnography*

> …we teach our students to do anthroethnography, meaning that the major concepts, models, techniques and purposes of "our" ethnography issue from the discipline and theory of cultural anthropology. (Green & Bloome, p. 191).

In this chapter, Green & Bloome link this conceptualization to the work of Hymes (1982), one of the founders of *ethnography of communication.* In making these links, they further argue that anthropology within a discipline is not a singular field but rather has different areas, each of which is guided by particular theoretical perspectives:

> The choice of cultural anthropology further locates their work in a discipline within anthropology. This difference shapes the meaning of the concepts used, the models selected, the purposes of the research and the techniques used. Thus, the decision to frame their approach in Cultural Anthropology has consequences for each step of the inquiry and interpretation processes (p. 191).

This *intertextual history* makes visible a critical dimension of ethnographic work, the importance of tracing the *theoretical roots and the developing history as inscribed in* texts written for particular audiences. For example, by exploring intertextual ties between and among texts, we gained a deeper understanding of the relationship between anthropology and education as formulated *by* and *for* different intellectual communities.[18]

In the following excerpt from their encyclopedia entry, Bloome et al. (2018) define the different perspectives at the intersection of anthropology and education that have developed over the past five decades.

> This entry frames the current state of anthropology and education as constituted by the heuristics: anthropology of education, anthropology in education, and anthropology for education. Anthropology of education refers to theory building in anthropology; anthropology in education refers to theory building in education; and anthropology for education refers to the enactment of educational change. Like any heuristic, these directions are not fully separate.

---

[18] For discussion of intertextuality framing our logic-of-inquiry, see (Bakhtin, 1986; Bloome & Green, 1992; Bloome & Hong, 2008; Fairclough, 1992; Egan-Robertson & Bloome, 1993).

In framing these three perspectives, what they made visible is the *theory building* role researchers grounded in anthropology *of*, *in* and *for* education. This shared goal, also made visible the different questions of interest to those engaged in anthroethnography *in, of*, and *for* education.

In their conceptual review of *anthropology of, in, and for education*, Bloome et al. (2018) provide further confirmation about the importance for examining the questions framed in our discussion of Anchor Text 1, i.e.*, to explore who is engaged in ethnography, drawing on what theoretical perspectives, focusing on what configuration of researchers, addressing what questions, leading to what insights or theoretical as well as practical understandings*. What this excerpt made visible to us is that to understand which traditions can inform research on language and discourse in the fields of teaching and learning, readers will need to explore not only the questions asked but also the governing assumptions guiding the logics-of-inquiry of different traditions that shape the decisions and actions of the research group engaged in the particular study.

In distinguishing the goals for these different research communities, Bloome et al. make visible, once again, that ethnography from an anthropological perspective is not a method. Rather from an anthropologically grounded logic-of-inquiry is undertaken to construct theoretical understandings of what participants socially, interactionally and discursively understand and develop in particular educational settings, guided by particular theoretical perspectives, for particular purposes (for classroom settings, see Bloome & Beauchemin, 2018).

In the section that follows, we explore in more detail how Bloome, Beachemin, Brady, Beuscher, Kim & Shey (2018) framed the goals of anthropology *of* education, *in* education and *for* education. Rather than present these in a single table, we will *progressively disclose* (Gutierrez, 1993) excerpts from each selected section in their text to make visible to readers what each enabled us to understand about developments in the different programs of research as we engaged with these distinctions in light of our earlier understandings from (re)engaging with Green & Bloome (1997; in anchor text 1). Table 2 presents Bloome et al.'s definition of ethnography *of* education from an anthropological perspective.

Table 2: Defining Ethnography *of* Education*:* An Anthropological Perspective.

	Anthropology of education is the study of education as part of the theorizing of cultural continuity and change, broadly considered. Central to such inquiries is a framing grounded in social, cultural, and linguistic anthropology, as well as an orientation to contributing to that knowledge base. As Levinson, Gonzalez, and Anderson-Levitt note, the questions

	asked in the anthropology of education derive from fundamental questions asked in anthropology more generally such as "How and why do human beings behave the way they do?" and coalesce around the question "How and why do human beings educate the way they do?" (2015, 728). One fundamental question concerns socialization as education processes. It is now widely accepted that socialization entails the active involvement of the parent and the child, the student and the teacher… Collectively, what these studies suggest is that socialization processes are complexly contextualized by the hierarchical relationship of communities to each other, by community histories, by gender relationships, by languages, by state institutions, and by the material environment, and that they are mediated by the agency people take as individuals and as communities with regard to adapting and hybridizing the cultural practices and ideologies in which they are situated. (p. 2-3)
Anthropology *of* education	

In their definition of ethnography *of* education, they made visible theoretical understandings that have been developed through the research within and across areas within anthropology: social, cultural and linguistic anthropology. They also made visible what they framed as *fundamental questions* asked in anthropology, which they then (re)frame in relationship to studies in education: From *how and why do human beings behave the way they do? to "How and why do human beings educate in the way they do?*

In framing this shift in focus, they draw on Levinson, Gonzalez & Anderson-Levitt's (2015) framing of "Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Education: The United States and Beyond" in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Smelser & Baltest, 2015). This link to Anderson-Levitt provides further insights into the roots of her argument that ethnography is a philosophy of inquiry. In drawing on encyclopedias from different disciplines, rather than meta-analyses of empirical research studies in particular disciplines, they have taken the role of *cultural guides* to ways of understanding how *anthropological approaches* have been conceptualized.

In framing the conceptual goals and differences in areas of study from the perspective of anthropology *of* education, they made transparent to us as readers that the intellectual site of anthropology and education is not focused on a singular set of phenomena but rather on complex and often interdependent phenomena, each framed by a particular conceptual body of literature and prior research. In making visible the diversity of questions and areas of study, they challenged us to understand each, or even particular ones.

This led us to construct the following *if…then…* logic to explore not only the research framed

within the distinction of *anthropology of education* but also of the two other distinctions that follow in order to develop a more conceptual understanding of what constitutes an ethnographic *logic-of-inquiry*. This process led us to the following understanding: **If** ethnography is undertaken as a way of knowing through particular epistemological processes, **then** the question that readers will want to ask is the question we asked previously (see questions in Anchor 1): How, in what ways, under what conditions, drawing on what theories, to address what issues *of* (*in* or *for)* education is ethnography being undertaken?

By taking an *if ... then...* approach to examining the arguments in this excerpt, what became visible to us through our roles as readers-as-analysts is the importance of examining the fundamental questions of the disciplines that frame not only the theoretical and ontological perspectives guiding the research but also the methodological processes central to the questions of interest to the discipline. This point was clearly visible when we once again *stepped back* from our understanding framed by Green & Bloome (1997) to engage with Bloome et al.'s current conceptualization of *anthropology of education.*

This approach, the *if...then...* logic and related questions, enabled us to explore further the relationships between ontology, epistemology, and methodology (Arthur, Coe, Waring & Hedges, 2012) central to examining the *logic-of-inquiry* guiding different intellectual communities engaged in educational research from an anthropology of education perspective. This process will be examined further in the next section of this anchor text in which Bloome et al. (2018) frame directions that have developed in *anthropology in education.*

Table 3: Anthropology *in* Education: **A (Re)formulation**

Anthropology *in* education	Anthropology in education refers to the use of theories and constructs associated with anthropology to understand education in order to build theory, logics of inquiry, and a knowledge base within the field of education (Street 2013). Anthropology in education is a laminated field with layers appropriated from anthropology and other disciplinary fields (e.g., cultural psychology, sociology, literary studies, critical social theories, sociolinguistics, the learning sciences) and from the lived experiences of students, educators, and others in a broad range of educational settings.
	Attention to language use is central to understanding classrooms as cultures, as it is primarily through language that teachers and students interactionally construct meaning, knowledge, learning, identities, social relationships, their histories, visions of their futures, and what they are

> doing, as well as the distribution of cultural, social, and linguistic capital. How teachers and students use language reflects and refracts a broad range of diverse cultural, social, linguistic, economic, and disciplinary contexts, including local and global contexts. (p. 4-5)

In defining what constitutes *anthropology in education,* Bloome et al, make visible how in some anthropological theories culture is viewed as a verb (e.g., Spindler & Spindler, 1987; Street, 1993; Heath & Street, 2008), e.g., culture in the making, guide ethnographic research *in* education. They also make visible that studies *in education* also draw on a range of disciplinary fields to conceptualize the ontological perspectives framing the research processes as well as the epistemological decisions undertaken. By tracing the contexts of study, they also made enabled us understand the range of social, linguistic and cultural phenomena that are of at the center of ethnographic studies *in* education.

