INTRODUCTION

ANTHROPOLOGIES AND ETHNOGRAPHIES OF EDUCATION WORLDWIDE

Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt

Toward a World Tour

In the 1950s, a branch of educational research known as the anthropology of education first appeared in the United States, and by the 1970s its practitioners were publishing the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly.* Also in the 1950s, pedagogical anthropology emerged in Germany, and more than a dozen books have now appeared with the title *Pëdagogische Anthropologie.* In the United Kingdom, the ethnography of education has blossomed since the late 1960s, although few of its practitioners identify themselves as anthropologists. Anthropology of education or ethnography of education has also emerged in other European countries, Latin America, Israel, Japan, India, and China.

What is going on here? Do anthropology of education, pedagogical anthropology, and related terms mean the same thing in different parts of the world? What counts as ethnography of education from one nation to another? This book addresses those questions by surveying anthropologies and ethnographies of education around the world. It asks how practices of the disciplines vary, what accounts for their differences or similarities, and why research beyond our own national and linguistic boundaries merits our attention.[1]

Why a World Tour?

Globalization does not mean that international academia is melting into a single, homogenous whole. For example, although the majority of academic journals on the subject of education—about five thousand of them—publish articles or at least abstracts in English,[2] there are another three thousand academic journals on education that do not publish a word in English. There is, then, much to explore, and this is the

moment to do it. UNESCO is launching an annual report on the state of the social sciences around the world (UNESCO & ISSC 2010).[3] Translations of "other people's anthropologies" into English have burgeoned (Boškovic 2008; see also Barth et al. 2005; Dracklé, Edgar, and Schippers 2003; Ribeiro and Escobar 2005; Vermuelen and Alvarez Roldán 1995; Yamashita, Bosco and Eades 2004), and both anthropology and the educational sciences are seeking to expand and institutionalize a multilingual global dialogue. In 2005, anthropologists from Brazil, Japan, and other countries founded the World Council of Anthropological Associations,[4] while 2009 saw formation of the World Educational Research Association, another association of associations (AERA 2009).

As this volume will demonstrate, exploration is worth the effort. A world tour of anthropologies and ethnographies of education enables us to discover realms of scholarship outside our normal ken and helps us recognize their significance. Without such a broader comparative perspective, we tend to focus too narrowly on a few nationally relevant questions (Anderson-Levitt 2011); we fail to recognize that "the analytic categories used to construct ethnographic texts are not autonomous; they are rooted in the societies in which they are first used, and they reflect actual ways of constructing difference in those societies" (Rockwell 2002: 3). The pragmatic purpose of this overview, then, is to seek new angles on old questions and hence, perhaps, to glimpse new solutions. A related purpose is to raise our awareness of inequities and distortions caused by ethnocentrism in academic publishing.

Meanwhile, a global review of our disciplines raises questions about social, cultural, and historical influences on social science in general. This book proposes a modest anthropology of the anthropology of education; it offers anthropologies and ethnographies of education as a case study in the sociology of social science (compare Larsson 2006). It provides an opportunity to ask how a discipline—or a cluster of disciplines with family resemblances—is organized at the global level. For example, what are the channels in which scholarly ideas flow (Heilbron, Guilhot, and Jeanpierre 2008)? Who borrows freely from whom, and where are there barriers (Hannerz 1992)? Is there convergence or divergence of thinking over time? In fact, given the context-bound nature of our subject matter, is a global social science even possible?

The Approach and Its Limitations

The approach here is simple. First, in this introductory essay, I attempt an overview of scholarship across the globe by drawing on published

reviews of the literature and collected volumes—cross-national work (such as Candela, Rockwell, and Coll 2004; Derouet, Henriot-van Zanten, and Sirota 1990; Gibson 1997; and Souza Lima 1995) as well as the more geographically focused reviews cited in sections below. This essay also draws on personal e-mail communications from scholars in different parts of the world, on public web sites, and on my experience as a former editor of a journal that received international submissions.

Second, in each of the chapters, I invited colleagues to introduce a sample of the anthropologies and ethnographies of education from their part of the world. Many of the resulting thirteen chapters are written by senior scholars and others by newer scholars, all of whom have taken on a difficult and delicate task. I specifically asked the chapter authors *not* to attempt comprehensive reviews of the literature, but rather to develop introductory guides addressed to the naïve newcomer, written as if to a visiting scholar or a brand-new student, and designed to orient the novice and encourage further independent exploration. The chapter authors addressed questions such as:

- How do you and your colleagues define the "anthropology" or "ethnography" of education? What kinds of scholarship do you include?
- What have been the major themes or the major debates within the literature as you define it?
- To what scholars or schools of thought do you point as sources of inspiration?

I also invited chapter authors to include their own personal experiences where doing so would help outsiders understand the historical or social context.

The chapters represent a fairly wide sample, covering several parts of Europe, parts of the Americas, one region in Africa, and two important countries from East Asia. I deliberately restricted the space allocated to the "hegemonic" English-language and French-language literatures to leave more room for scholarship in other languages. The particular sampling is limited by space but also by my own access to academic networks; unfortunately, it leaves out important parts of international academia, including Russia, India, Spain, and Portugal, and work in Flemish and Dutch, meaning that much exploration remains for the future.

Of course, it would be foolhardy to think that a small group of scholars could accurately summarize the research traditions across the globe. This book will necessarily exhibit gaps and misunderstandings, and this introductory overview in particular may appear hopelessly superficial. Nonetheless, taking the broadest possible comparative view,

in spite of the superficiality of such an approach, can provide certain insights. Patterns may emerge that are visible only when the whole world or at least a very large sample is examined, as has been illustrated by world culture theorists' survey of curricula around the world (Meyer, Kamens, and Benavot 1992), and by the controversial but productive "mass comparison" of world languages (e.g., Greenberg 1966).

Another problem with this volume is the lack of a coherent unit of analysis. Rather than organize strictly by nation, strictly by multinational regions, or strictly by language zones, I could not escape a messy, eclectic approach. The significance of language barriers quickly emerged, and language zone became the first of multiple criteria used to order these bodies of scholarship. For example, France is clustered with French-speaking Belgium, Switzerland, and Canada in a single chapter because they share a common professional organization and publish in some common journals (although multilingual West Africa is treated separately because it is not as well integrated into the French-language network). However, national identity also proved to be important. Thus, although I cluster Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries in this essay, the book devotes separate chapters to Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil in order to recognize the distinct effects of their national and political histories. Finally, I use regional groupings, here simply for pragmatic reasons, to cluster smaller and diverse countries, although one could also have identified multinational and multilingual regions on principled grounds, for example, by tracing the area influenced by German anthropology (Eröss, this volume) or by continental European pedagogical philosophy (Alexander 2001a).

A third challenge is how to determine which scholars "belong" to each language zone, country, or region. Clearly place of birth is not the appropriate criterion; both students and senior scholars move across borders, sometimes returning home and sometimes taking a job in a new part of the world, and in both cases serving as conduits of ideas from one location to the other (Heilbron, Guilhot, and Jeanpierre 2008). In this volume, the chapter authors and I have generally excluded the work of ethnographers who visited from elsewhere to do research, but we have generally counted expatriate scholars who permanently settle at a university or research institute inside an adopted country as belonging to that country.

The English language also limits this volume. Some of the chapters were originally written in other languages, and we will make those versions available on the web. I encouraged chapter authors to emphasize in their brief reference lists works that do *not* appear in English so as to point readers toward that voluminous but less visible work.

Finally, this volume creates the danger that readers will mistakenly ascribe one and only one kind of anthropology or ethnography of education to each nation or each linguistic zone. In fact, scholarship is never so homogeneous; the brief sketches in this book mean to identify some prominent themes but certainly not all the topics or debates within a given country or region. By the same token, the chapter authors do not necessarily claim to represent the only or even the most typical trends within their own countries.