In the second part of their framing of anthropology *in* education in this entry, they frame key concepts that have been (re)theorized through studies of anthropology *in* education. For example, they identify the concept of *classrooms as cultures* as a key concept that has been conceptualized drawing on theories of culture from anthropology. They also make visible the range of social, historical, and cultural and communicative processes that are developed and potentially become part of the collective's as well as individual-within-the-collective's repertoire for learning in and across times, events and configuration of actors. Additionally, in discussing classrooms as cultures they frame a *shift* that occurs in a fundamental concept in education when reconceptualizing classrooms as "cultures." This shift is captured in the following excerpt from their review:

> The redefinition of core education terms involves a shift from the individual as the locus of education to the social and cultural processes and practices, from autonomously constituted to contextually and ideologically constituted, and from discrete skills to repertoires of practice. Redefining key concepts includes reconceptualizing classrooms as "cultures."
> Although what teachers and students do in classrooms reflects the culture of their schools and the dominant society, classrooms also develop distinct ways of using language, thinking, valuing, acting, and constructing learning. It is in this sense that the term "classroom culture" is defined.
> Classroom teaching and learning are reconceptualized as cultural processes (Green & Castanheira, 2012). That is … teaching and learning are conceptualized as a part of the cultural processes in which teachers and students construct and give meaning to their lives together.

In this excerpt, Bloome et al. frame this theoretically grounded conceptualization of teaching and learning processes for readers as a *shift* in a fundamental concept *in* education, a shift directly related to the issue of the study of language, discourse, and we add literacies in the fields of teaching

and learning in educational contexts from early years through adulthood.

This shift in theoretically grounded ways of viewing classes and other educational settings addresses calls from the 1960s for developing new insights into educational phenomena, given the changing social worlds of the post-WWI era in the US and abroad (Smith & Ennis, 1961). This argument is one that we view as relevant to understanding not just what constitutes opportunities for learning in educational contexts but also how local and situated contexts for learning in education are themselves part of larger systems that impact the developing cultures of particular educational contexts (See Smith, 1990; Spindler & Spindler, 2000; Heath & Street, 2008; Green & Heras, 2011, Heras & Green, 2011 in Spanish).

In (re)formulating the conceptions of *ethnography in and of education,* through the broader exploration and formulation of its roots in an anthropological perspective, Bloome et al. foregrounded the roots of the argument in Green & Bloome (1997). This process also frames the further need to understand the *intellectual communities* inscribing the goals as well as the epistemological process, i.e., the ways of knowing, guiding particular traditions of research on education as a social process for children and adults in different educational contexts.

Having foregrounded the developments of *anthropology in* and *of education* to bring forward our understandings of these distinctions as requested by the editors, we now turn to the third distinction that they frame, one that moves beyond theorizing educational processes and practices to one that frames *anthropology for education.* The excerpt we present from this part of their chapter, although brief, makes visible how different conceptual perspectives have supported a broad range of scholar in creating programs for what they frame as "marginalized students". Thus, in this excerpt, Green & Bloome (1997) frame these studies and more than applied studies; that is, they make visible how abductive processes are critical informing both educational policy and practice.

Table 4: Anthropology *for* Education:

Anthropology *for* education.	Anthropology for education refers to studies that explicitly enact change in educational institutions. Such studies are not applied studies per se since the effort to change social, economic, and civic institutions also leads to a deeper theoretical understanding of cultural processes, contexts, and ecologies… Through integrating anthropological perspectives, cultural critique, and political action, scholars have created educational programs for marginalized students that abductively inform educational practice and policy. (Bloome et al., 2018, p. 6-7).

In this excerpt, they make visible how an ethnographic perspective, guided by anthropological theories of culture, has become a resource for a broad range of researchers, teachers, students, teacher educators, institutional leaders, and policymakers, among others, who are seeking a "deeper theoretical understanding of cultural processes, contexts and ecologies." (Bloome, Beauchemin, Brady, Buescher, Kim & Shey)

This latter direction was visible in their inclusion of the work over five decades by Spindler (Spindler & Spindler, 2000), who developed a programmatic effort to help teachers to not only understand the cultural differences among students but also their own *ethnocentrism*. Their goal is capture in the following description of this body of work by Bloome et al. (2018):

> Programmatic efforts to help teachers to do so, once called "cultural therapy" (Spindler 2000), focus on helping educators recognize their own and others' ethnocentrism by addressing the invisibility of students from nondominant cultural communities and defenestrating deficit models. (p. 5-6).

To make visible the governing principles and ontological perspectives guiding Spindler's five decades of research, Bloome et al., once again invited us (and readers) to *step back* from our developing understandings of the distinction to develop deeper understandings of the conceptual framework guiding Spindler's research over the five decades. In the next section, we will present what, from our perspective of *readers-as-analysts*, we learned through the (re)presentation of the roots and developments of this program of research.

Roots of Anthropology for Education: Spindler

In exploring how this program developed, who contributed to this conceptual approach, and what it framed for research *in education,* Bloome et al (2018) identified the work of George Spindler, and the volume on *Fifty Years of Anthropology and Education (1950-2000)* (Spindler & Spindler, 2000). This volume frames the roots of this program of research in a conference in 1954 in which he assembled a community of scholars to engage in dialogues about the intersection of anthropology and education, which led Spindler to the identify four common thematic (conceptual) concerns (Spindler & Spindler, p. 6 as cited in Bloome et al., 2018). These themes frame key actions that this group of scholars discussed and debated to frame the direction that has become a sub-field within anthropology and education, *anthropology for education.* At this meeting they identified the following areas that would be addressed to accomplish this goal:

1. The search for a philosophical as well as a theoretical articulation of education and anthropology.

2. The necessity for sociocultural contextualization of the educative process and its analysis.

3. The relations of education to "culturally phrased" phases of the life cycle.

4. The nature of intercultural understanding and learning.

In identifying these common thematic concerns of those scholars attending this conference, Spindler identified a set of governing principles (Strike, 1989) that framed conditions for research from an anthropological point of view. He also framed how this tradition was developed as a philosophy of research, a perspective latter framed by Anderson-Levitt (2006) for ethnography as noted by the editors. The themes that Spindler and participants at this conference identified, also framed themes that were visible across the different conceptual areas guiding the framing of *anthropology of education* and *anthropology in education.*

In Table 5: **Defining Educational Anthropology Actions And Processes**, we present a set of governing assumptions that we identified by both engaging with Bloome et al's introduction of Spindler and then by exploring how Spindler & Spindler (1987 in Spindler & Spindler, 2000) inscribed the processes and actions that they undertook, a process that we understand as their logic-of-inquiry and philosophic perspective. As the following actions make visible, these principles focused us on developing understandings of how they conceptualized education social contexts in any setting as dialogically constructed by participants, a perspective that involves understanding the sociocultural contextualization of educative processes.

In Table 5, rather than provide how we used these principles to engage in process of *theoretical reflexivity,* we invite readers to explore this reflexive process. Our goal in including this process at this point in this interview is to engage readers in exploring their own conceptual perspectives in relationship to those of Spindler & Spindler (1987). As you read through these actions and processes, consider what is consistent with your perspective, what you would modify, or what you would add that is not part of this framing of governing principles.

Table 5: Defining Educational Anthropology Actions And Processes

Spindler & Spindler, defining educational anthropology actions and processes 1950-2000	Your conceptual perspective. You can edit the conceptual statement, add to it. Cite the sources of your modifications.
In any social scene within any setting, whether great or small, social actors carry on a culturally constructed dialogue.	
The dialogue is expressed in behavior, words, symbols, and in application of cultural knowledge to make instrumental activities and social situations "work" for one	
We learn dialogue as children and continue learning it all of our lives, as our circumstances change.	
These are the phenomena that we believe we study as ethnographers – the dialogue of action, interaction and meaning. We observe behavior and we interview any "native" who will talk with us. When we are in classrooms, we observe the actions and talk of students and teachers, principals, counselors, parents and janitors.	
We observe, formulate and ask questions, observe some more, record behavior of various means, including film or video, and ask yet more questions, until the patterns of and native explanations for them coalesce into repetitive sequences and configurations.	
We try to determine how teaching and learning are supported and constrained by understandings, many of them implicit that govern the interaction of teachers and students.	
The dialogue around what is to be taught, and how much of it is to be learned, how the teaching and learning will be conducted, and how it is actually conducted is what we try to record and interpret as ethnographers of education.	
Educational anthropology is more than ethnography, but ethnography is the business end of the relationship and has a massively determined influence on what our discipline is and will be	

While these principles are partial and not reflective the full range of principles guiding Spindler & Spindler across their five decades, they make visible a critical goal of the process that Parkman in the final chapter frames *making visible the invisible*.

This goal, as indicated in the previous anchor text discussion, is one common to all areas that constitute research at the intersection of anthropology and education as inscribed by Bloome et al. (2018) in conceptualizing directions of these developing traditions of research. To explore this argument further, we turn to conceptual arguments by Heath & Street (2008).

Anchor 3:
On Heath & Street's (1986) approaches to studying language and literacy in different

As indicated above, to address the editors' question of how and in what ways the processes inscribed in Heath (1983) might inform research on language, discourse and literacy in educational contexts, we included a recent volume by Heath & Street (2008). To create their book, *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research*, they engaged in a cross-national dialogue – a dialogue that makes visible (transparent) their personal histories from anthropology in their particular national contexts. In their dialogic process, they also included a novice ethnographer is capture in the following excerpt from their preface:

> For many years, conversations on language, culture, learning and ethnography between Brian and Shirley, authors of this volume, have taken place in different parts of the world. We want you as readers to enter this conversation. Debates over the place of ethnographies in language and literacy research will surely continue for some years. This volume brings together our views on both the history and current thrust of deliberations, narratives and declarations about ethnography as a trustworthy social science. (p. xi)

In this excerpt, they frame for us their histories across academic languages and national contexts that they frame as a way of paying "dogged attention to 'literacy' in its many variants across societies and situations." (p. xiii). They also make visible the sites of their research, providing insights into how they conceptualize literacies as situated in particular contexts of study:

> Both of us emphasized visual and performative dimensions that made multimodal literacies critical for understanding social and cognitive dimensions of verbal aspects of written texts. Each of us has studied ways in which scientific understanding and mathematical calculations relate to interpretation and functional uses of symbol systems. We have undertaken these studies in organizations (such as businesses, social serve programs, and nongovernmental agencies), setting and situations (such as teashops and employment interviews) and institutions (such as courts, families, and schools) (p. xiii).

In this statement, they provide a *context of situation* (Hasan, 1994; Duranti & Goodwin, 1992) to explore the *convergence of their perspectives*. They further elaborate what this enable them to understand, ways central to our (Lalu and Judith) own perspectives on ethnography:

> The insights that have come from all our inside and outside encounters have informed our thinking about ethnography, language, and literacy. We hope these have helped us translate our experiences in ways that will benefit readers ready to engage with language and literacy research through ethnography. (p. xiv).

This volume was for us instrumental in making visible what constitutes anthropologically guided ethnographic ways thinking, acting and (re)presenting what they learned through these processes. What is unique about their approach to the dialogue that made these principles transparent

was that they not only engaged each other but also a novice ethnographer as she studies a juggler on the streets of a city in Rhode Island (USA). Their dialogic processes are visible in the following excerpt:

> Throughout this volume, as we talk about ethnography in the study of language and literacy, we often return to metaphors that surround juggling [the cultural phenomena Molly Mills, the novice ethnographer, was studying]. We see learning ethnography as being a bit like learning to juggle. Both call for practice, close observation, and the challenge of having to manage more and more balls in the air. Both involve figuring out and hanging onto definitions, principles of operation, and motivational incentives. Both are about constant learning. Both depend on observing, comparing, reflecting, assessing, and coming to "feel" certain stages of achievement in knowledge and skills that do not easily translate into words. Both make use of various means and modes in different combinations at various stages of learning. Finally, both engage learners in figuring out multipoles that go beyond any single moment of insight, step toward expertise, or sense of disappointment. (p. 2-3)

Additionally, they frame the following relationship between the study of language and its relationship to culture:

> Figuring out what language, culture, and learning can be for ethnographers takes us head-first into *culture*. As we study how humans go about producing "symbolic structure for one another," we see immense variability as well as stability in the ways they create, sustain, and adapt their modalities, including oral and written language.

Throughout this text, Heath and Street (Shirley and Brian as they preferred to be called) define key constructs that guide their conceptually driven decisions, actions and processes as ethnographers. In the next section, we draw on a published review of their book that we published in *Linguistics & Education* (Castanheira & Green, 2010) to make visible the processes and practices of their ethnographic logic-of-inquiry that they framed across the chapters of this volume. Thus, in this section, we make visible what we learned from their text that informs us about how to understand the iterative, recursive and abductive processes that guide their ethnographic processes and actions, from the first moments of framing their studies through reporting what was learned through the studies.

On What Counts As Ethnography As an Iterative, Recursive and Abductive Process

In this volume, Shirley and Brian directly address the readers by making transparent their decisions about how to *(re)present*, not represent, the ***decisions, actions,*** and ***learnings*** through ***intertextual webs of texts***. This *reflexive process* was designed to engage readers with the logic-of-inquiry guiding the ***processes*** and ***theoretical ways*** that these ethnographers frame the process of ethnography in the study of language and literacy in different contexts with particular configuration

of actors, within and across particular periods of time. Their dialogues also provide a grounding for exploring less than the comprehensive ethnographies in which they had engaged in order to explore how it is possible to do less than a community level ethnography to gain *emic,* i.e., insider understandings of what members of particular social groups need to know, understand and do to engage in developing events in socially appropriate ways to other members (Heath, 1982).

Therefore, what follows is a (re)construction of how Brian and Shirley framed the *conceptual logic-of-inquiry* through a multi-modal approach to making visible different dimensions of the dialogic process that frame the similarities and differences between the US and UK histories of ethnography. Through this process, we also make visible how they engaged in *theoretical* and *intertextual reflexivity.* By presenting their argument as a table, we seek to make *visible* key conceptual arguments that we identified in our review of this volume by assuming the position of *readers-as analysts.* In Table 6, we present *theoretical perspectives, reflexive processes, and actions* that we identified as we (re)engaged with their discussion of ways of examining how members of a social group create symbolic structures in and through their local and situated talk, actions and multimodal texts and constructs extracted from them

Table 6: Actions and Processes of Ethnography Framed by Heath & Street (2008)

Ethnographic Principles Identified Through Readers-as-Analyst Perspective by Castanheira & Green (2010)

Close the distance between themselves and readers by enabling the reader to "see"
    ethnography as a series of grounded decisions by actual social scientists, which shapes what can be known
 	
   Actions are guided by the ethnographer's perceptions, thinking, and theoretical understandings is
        a dynamic, non-linear process of examining the ways members of social groups create symbolic structures in and through their local and situated talk, actions, and multimodal texts.
 	
Taking this personal and
        reflexive stance to their writing,
 	
How their [the ethnographers'] work, like the work of the people they are studying, itself
        comprises *acts of symbolic structuring*.
 	
Anthropologists
        produce data (Ellen, 1984) and
        write culture (Clifford & Marcus, 1985),

not find data or locate culture.
Embedding different kinds of texts (e.g., fieldnotes or dialogue) *within the expected theoretical or explanatory narratives about concepts underlying an ethnographic perspective*, *Interrupt the flow of text at times to provide an interactive space*, *not only for their own exploration of ideas using texts from the field*, *but also, for readers.*
By using hybrid texts and ways of inscribing the local actions, thoughts, and explanations of the ethnographer(s) and those within the social worlds being studied, *Create local moments in the history of their conversation and in the work of people in the local worlds (e.g., learning to be a juggler*) in which readers are invited *Explore the outcomes and consequences of the ethnographer's actions for what can be known or learned about language and literacy/literacies through self-reflexive analyses of the situated work of actual people working in the field*.
Shirley's experience in entering the field in Trackton and Roadville provides an example through which they consider the ethnographer's sense of "real" unknowns as the trigger for his/her particular interest in developing a study. *Ways of constructing an understanding of the unknown*, which they discuss via the *nature of participant observation, the constant comparative principles, and the recursive process of linking observation, theories, and practices*. *Co-occurrences of patterns that support the ethnographer in unraveling and identifying cultural patterns of life in the group being studied.*
Setting Decision Rules for Fieldwork: Chapter begins with a discussion of the literature review as central to the ethnographer's search for areas in need of study *confirm the relevance of the ethnographer's initial question and to establish a dialogue on the topic with others in the field.* *Literature review as the ethnographer's act of creating and keeping company for him/herself, while allowing data and theoretical and methodological triangulations to be built on previous work.*
Ethnographer is the ultimate instrument in

constructing an understanding of what is really happening
in the context under study.

How the ethnographer seeks to remain open by
examining the intersection between existing explanations and understandings,
and ongoing data being produced in the local study

Take into account that the initial curiosity that moves the ethnographer
into an area of interest does not transfer smoothly into specific research questions.

How the process of defining guiding questions for the study is developed
in relationship to "looking ahead to research site,
setting time frames, and
making decisions on how you (the ethnographer) will operate in the field"

How fieldnotes can be
organized and
what these records need to include.

How taking, reading, and interpreting fieldnotes is supported by the
intensity of observations,
willingness to make efforts to compare perspectives and conditions, and
the processes of critique and reflexivity.

how ethnographers are able to disrupt dichotomies and to see learning situations in more nuanced and complex ways.

To make visible how they disrupt dichotomies and build understandings of what they are observing as well as experiencing, they identify a dynamic and dialogic process between and among
different types of records,
continuing literature reviews, and
balanced representation of Molly's developing understandings of Roger's (the juggler) journey to learning to juggle

Make visible a range of focal areas of interest to ethnographers of language and literacy and how to log data in those areas to explore patterns across domains: including
individual and group language development,
socialization, and
identity distinctions,
change in structure and
use of modes, discourse and narrative, and
social theories and language and literacy use.

How a new ethnography *is* part of
a history of ongoing research and conversations –
their own and with others (through texts and dialogues with the ethnographers).