Anthropologies, Ethnographies, and Other Affiliations

Some readers will object that anthropology of education should not be conflated with ethnography of education. After all, anthropology is the holistic study of human beings, whereas ethnography is a philosophy of research practiced in several disciplines. Nonetheless, this volume includes ethnographers who identify with disciplines other than anthropology. It does so partly because the definitions of disciplines vary across nations, as we shall see; partly because nonanthropologists like Paul Willis, Hugh Mehan, and Michelle Fine have helped to shape anthropology of education; but especially because many nonanthropological ethnographers define ethnography more or less as anthropologists would. For example, the editors of the journal *Ethnography and Education* describe ethnography as "long-term engagement with those studied in order to understand their cultures" (Troman 2010), echoing anthropologist Harry Wolcott's formulation that "the purpose of ethnographic research is to describe and interpret cultural behavior" (1987: 42–43).

In any case, "anthropology" does not mean the same thing everywhere, nor is it a global term for the discipline as practiced by anthropologists of education in the United States. There are actually several versions of anthropology and related disciplines. For example, the discipline called "philosophical anthropology" pursues the question of what it means to be human by seeking generalizations about the human condition. It is concerned with general human Culture—Culture with a capital C and in the singular. A philosophical anthropology of education, then, is concerned with the human capacity for learning as an important part of the species' toolkit for survival.

Meanwhile, the discipline called "cultural anthropology" (or sometimes "ethnology") in the United States examines human beings living in cultural worlds, that is, in worlds of meanings constructed by people rather than given in nature. It examines cultures in the lower case and

the plural—and turns attention to learning when it asks how children and other newcomers come to construct understandings held in common with other people. Within the realm of education, then, cultural anthropology leads to an anthropology of learning.

The discipline called "social anthropology" in the English-speaking world focuses on the social, that is, on relationships among persons and groups. Its questions about relationships, such as how social hierarchy is maintained or how children move into adult roles, direct attention to schooling as a central institution in complex societies and thus lead to an anthropology of schooling. However, the distinction between cultural and social anthropology has always been tenuous (Ingold 1994, Spencer 2000), and an anthropology of schooling can also direct attention to the construction of cultural worlds of meaning within classrooms, schools, and other academic settings.

This book will also make reference to disciplines, variously called "ethnology" or "ethnography" in parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa, that have often developed from folklore studies or museum studies and that examine local cultures in the researcher's home country. It will also note the practice of ethnographic methods by sociologists and by psychologists, and will cite the influence of history, cultural historical activity theory, critical race theory, feminist theory, and other disciplines. In addition, chapter authors will point out that fields within the educational sciences themselves, including curriculum and instruction, didactics, teacher education, and intercultural education, are important locations for practicing anthropology or ethnography of education.

Organization

There is no single, logical itinerary through the different literatures, particularly since the unit of analysis in this book is not consistent. This essay and the chapters are organized, therefore, simply to serve the flow of the argument. I begin with the German-language zone to "make the familiar strange," for its extensive literature and its versions of anthropology of education will be less familiar if not surprising to many English-speaking readers. Next I turn to the hegemonic English-language literatures as a more familiar baseline, and then to two broad language zones, first Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries, and then the French-speaking world. Next, I address the vibrant traditions in "smaller" European languages. A section on Asia includes both the large, long-established body of work in Japan and a new, burgeoning literature in China. Finally, I turn to newer and emergent work in the

Middle East and Africa. The volume concludes with important comments from a leading sociologist of education, Agnès van Zanten, who points out key lessons from the chapters.

Philosophical and Historical Anthropology of Education in Germany

We begin our world tour, then, in the German-language zone. More accurately, although scholars from Austria, Switzerland, and Luxemburg participate in German-language conferences on anthropology and education, this section focuses on Germany.

In his chapter in this volume, Christoph Wulf locates the original source of German educational anthropology within philosophical anthropology. Since the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt, philosophical anthropology asks what distinguishes "man in general" from animals on the one hand and from machines on the other. Any discussion of education concerns learning in the broadest terms as a generic human experience (e.g., Bollnow 1987).