By extracting key concepts that Heath & Street's (2008) made visible to Molly, the novice

ethnographer, and thus to readers, we foreground key ontological, theoretical and epistemological perspectives guiding their collaborative logic-of-inquiry that they inscribe by drawing on their individual histories. By extracting these concepts and premises guiding their perspectives on ethnography, we sought to make transparent how we understood their arguments, what their arguments focused us on and how this process enabled us to address the questions posed by the editors that we bring forward now, given that this text now serves as an anchor for our response.

Question 3: In the prologue of the wide-known book *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*, Shirley Brice Heath (1983) reported an in-depth ethnographic research she had carried out in Roadville and Trackton communities. In the text she wrote things such as:

> "In the years between 1969 and 1978, I lived, worked, and played with the children and their families and friends in Roadville and Trackton." (p. 5).

> "I spent many hours cooking, chopping wood, gardening, sewing, and minding children by the rules of the communities." (p. 8).

It is clear, at least to us, that Heath informed her research on the essentials of ethnography *per se*, the method adopted by anthropologists in their investigations. **In your opinion, is it possible to adopt the *same method* – ethnography – in educational research, as Heath did? Why?**

By (re)constructing the core concepts that Heath and Street inscribed and described as the processes of ethnography, what became is that they made transparent the *logic-of-inquiry* that they as ethnographers engage in to examine *the ways members of social groups create symbolic structures in and through their local and situated talk, actions, and multimodal texts.*

In their concluding argument, they frame an argument that is often overlooked when single studies are considered -- a **new ethnography *is* part of a history of ongoing research and conversations – their own and with others (through texts and dialogues with the ethnographers).** In framing this intertextual web, they provide a frame for understand that ethnography is not a method but rather a way of knowing, understanding and engaging with others (local and future) through their studies that are guided by particular ontological, theoretical and epistemological processes.

In framing the dynamic and ongoing range of decisions and actions, and the necessity of *reflexivity* of different kinds, they also make visible how the studies of a local context and their

experiences in that context for a foundation for constant comparative processes between and among events, configuration of actors as well as over time processes and practices. Their argument about returning to the literature also makes visible how a local study can inform and be informed by past research and can frame new insights and core concepts guiding common processes across studies. Their processes also provide understandings of ways in which language and social processes are a basis for exploring how participants in particular educational settings and contexts within setting structure the symbolic systems that constitute cultural processes and practices, meanings and material resources of a social group (e.g., Gee & Green, 1998).

Based on our (re)construction of these actions, decisions, reflexive processes and non-linear, abductive ways of thinking and taking action ethnographically, we answer the question of the editors in the affirmative—*yes*, Heath's (and Street's) logic of inquiry can inform research on language and discourse for the fields of teaching and learning in different educational settings. However, what will differ is the ways of entering, engaging in the events being constructed, and ways of interacting with students and teachers, given the bounded nature of classrooms and educational contexts of youth and adults.

Additionally, as indicated in our (re)construction of their conceptual framework, their approach, and that of others who adopt their perspective, will seek to engage in an ethnographic study to deconstruct dichotomies, a process that involves (re)engaging with literature from other ethnographic studies as well as studies that frame *grand narratives* about teaching and learning. Therefore our answer to this question is also a caution for readers as they seek to understand what it means to take an *ethnographic perspective* (Green & Bloome, 1997), and which ethnographic perspectives will guide their own research.

In the next section, we introduce briefly the concept of microethnography through the work of David Bloome and colleagues (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto & Shuart-Faris, 2005). Our selection of Bloome et al's work is based on the fact that our perspective, *interactional ethnography,* is available in Portuguese in Brazilian journals (Castanheira, Green, & Dixon, 2007; and in a book Castanheira, 2004)[19]. Additionally, Brian Street wrote the preface to that volume in which he makes visible how micro-ethnography relates to and entails consideration of macros ethnographic areas of concern.

---

[19] For published articles in Portuguese and in Brazilian contexts, see: Castanheira, Green & Dixon, 2007; Freitas & Castanheira, 2008; Neves, Gouvea & Castanheira, 2011; Castanheira, Street & Carvahlo, 2015; Castanheira, Neves & Gouvea, 2013; Castanheira, 2013.

Anchor text 4

Revisiting the editors questions on language and ethnography

In this section, we return to the question that the editors posed for this interview to address the areas focusing on language and discourse in the fields of Teaching and Learning in Education:

Question 2: And, how can ethnography inform research on language and discourse in the fields of teaching and learning children and adults in schools and universities?

Before turning to an exploration of the micro-ethnographic approach of Bloome et al, (2006), we (re)engaged with Green & Bloome (1997) to examine what they identified as *theoretical understandings* of what was then known through ethnographic research about the study of language in educational contexts. In their analysis of the different areas of concentration, they identified the following common conceptual understandings and areas of focus across traditions:

- Regardless of the particular topic, the research examining classroom language has a common set of concerns-- the social and cultural dynamics of the classroom.
- In ethnographic studies of classroom language in general, issues of language are not separated from social and cultural issues.
- Social organization issues have also framed ethnographic studies of language in the classroom.
- Researchers, to construct their conceptual frameworks, ground their studies in a variety of fields: "anthropology, education, linguistics, psychology, and sociology"
- Ethnographic studies have focused on exploring multiple languages in classrooms
- Of prominent concern in the study of multiple languages in the classroom has

 been questions of how choice of language - by the school, teacher, and students – structures social relationships between the student and the school and provides or denies access to academic knowledge and achievement.

By (re)engaging with Green & Bloome (1997), we followed Brian and Shirley's process of re-examining the literature base to frame our further exploration of the editors' question about how ethnography can inform studies of discourse and language in the study of teaching and learning in

educational contexts.

What these summary findings by Green & Bloome (1997) identified is that the answer to what constitutes studies of language in educational settings, both from an ethnographic perspective and from related studies of language, depends on the theories guiding the particular study and how those theories implicate particular epistemological processes as well as inter-relationships between and among social and linguistic processes. This conceptual understanding will be made visible in the next section focusing on the relationship of *discourse analysis* and microethnography.

On the Relationship of Discourse Analysis and Microethnography

In the introduction to *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Language and Literacy Events,* Bloome et al frame their goals as:

> The purpose of this book is to provide a description of an approach to the discourse analysis of classroom language and literacy events. The approach can be described as a *social linguistic* or *social interactional* approach. It combines attention to how people use language and other systems of communication in constructing language and literacy events in classrooms with attention to social, cultural and political processes. For convenience, we label this approach a *microethnographic approach.*

Following this conceptual framing of the approach and goals for the volume, they turn to a review of literatures on social and linguistic theories as recommended by Heath and Street in their *principles of conduct* (as cited in Green & Bridges, 2018). The following areas are identified as sources for their theoretical perspective to discourse analysis as an epistemological process, not a method. The theoretical traditions that they drew on are:[20]

> Sociolinguistic ethnography (also known as the *ethnography of communication)*
> Related discussions of language and culture, including
> *Humanistic linguistics*
> *Linguistic anthropology*
> *Anthropological studies of narrative and poetics*
> *The New Literacy Studies*
> *Ethnomethodology*
> And *those literary discussions of language that evolved from the work of Bakhtin and Volosinov*
> As well as *those that evolved from the work of Benjamin (1969), Williams (1977), Dubois (1980), and deCerteau (1984, 1997).*

They also stated that "we build on the work of educational researchers who have been

---

[20] Citations are omitted, given that each area has multiple citations. We are willing to send these when requested if the book is not available to readers.

engaged in discourse analysis from similar perspectives and who have established their own histories." (p. xv). This latter analysis led them to frame this research in the following way:

> As Bloome (2003a), and Green & Bloome (1997), and others have argued, educational researchers have created their own history of research on the use of language in classrooms that is distinct from but complements that in the disciplines of anthropology, linguistics, sociology, and social psychology. We discuss the intellectual and disciplinary foundation of our microethnographic approach at length in Chapter 1. (p. xv)

In this introduction, as recommended by Heath and Street as represented in the principles above, they frame their view of both microethnography to situate their approach.

> Microethnographic approaches foreground the daily life of classrooms. We take a strong view that the daily life of teachers and students in classrooms is not to be taken for granted, homogenized under broad generalizations, or collapsed into deterministic processes of social and cultural reproduction. For us, classrooms are complex places where teachers and students create and re-create, adopt and adapt, and engage in a full range of human interactions. Teachers and students are viewed as active agents. Although teachers and students must act within the events, contexts and settings in which they find themselves, and although they must react to the actions of others and the social institutions of which they are a part, they nonetheless act on the worlds in which they live. (p. xvi)

In this excerpt, they frame their perspective in opposition to normative approaches or approaches that position teacher and students in particular ways. They create their own perspective that will guide their study, an approach that formulates roles and relationships as well as actions of teachers with students and students with others within *events*, *contexts* and *settings*. In this way, they frame the social context, how they view these from the perspective of participants engaged with each other in the events, contexts and settings.

These three distinctions also frame different levels of analysis—the event being engaged in, the context of that event, and the social and political setting (a school). This process is what Bloome framed earlier in this interview as a laminated process (See Bloome et al, 2018, in the section on *ethnography of education)*. They then present their view of language which they conceptualize as:

> At the center of what happens in classrooms is language: the language used by teachers and students, the language of texts and textbooks, the language of school and school district policies, the language of parents and children as they interact with each other and with educators, and myriads other use of language. Language is both the object of classroom lessons (e.g., learning to read, write, and use academic discourse) as well as the means of learning (e.g., through classroom discussions and lectures, reading and writing). Thus, language not only is the object of study in research on classroom language and literacy events but it is also the means through which the research occurs. It is through language that researchers conduct interviews and develop coding and other means of analyzing observations, videotapes, and other data, and it is through language that researchers conceptualize, write up, and report their research. Given the central role of language in people's lives, in the construction of classroom events, and in the conduct of research, understanding and attending to language as people and researcher use it is crucial to the microethnographic approach we describe here. (p. xvi)

In framing language in this way, they make visible different forms of *reflexivity* that are related to Heath & Streets (2018) arguments.

They further frame their perspective on language when they introduce their approach to microethnographic analysis of classroom language and literacy events, which they state is

> Informed by our continuously evolving understanding of language, literacy and classrooms. For us, language is not a "transparent" vehicle for the communication of information. Any use of language (spoken, written, electronic, etc.) involves complex social, cultural, political, cognitive, and linguistic processes and contexts all of which are part of the meaning and significance of reading, writing, and using language. (p. xvii).

While Bloome et al. continue defining their microethnographic approach, we have elected to focus on one final distinction, the relationship of theory and method that is related to the arguments of Heath & Street (2008) and to our perspective on *ethnography as a logic-of-inquiry*:

> We do not separate methodological issues and procedures from theoretical or epistemological issues. Indeed, we use the term *methodology* to refer to the integration of theoretical and methodological issues, reserving *method* for the techniques, tactics and strategies of data collection, analysis, and reporting. The separation of theory from methods results in researchers engaging in unreflected actions and holding magical beliefs; that this, they conduct research without questioning why they do what they do or how their actions are connected to understandings of knowledge, people, or language. Gee & Green (1998) argued similarly about the relationship of theory and method. They quoted Birdwhistell (1977) about the danger of separating theory and methodology and argued for the importance of articulating a logic-of-inquiry: "The interdependence of theory and methodology can be hidden by exclusive focus upon either philosophy or technique. Once separated, only the most sophisticated can reconstitute them into investigatory practice" (p. 120). Birdwhistell saw the separation of theory from method as widespread over the previous 25 years, and Gee and Green argued that this was still the case. Although Birdwhistell and Gee and Green were specifically directing their comments at observational, ethnographic and discourse analysis research, we believe their comments extend broadly. (p. ix)

In this excerpt, they further frame the need for *transparency* in decisions that were raised previously by Heath & Street (2008) presented above, and in the AERA (2006) call for transparency in reporting research processes.

While these authors elaborate further their underlying perspective, we stop here to frame one final set of issues. While some would see microethnography as too focused on a particular phenomenon in a single setting, Street (2005) in his introduction to this volume framed microethnography as entailing a more complex process:

> The authors build upward and outward from the participants in events in which they participate. They argue that we can only claim a "warrant" to draw larger inferences when research is "grounded in the setting itself." But this does not mean that they are focused only on the "micro." However critical they may be of approaches that impose outside ideas and concepts on the immediate and local, their larger aim is to help us understand "macros level contexts"—or rather "to address the relationship between microlevel contexts (specific events and situations) and macros level contexts." Their worry is that the interests in the

latter, especially that in "grand narratives," fails to take account of the importance of specific events, an approach that denies participants' agency and even awareness of the constraints they operate within. In the authors' view, people continually construct relationships between events, including those that are not immediately present: "They are not unaware that there are broader contexts and dynamics that influence and are influenced by what they do in their daily lives…Furthermore, people can and do take actions based on their understanding of broader contexts and dynamics. (p. x)

In framing these issues, Street (2005) provides validation for their theoretical perspective, a perspective that overlaps his own work. He further ties this work to a perspective from anthropology that has guided his own research as well as collaborative work he has undertaken with David Bloome (Sheridan, Street & Bloome, 2000). This perspective is visible in his citation to the work of Mitchell (1984) who framed the issue of *analytic induction*.

While he continues to frame analytic induction and how it relates to not only his work as well as the work of Bloome et al. (2005), we have elected to stop here, given the excerpts above provide a rich dialogue with the Bloome et al, (2005) as well as Street (2005). Also, by including these excerpts, we have followed the practice of Heath & Street (2008) as captured previously in which they argued for

Embedding different kinds of texts (e.g., fieldnotes or dialogue) *within the expected theoretical or explanatory narratives about concepts underlying an ethnographic perspective*, and to

Interrupt the flow of text at times to provide an interactive space, *not only for their own exploration of ideas using texts from the field*, *but also for readers.*

In providing the excerpts from the introductions and preface to Bloome et al. (2008), we sought to make visible how we engaged with the arguments in this text but also how Bloome et al. (2005) and Street (2005) also engaged in a common process to make visible the *reflexive iterative*, *recursive,* and *non-linear processes* of ethnography.

A Closing and an Opening

In framing this interview, the editors asked us to respond to the following question:

Is the concept of ethnography as a logic of inquiry a good example of what Anderson-Levitt means by "philosophy of research"? Why?

In this section, we address this question by once again (re)engaging with Anderson-Levitt's

inscription of this process in her chapter in 2006 that the editors' cited and in a second chapter, "World Anthropologies of Education*"* published in *The Companion to Anthropology of Education* (Levinson & Pollack, 2010). In the introduction to her chapter on "Ethnography", in the *Handbook of Complementary Methods of Education Research* (Green, Camilli & Elmore, 2006), Anderson-Levitt (2006) frames ethnography as follows:

> Ethnography is an approach to studying people that developed in anthropology and is used as well in sociology, educational research, and other fields. It is the study of people in everyday settings, with particular attention to culture—that is, how people make meaning of their lives. Ethnography is really a philosophy of research rather than a specific method; it depends primarily on the two broad methods of participant observation and open-ended interviewing.

This conceptual argument is expanded in her conclusion to this chapter:

> Ethnography is an approach to the study of people in everyday life. It focuses on culture, that is, on people making and sometimes contesting the meaning of their experiences, but without ignoring the material, economic, and political contexts of that meaning making. Ethnography requires a dual perspective: understanding the insiders' points of view to grasp the logic of their actions, but stepping back to take the outsiders' distanced perspective that makes visible what insiders would otherwise take for granted. Ethnography is really a philosophy of research rather than a specific method; it depends primarily on the two broad methods of participant observation and open-ended interviewing.

To further explore our growing understanding of what she includes in her view of ethnography as a philosophy of research, we (re)engaged with her arguments about anthropology and ethnography in her chapter on "World Anthropologies of Education" in the *Companion Reader to Anthropology of Education* (Levison & Pollack, 2010):

> Anthropologies and ethnographies of education vary not only because of language but also because they have evolved from multiple disciplinary sources and hence refer to different canons of literature and different constructions of key research topics. The term "anthropology" itself actually points to a whole family of disciplines. In the United States and Great Britain, it includes the study of human beings in biological as well as social and cultural terms, although few anthropologists take the opportunity to purse the implications of human learners as primates (Herzog 1984). Even anthropology understood strictly as a social science includes different threads of research, each expressed in a different kind of anthropology of education. (Anderson-Levitt, 2010, p. 1)

These two definitions made visible how she frames this body of work that Bloome et al. (2018) framed as *anthropology of education.*

While we share her overall goal of engaging in the study of everyday life of people in particular social contexts, we draw on different theoretical, ontological and epistemological perspectives to guide us in examining the role and consequences of classroom discourse studies on teaching learning processes to develop theoretical understandings of how they inform work on

teaching and learning processes in different educational contexts (Markee, 2015). Thus, by engaging in the processes of *intertextual* and *theoretical reflexivity,* we developed understandings of how our *logic-of-inquiry* was consistent with as well as differed from her argument that ethnography is a philosophy of research.

Additionally, by (re)engaging with Bloome et al. (2018) and their distinctions between anthropology *of, in* and *for* education, we gained further insights into what these different approaches in the developing field of anthropology and education support. For instance, in their discussion of anthropology *in* education, they argue that researchers engaging in anthropology *in* education have framed new fundamental concepts in education.[21] As framed in Anchor Text 2, studies within anthropology *in* education,

> The redefinition of core education terms involves a shift from the individual as the locus of education to the social and cultural processes and practices, from autonomously constituted to contextually and ideologically constituted, and from discrete skills to repertoires of practice. Redefining key concepts includes reconceptualizing classrooms as "cultures."