Wulf and his colleagues have reacted against philosophical anthropology's abstract and unwittingly Eurocentric and masculine picture of human beings to create a more complex historical cultural anthropology of education. Even though the German work reacts against excess abstraction, some readers from a US or UK tradition may nonetheless perceive some of it, such as Wulf (2003), as surprisingly philosophical and still Eurocentric. Nonetheless, its philosophy is deeply grounded in ethnography. The Commission on Anthropology of Education of the German Educational Research Association has conducted a twelve-year ethnographic study on learning and everyday life in school and family, as Wulf reports here, and the result is a fascinating meditation on ritual and performance in education and socialization. Meanwhile, other recent German anthropology and ethnography of education explores cultures of home and school in ways that may be more familiar to US readers (e.g., Breidenstein 2007; Hünersdorf, Maeder, and Müller 2008; Qvarsell and Wulf 2003).

The English-Speaking World

I cluster the English-speaking countries of the global North here because scholars can easily read one another across boundaries within it, although Delamont in this volume argues that the flow of reader-

ship is unidirectional. Moreover, there is a tendency of scholars outside this language zone to treat it as a single unit. Some, including authors in this volume, refer collectively to the English-language literature of the United Kingdom, North America, Australia, and New Zealand as the "Anglo-Saxon" world—a label that can shock authors from inside that zone who identify themselves as "African-American," "Irish-Australian," or anything but Anglo-Saxon. There are also reviews of the literature that treat ethnography of education within the entire English-language zone without making regional distinctions (Derouet, Henriot-van Zanten and Sirota 1990; Gordon, Holland, and Lahelma 2001; Goodman 2001; Osborne 1996). The English-language research literature of India does not appear in such reviews, and I therefore treat India separately in the section on Asia.

The United States and English-Speaking Canada

Anthropology of education in the United States is rooted, first, in cultural anthropology and specifically in the study of cultural transmission; it has thus been an anthropology of learning since Margaret Mead published *Coming of Age in Samoa* in 1928. However, beginning in mid-century, US pioneers like George and Louise Spindler and Murray and Rosalie Wax (see Delamont, this volume) expressed interest not only in the transmission of culture, but also in inequalities in the schooling of different ethnic populations within the United States. Soon young researchers who were attracted by this approach, some of them former schoolteachers, established a new subdiscipline, an anthropology of schooling. In Canada as well, English-language anthropology of education focused heavily in early years on schooling, particularly of indigenous peoples (Fisher 1998) and now frequently of immigrants and minoritized ethnic groups.

Today in both Canada and the United States, ethnography is popular as a research method not only among the anthropologically trained, but also among sociologists, linguists, and other educational researchers, who publish in journals like *Ethnography and Education*, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *Linguistics and Education*, *Educational Researcher*, and occasionally in *Sociology of Education.* However, in this volume, British scholar Sara Delamont focuses her assessment of the vast English-language literature on anthropology, not ethnography more broadly, and limits her chapter to the United States and Canada. She describes US anthropologists of education as obsessed by school failure among ethnic and racial minorities to the point of being blinded to other important topics. North American scholars will probably object that she

underplays smaller yet still sizeable bodies of US work on a wide array of topics, from gender to social class to higher education to school success. However, Delamont's analysis of citation patterns is compelling, and other reviews support her argument. Thus, as reported in Anderson-Levitt (2011), a Swiss study found that 63 percent of the articles published by the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* from 1995 to 2005 concerned schooling and, within that set, 52 percent, or thirty-nine articles, addressed success and failure; the articles that were not about schooling tended to address culture and ethnicity, language, and identity (Jacquin 2006; see also Henriot-van Zanten and Anderson-Levitt 1992).