In their discussion of work within this developing program of research, they foreground the following shift:

> Although what teachers and students do in classrooms reflects the culture of their schools and the dominant society, classrooms also develop distinct ways of using language, thinking, valuing, acting, and constructing learning. It is in this sense that the term "classroom culture" is defined.
>
> Classroom teaching and learning are reconceptualized as cultural processes (Green & Castanheira, 2012). That is … teaching and learning are conceptualized as a part of the cultural processes in which teachers and students construct and give meaning to their lives together.

In framing these goals for studies *in* education, Bloome et al. (2018) provide insights into how to understand the goal of studies *in* education—to construct theories of teaching and learning processes that can inform educators and others about the role of language and discourse in the social construction the opportunities for learning constructed by teachers with students.

---

[21] For volumes that make visible how different theoretical perspectives on language and discourse-in-use see Green & Harker, 1988; Heap, 1991; 1995; Cole & Zuengler, 20o7; Spolsky & Hult, 2007; Pea, Goldman, Goldman, & Derry (2010); Markee, 2015, **Newell, G., Bloome, D., Hirvela, A** (2015), and the three volumes of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Corson, 1997; Hornberger, 2008; and May, 2018; See also volumes on Discourse by Davies & Corson, 1997; Martin-Jones & de Meija, 2008; and Wortham, Kim & May, 2018)

In making visible these goals, they also demonstrate how studies of *ethnography in education* have addressed the call by education philosophers Smith & Ennis (1961) for the (re)formulation of fundamental concepts in education in the face of the changing worlds of education in the Post World War II society of the 1960s. In their book *Language and Concepts in Education,* Smith & Ennis, 1961 called for

> Exploring the dimensions of educational terminology in order to gain a clearer understanding of the relationships between thought, language and reality, and thus to broaden the basis upon which we ground our beliefs about reality and our convictions of value" (p. 5 of Preface).

One area foregrounded in this call was "The Language of Teaching" in a chapter by M.J. Aschner (1960; 1961). At the center of Aschner's conceptual argument was the critical need for focusing on *language in operation in particular classes (classrooms),* a philosophic argument based on the work of Wittgenstein (1958), that "… *the speaking of language is part of an activity, or a form of life*" (As cited in Aschner, 1961, p. 117; 1960). This argument led Aschner to conceptualize the inter-relationships among teaching-learning-activity processes, which is captured in the following: *"For just as an act of teaching, however else defined, is an effort to induce learning, so is the language of teaching a taproot for learning."* (p. 117).

In bringing these two calls together in this closing, we make visible why we framed this section as a *closing and an opening.* By (re)engaging with Bloome et al.'s, (2018) findings from their review of anthropology *in* education and Smith & Ennis' (1961) calls, we make visible how the call by Smith & Ennis (1961) is as relevant today as it was six decades ago, given the changing social, cultural, linguistic and academic worlds of the 21st C.

Additionally, by framing this distinction between *anthropology of education* and *anthropology in education*, as well as *for education,* Bloome et al. (2018) provide insights into what the differing logics-of-inquiry guiding these different programs of research have provided that can inform studies of teaching and learning across levels of education in classrooms, schools and community settings. These different programs of research, when view contrastively, provide a broad set of core concepts that make visible shifts in understanding of the linguistic, cultural, social and academic challenges facing students and their teachers today across levels of schooling and community settings (McCarty, 2005; 2014; Markee, 2015; Green & Bridges, 2018; Kelly, 2016a; b; Kelly & Green, 2019, among others)

In this interview, we have proposed processes for engaging in *theoretical* and *intertextual* reflexivity (Heath & Street, 2008) as well as *interpersonal reflexivity* central to an ethnographic

perspective. In this way, we sought to introduce to readers ways of stepping back from what we/they assume is known, in order to explore the range of traditions that have the potential for *informing research on language and discourse in the fields of teaching and learning children and adults in schools and universities* that is at the center of the questions posed to us by the editors.

Our hope is that this interview will be an opening of further discussion with readers of this journal in formal and informal contexts in the future. We want to thank Adail Sebastião Rodrigues-Júnior and Clézio Roberto Gonçalves, the *Editors-in-chief* of this journal for this rare opportunity to address their insightful questions for this field of study.

References

American Educational Research Association (AERA) Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research. (https://www.aera.net/Publications/Standards-for-Research-Conduct).

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Agar, M. (2005). Culture: Can you take it anywhere? *The International Journal of Qualitative Methods.* DOI: 10.1177/160940690600500201

Agar, M. (2006). Culture: Can you take it anywhere? Invited lecture presented at the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California at Santa Barbara. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(2), 1-16.

Agar, M. (2006b). An ethnography by any other name… *Forum: Qualitative Social Research..* 7(4),

Anderson-Levitt (2006) Ethnography. In J. Green, G. Camilli & P. Elmore (Eds.) *Handbook of Complementary Methods of Education Research*

Anderson-Levitt (2010). "World Anthropologies of Education*"* in Levinson & Pollack, Eds., *The Companion to Anthropology of Education*

Anderson-Levitt, K M. 2012a. "Introduction: Anthropologies and Ethnographies of Education Worldwide." In Anthropologies of Education: A Global Guide to Ethnographic Studies of A NTHROPOLOGY OF, IN, AND FOR EDUCAT ION Learning and Schooling, edited by Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, 1–28. New York: Berghahn Books.

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M., ed. 2012b. Anthropologies of Education: A Global Guide to Ethnographic Studies of Learning and Schooling. NewYork: Berghahn Books.

Anderson-Levitt & Rockwell (2017), *Comparing Ethnographies: Local Studies* of Education across the Americas, published by the American Educational Research Association (AERA).

Andrade, L.T. & Castanheira, M.L. (2016). Lendo o texto de História do livro didático: construindo práticas de leitura e narrativas históricas.. EDUCAÇÃO EM FOCO, v. 29, p. 35-60, 2016.

Arthur, J., Warning, M. Coe, R. & Hedges, L. (2012). *Research Methods & Methodologies in Education.* London: SAGE.

Aschner M. J. (1960). The language of teaching. *Teachers College Record* Volume 61 Number 5, 1960, p. 242-252

Aschner, M. J. (1961). The language of teaching. In B.O. Smith & R.H. Ennis (Eds.), *Language and Concepts in Education: Analytic Study of Educational Ideas.* (pp.112-126). Chicago: Rand McNally and Company (reprinted from TC Record, 1960)

Atkinson, P. 1990. *The Ethnographic Imagination: Textual Constructions of Reality.* London: Routledge

Atkinson, P. Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. (2001). *The Handbook of Ethnography.* London: SAGE.

Baker, D. & Green, J. (2007). Limits to certainty in interpreting video data: Interactional ethnography and disciplinary knowledge. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 2(3), 191- 204.

Baker, D., Green, J. & Skukauskaite, A. (2008). Video-enabled ethnographic research: A microethnographic perspective. In G. Walford (ed.), *How to do Educational Ethnography*. London, UK: Tufnell Press.

Baker, W. D. & Daumer, E. (2015). Designing interdisciplinary instruction: Exploring disciplinary and conceptual differences as a resource. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 10*(1), 38-53, DOI: 10.1080/1554480X.2014.999776

Bakhtin, M. M. (1979/1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* , Austin: University of Texas Press.

Beach, D., Bagley, C. & Marques da Silva, S. (2018). *The Wiley Handbook of Ethnography of Education* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Birdwhistell, R. (1977). Some discussion of ethnography, theory, and method. In John Brockman (ed.), About Bateson: Essays on Gregory Bateson. (pp. 103-144). New York: E.P. Dutton.

Bloome, D. & Beauchemin, F. (2016). Languaging everyday life in classrooms. In *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice.* Vol. 62, 152-165.

Bloome, D., Beauchemin, F., Brady, J., Buescher, E., Kim, M., & Schey, R. (2018). Anthropology of education, anthropology in education, and anthropology for education. In H. Callan (ed.) *The International*

Encyclopedia of Anthropology. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. (DOI: 10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea2140)

Bloome, D., Carter, S., Christian, B., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events A Microethnographic approach.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bloome, D., Castanheira, M., Leung, C., & Rowsell, J. (Eds.) (2019) *Re-Theorizing literacy practices.* New York: Routledge.

Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A., (1993). The social construction of interatextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. Reading Research Quarterly, 28 (4), 304-333.

Bloome, D., & Green, J. (In press). Ethnography. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bloome, D. & Green, J. (1992). Educational contexts of literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 12,* 49-70.

Bloome, D., & Hong, H. (2013). Reading and intertextuality. In C. Chapelle (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bloome, D., & Kim, M-Y. (2015). The social and linguistic turns in literacy theory: A retrospective and prospective view. *Korean Language Education Research Journal,* 36, 495-533.

Bloome, D., Puro, P. & Theodorou, E. (1989). Procedural display and classroom lessons. Curriculum Inquiry, 19, 3, 265-291.

Callan, H. (ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. (DOI: 10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea2140)

Carter, Stephanie Power. 2007. "'Reading All That White Crazy Stuff': Black Young Women Unpacking Whiteness in a High School British Literature Classroom." Journal of Classroom Interaction 41 (2): 42–54.

Castanheira, M. L.. (2004). *Aprendizagem Contextualizada: discurso e inclusão na sala de aula.* Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

Castanheira, M.L. (2013). Indexical signs within Local and Global Contexts: Case Studies of Changes in Literacy Practices across generations of Working Class Families in Brazil. In: Judy, Kalman; Brian Street. (Org.). *Literacies and Numeracies in Latin America: Local Perspectives and Beyond.* New York and London: Routledge, v., p. 95-108.

Castanheira, M. L., Crawford, T., Dixon, C. N., & Green, J. L. (2000). Interactional Ethnography: An Approach to Studying the Social Construction of Literate Practices. Linguistics and Education, 11(4), 353-400. doi: 10.1016/s0898-5898(00)00032-2

Castanheira, M. L., Green J. L . & Dixon, C.N., (2007). Praticas de letramento em sala de aula: uma analise de ações letradas como construção social. Revista Portuguesa de Educação, v. 20, p. 07-36.

Castanheira, M.L., Street, B.V., Carvahlo, G.T. (2015). Navigating across academic contexts: Campo and Angolan students in a Brazilian university. Pedagogies (Mahwah, N.J.), v. 1, p. 1-16,

Castanheira, M.L., Neves, V.F.A., & Gouvea, M.C.S., (2013). Eventos interacionais e eventos de letramento: um exame das condições sociais e semióticas da escrita em uma turma de educação infantil. Cadernos CEDES (Impresso), v. 33, p. 91-107.

Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. Wittrock (ed.) Handbook of research on teaching: Third edition (pp. 432-463). New York: Macmillan.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cazden, C. B. (2017). *Communicative competence, classroom interaction, and educational equity: The selected works of Courtney B. Cazden.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Cazden, C., John, V., Hymes, D. (eds). (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (eds.) (1986). Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1984), *The making of a reader.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Cole, K. J., & Zuengler, J. (Eds.). (2007). *The research process in classroom discourse analysis*: *Current perspectives.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, ed. (1986) 2006. *The Social Construction óf Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corsaro. W. & Heise, D. R. (1999), event structure models from ethnographic data c. Clogg (ed.), *Sociological Methodology: 1990* (Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell), pp. 1-57.

Corson, D. (1997), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, Dortrecht: Springer Science

Cunningham, C. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2017). Epistemic practices of engineering for education. *Science Education*, *101*, 486–505. doi.org/10.1002/sce.21271.

Davies, B. & Corson, D. (1997), *Oral Discourse and Education*, Dortrecht: Springer Science.

Delamont, S. (2011). Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education. London: Edward Elgar

Egan-Robertson, A., & Bloome, D. (Eds.) (1998). *Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Egan-Robertson, A. & Bloome,D. (eds.) (1998). Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Ellen, R.F. (ed.) (1984). Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct. New York: Academic Press.

Erickson, F. (1982). Taught cognitive learning in its immediate environment: A neglected topic in the anthropology of education. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 13(2), 149-179.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods on research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (ed.) Handbook of research on teaching: Third edition (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Evertson, C., & Green, J., (1986). Observation as theory and method. In M. Wittrock (ed.) Handbook of research on teaching: Third edition (pp. 162-214). New York: Macmillan.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Education, 4*(3-4), 269-293.

Floriani, A. (1993). Negotiating wht counts: Roles and relationships, texts and contexts, content and meaning. Linguistics and Education, 5 (3&4), 241-274.

Flood, Heath and Lapp (1997) *Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy Though the Communicative and Visual Arts*: NY: McMillan.

Freitas, C.A. & Castanheira, M.L. (2008). Talked Images: Examining the Contextualised Nature of Image Use. Pedagogies (Mahwah, N.J.), v. 2, p. 151-164

Gilmore, P. & Glatthorn, A. (eds). Children in and out of school. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Gee, J. P. & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education. 23, 369-391.*

Geertz, C. (1983). Local knowledge. New York: Basic Books.

Green, J. (1983). Research on teaching as a linguistic process: A state of the art. Review of Research in Education, 10, 151-252. (b)

Green, J., & Bloome, D. (1997). Ethnography and Ethnographers of and in Education: A Situated Perspective. In J. Flood, S. Heath and D. Lapp (Eds.) *A Handbook of Research on Teaching Literacy through the Communicative and Visual Arts.* (pp. 181–202). New York: Simon and Shuster Macmillan.

Green, J., & Bloome, D. (in press). Video documentation and analysis in literacy studies. In C. Chapelle (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Green, J. L. & Bridges, S. (2017). Interactional Ethnography. In F. Fischer, C. E. Hmelo-Silver, S. Goldman & P. Reimann, International Handbook of the Learning Sciences NY: Routledge/ Taylor & Francis

Green, Camilli & Elmore, 2006)(Eds.), *Handbook of Complementary Methods of Education Research*

Green, J. L., and Castenheira. M. L., (2012). "Exploring Classroom Life and Student Learning: An Interactional Ethnographic Approach." In Understanding Teaching and Learning: Classroom Research Revisited, edited by Baljit Kaur, 53–67. Rotterdam: Sense.

Green, J., Castanheira, M.L., & Yeager, B. (2011). Researching the opportunities for learning for Students with learning difficulties in classrooms: An ethnographic perspective. In C. Wyatt-Smith, J. Elkins, & S. Gunn (Eds), Multiple Perspectives on Difficulties in Learning Literacy and Numeracy. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Green, J., Castanheira, M.L. Skukauskaite, A. & Hammond, J. (2015). Developing a Multi-Faceted Research Process: An Ethnographic Perspective for Reading Across Traditions, In. N. Markee (Ed.), Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction, (pp. 26-43). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell

Green, J. L. & Bridges, S. (2017). Interactional Ethnography. In F. Fischer, C. E. Hmelo-Silver, S. Goldman

& P. Reimann, International Handbook of the Learning Sciences NY: Routledge/ Taylor & Francis

Green, J., Chian, M., Stewart, E, with Brooks, L.A., Saveri, A., Couch, S., Stewart, A. & Yeager, B, (2017). What is an ethnographic archive an archive of? A telling case of challenges in exploring developing interdisciplinary programs in higher education. *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia.* Lithuania, Klaipeda University.

Green, J., Dai, Y., Joo, J. ,Williams, E., Liu, A., & Lu, C-Y. (2016). Interdisciplinary Dialogues As A Site For Reflexive Exploration of Conceptual Understandings of Teaching-Learning Relationships Pedagogies: An International Journal, DOI: 10.1080/1554480X.2014.999777

Green, J., Dixon, C., & Zaharlick, A. (2003). Ethnography as a logic of inquiry. In J. Flood, D. Lapp & J. Squire (Eds.) *The Handbook for Research in the Teaching of the English Language Arts.* Mahwah, NJ: LEA.

Green, J. L. & Harker, J. O. (Eds.). (1988). Multiple perspective analyses of classroom discourse. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Green, J. & Heras, A.I., Identities in Shifting Educational Policy Contexts: Languages, One Community to English Only, In G. Lopez-Bonilla & I. Englander (Eds.), Discourses and Identities in Contexts of Educational Change (pp.155-194). Peter Lang Publishing

Green, J., Skukauskaite, A. and Baker, B. (2012). Ethnography as epistemology: An introduction to educational ethnography. In J. Arthur, M. I. Waring, R. Coe, L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *Research Methodologies and Methods in Education* (pp. 309–321). London: Sage. Ltd.

Green, J. & Wallat, C., (Eds.) (1981). Ethnographic and Language in Educational Settings. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Grenfell, M., Bloome, D., Hardy, C., Pahl, K., Rowsell, & J., Street, B. (2012). *Language, ethnography, and education: Bridging New Literacy Studies and Bourdieu.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Gumperz, John J. 1981. "Conversational Inference and Classroom Learning." In Ethnographyand Language in Educational Settings, edited by Judith L. Green and Cynthia Wallat, 3–24. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Gumperz, J. (1986). Interactional Sociolinguistics. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), The social construction of literacy. (pp.). New York: Cambridge

Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (eds). (1972). Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Gutierrez, K., (1993). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. Linguistics and Education. 5 (3&4), 335-366.

Hasan, R. (1994). 'Situation and the definition of genre', In What's Going on Here: Complementary Studies of Professional Talk, edited by Allen D. Grimshaw. Norwood, N J: Ablex

Heath, S. B. (1982). Ethnography in education: Defining the essential. In P. Gilmore & A.Glatthorn (eds). Children in and out of school (pp. 33-58). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Heath, Shirley. 1983. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms.* Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.

Heath, S. B.(2012). Heath, Shirley. 2012.*Words atWork and Play: Three Decades in Family and Community Life.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Heap, J. (1991). Ethnomethodology, cultural phenomenology, and literacy activities. *Curriculum Inquiry.* 21(1), pp. 109-117.

Heap, J. (1995). The status of claims in "qualitative educational research. *Curriculum Inquiry.* 25 (1), pp. 271-292.

Heath, Shirley. 1983. Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B., & Peters, S., (1984) Ethnography and education: An uneasy union? Reviews in Anthropology, 52-57.

Heath, S. B. & Street, B. with Molly Mills. (2008). *On Ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research.* NY: Teachers College Press

Heras, A. (1993). The construction of understanding in a sixth-grade bilingual classroom. Linguistics and Education. 5 (3&4), 275-300.

Heras, A.I. & Green, J. Identidades y politicas publicas educativas. Las consecuencias de cambiar de una comunidad bilingue a ingles como unica lengua de instruccion,In G. López Bonilla y Carmen Perez Fragoso, Discursos e identidades en contextos de cambio Educativo. Mexico: Plaza y Valdez Hornberger & Corson,

200x;

Hornberger, N. (2008). *Handbook of Language and Education.* The Netherlands*:* Springer.

Hymes, D. (1982). What is ethnography? In P. Gilmore & A. Glatthorn (eds). Children in and out of school (pp. 21-32). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Jeffrey, B, & Troman, G, (2004), Time for ethnography. *British Educational Research Journal.* 30(4). 535-548.

Kaur, B. (Ed.). (2012). *Understanding teaching and learning: Classroom research revisited*. The Netherlands: Sense Publishing.

Kelly, G. J. (2006) Epistemology and educational research. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore, (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 33–55). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kelly, G. J. (2008). Inquiry, activity, and epistemic practice. In R. Duschl & R. Grandy (Eds.) *Teaching scientific inquiry: Recommendations for research and implementation* (pp. 99-117; 288–291). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kelly, G. J. (2008). Learning science: Discursive practices. In A.-M. de Mejia & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 3: Discourse and education* (pp. 329–340). New York: Springer.

Kelly, G. J. (2016a). Methodological considerations for the study of epistemic cognition in practice. In J. A. Greene, W.A. Sandoval, & I. Braten (eds.) Handbook of epistemic cognition (pp. 393-408). New York: Routledge.

Kelly, G. J. (2016b). Learning science: Discourse practices. In S. Wortham, & D. Kim, & S. May, (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 3: Discourse and* education (pp. 1–15). New York: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02322-9_29-1

Kelly, G. J. & Green, J. L. (Eds.). (2019). *Theory and methods for sociocultural research in science and engineering education.* New York: Routledge.

Kelly, G. J., & Licona, P. (2018). Epistemic practices and science education. In M. Matthews (Ed.), *History, philosophy and science teaching: New research perspectives* (pp. 139–165). Springer: Dordrecht. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-62616-1_5. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-62616-1_5

Kelly, G. J., Luke, A., & Green, J. (2008). What counts as knowledge in educational settings: Disciplinary knowledge, assessment, and curriculum. *Review of Research in Education*, 32, vii–x.

Kuhn, T. S., (1962), *The structure of the scientific revolution.* Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago.

Lakatos, I. Falsification and the methodol- ogy of scientific research programs. In Lakatos and A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Lemke, J. (1990), Talking science. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Levinson, Gonzalez, and Anderson-Levitt (2015). Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Education: The United States and Beyond. In Smelser & Baltest (ed). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences.*

Levinson & Pollack, 2010. (Eds.) *The Companion to Anthropology of Education*

Lin, L. (1993). Language of and in the classroom: Constructing the patterns of social life. Linguistics and Education. 5 (3&4), 2367-410

Luke, A., Green, J., & Kelly, G. J., (2010). What counts as evidence and equity? *Review of Research in Education*, 34, vii–xvi.

McCarty, Teresa. 2005. "Indigenous Epistemologies and Education: Self Determination, Anthropology, and Human Rights." Anthropology & Education Quarterly 36 (1): 1–7.

McCarty, T. (2014). Ethnography in Educational Linguistics. In The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315797748.ch2

Markee, N. (2015). *The handbook of classroom discourse and interaction.* West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Martin-Jones, M. & de Meija, A.-M. (Eds.). (2007). *Discourse and Education* (Vol. 3), Encyclopedia of Language and Education. The Netherlands: Springer.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific.* London: Routledge.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in classrooms.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

Press.

Mercer, N. & Hodgkinson, S. (2008). *Exploring talk in school.* London: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, C. J. (1984). Producing Data. In R. F. Ellen (Ed.), Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct (pp. 213-293). New York: Academic Press.

Neves, V.F.A., Gouvea, M.C.S, Castanheira, M.L. (2011). A passagem da educação infantil para o ensino fundamental: tensões contemporâneas. Educação e Pesquisa (USP. Impresso), v. 37, p. 121-140, 2011.

Newell, G., Bloome, D., Hirvela, A., with VanDerHeide , J., Wynhoff Olsen, A., & Lin, T-J. (with Buescher, E., Goff, B., Kim, M., Ryu, S., Weyand, L.). (2015). *Teaching and Learning Argumentative Writing in High School English Language Arts Classrooms.* New York: Routledge.

Philips, S. (1983). Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. In C. Cazden, V. John & D. Hymes, *Functions of language in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Pea, R., Goldman, Barron, R, Derry, S., (Eds.) (2010), *Contribution to Video Research in the Learning Sciences*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Poveda, David. 2003. "Paths to Participation in Classroom Conversations." Linguistics and Education 141: 69–98.

Rockwell, Elsie. 2005. "Indigenous Accounts of Dealing with Writing." In Language, Literacy and Power in Schooling, edited by Teresa McCarty, 5–28. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scribner, Sylvia, and Michael Cole. 1981. *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (Green, J., Dixon, C., Lin, L., Floriani, A., & Bradley M., Paxton, S., Mattern, C., & Bergamo, H.), Constructing literacy in the classroom: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H. Marshall (Ed.), Redefining learning: Roots of Educational Change, Pp. 119-151. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Scribner, Sylvia, and Michael Cole. 1981. The Psychology of Literacy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

(2005). Shuart-Faris, N., & Bloome, D. (Eds.). *Intertextuality and Research on Classroom Education.* Greenwich, CT: IAP.

Smith, L. (1990). Critical introduction: Whither classroom ethnography? In M. Hammersly, Classroom ethnography (pp.1-12). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Smith, B. O. & Ennis, R. H. (1961). *Language and Concepts in Education.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Spindler, G. (ed.) (1982). Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational Anthropolgy in action.. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spindler, G. (2000). (ed.) *Fifty years of anthropology and education 1950-2000: A Spindler anthology.* Mawah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1982). Do anthropologists need learning theory? Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 13, 2, 109-124.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1983). Anthroethnography. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 14 (3), pp. 191-194.

Spindler, George. 2000. "Previews." In Fifty Years of Anthropology and Education 1950–2000: A Spindler Anthology, edited by George Spindler, 25–48. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spindler, George, and Louise Spindler. 1987. "Issues and Applications in Ethnographic Methods." In Interpretive Ethnography of Education, edited by George Spindler and Louise Spindler, 1–7. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spradley, J., (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spolsky, B. & Hult, F. (2007). *Handbook of educational linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Street, Brian V., ed. 1993. Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (1993). The new literacy studies. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *16*(2), 81-97.

Street, B. (ed.) (1993). Cross-cultural approaches to literacy. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Street (2005)

Street, Brian V. 2013. "Anthropology in and of Education." Teaching Anthropology 3 (1): 57–60.

Strike, K.A. The expressive potential of behaviorist language. American Educational Research Journal, 1974,

Spring, 11, pp 103- 120.

Strike, K. (1979) An Epistemology of Practical Research. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 8, No. 1 , pp. 10-16

Strike, K. A. (1989). Liberal Justice and the Marxist critique of education. New York: Routledge. p. 6.

Rockwell, Elsie. 2005. "Indigenous Accounts of Dealing with Writing." In Language, Literacy and Power in Schooling, edited by Teresa McCarty, 5–28. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., and Perry Gilmore, eds. 1986. The Acquisition of Literacy: Ethnographic Perspectives. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sheridan, D., Street, B., & Bloome, D. (2000). *Writing Ourselves: Mass-Observation and Literacy Practices.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Smith, B. O. & Ennis, R. H. (1961). *Language and Concepts in Education.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Toulmin, S. *Human understanding.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972

Walford, G., (Ed.) (2012). *How to do educational ethnography.* London: The Tufnell Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). Philosophical investigations (3rd ed.). (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Wortham S., Kim, D. & May, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Discourse and Education* (Vol. 3). Encyclopedia of Language and Education. The Netherlands: Springer.

Wyatt-Smith, C., & Cummings, J. (Eds.) (2000). Examining the literacy-curriculum relationship. *Linguistics and Education, 11*(4), 295-312.

Wyatt-Smith, C., Elkins, J., & Gunn, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Multiple Perspectives on Difficulties in Learning Literacy and Numeracy.* London: Springer.

Yeager, Castanheira & Green, in press

Zaharlick, A. & Green, J. (1991). Ethnographic Research. In J. Flood, J.S. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. Squire (Eds.), Handbook on teaching the English language arts, (pp. 205-226). New York: MacMillan