The United Kingdom

In Great Britain and Northern Ireland, even though classic anthropology tended to focus less on the concept of culture than did US anthropology, a few midcentury anthropologists like Raymond Firth and Audrey Richards showed interest in cultural transmission and the education of the child (Mayer 1967; Middleton 1970; see also Goodman 2001). Today, however, scholarship in the United Kingdom generally does not focus on learning.

Instead, ethnographic studies of schooling abound. Max Gluckman of the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester encouraged ethnography at home, and under his influence D. H. Hargreaves and Colin Lacey studied schools in Britain in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Goodman 2001). At about the same time, scholars variously educated as anthropologists and as sociologists were inspired by symbolic interactionism and by feminist scholarship as well as by social anthropology to conduct qualitative studies of classroom interaction and the social construction of meaning by teachers and students (Atkinson, Delamont, and Hammersley 1988). Those originally educated as anthropologists did not find a disciplinary home in anthropology (Delamont, this volume) and their work is referred to as ethnography rather than anthropology of education.

Most ethnographers of schooling in the United Kingdom conduct research at home, although there have been a few forays abroad, particularly to compare Britain with France (e.g., Sharpe 1992; van Zanten and Ball 2000). Some anthropologically trained scholars in the field of comparative education range further afield, such as Goodman (1990) and Alexander (2001b).

Ethnography of schooling in the United Kingdom, unlike US anthropology of education, consistently attends to social class and very often to gender (Gordon, Holland, and Lahelma 2001). However, since the

rise of cultural studies, UK ethnographers are paying more explicit attention to cultural processes, and some UK scholars have turned their attention to race and ethnicity (Gillborn 1997). UK scholars took the lead in creating the international journal *Ethnography and Education*, which, as mentioned above, embraces the concept of culture (Troman 2010).

Other English-Speaking Areas

Australia has a rich ethnographic tradition. Delamont notes that Forsey (2007) is an anthropologist, but other ethnographers such as Connell (1989), Walker and Hunt (1988), and Kipnis (2001) write in the same vein as UK qualitative sociologists, and on the same subjects—social class and gender. Others, like Osborne (1996), resemble US ethnographers of education and focus on cultural differences and culturally relevant pedagogy. Australians also conduct ethnography abroad; for example, Dolby conducted research in South African schools (2002) and Okano studied Korean-origin students in Japan (1997).

Spanish- and Portuguese-Speaking Countries

I group Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking nations together because both scholars and publications seem to flow across the two languages zones and between Latin America and the Iberian peninsula (see Candela, Rockwell and Coll 2004). For example, Portuguese-speaking Brazilian scholars assume that clearly written Spanish is a "normal" language to read.[5]

Spain and Portugal

At least three distinct strands of anthropology of education can be found in Spain. First, works in the philosophical anthropology of education are widely disseminated (e.g., Barrio Maestre 2004). Secondly, the neo-Vygotskian and cultural psychological current is vividly present (e.g., del Río and Álvarez 1995), as evidenced in the journal *Cultura y educación*, which has been published since 1990.[6] Finally, the anthropology of schooling seems to be flourishing at several centers across Spain. An important volume of English-language works, translated and interpreted, appeared in 1993 (Velasco Maillo, García Castaño, and Díaz de Rada 1993), and a recent overview of anthropologically oriented work appeared in the *Revista de Antropología Social* (Franzé Mudanó 2007). In the latter volume, Jociles (2007) argues that a majority of anthropolo-

gists of education in Spain focus on studies of ethnic minorities and of diversity. For example, Silvia Carrasco Pons studies the children of immigrants and minorities (2003), while ethnographer David Poveda (2001), himself educated in psychology, works with colleagues to study classroom interactions and ethnicity. Poveda also edits an electronic journal, *Working Papers on Culture, Education and Human Development.*[7] Portuguese scholars likewise show strong interest in ethnography of education, to judge by articles in the journal *Educação, Sociedade e Culturas*[8] and publications by scholars like sociologist of education Telmo Caria (2003).

Latin America

Reviews of ethnographic studies conducted in Latin America include Anderson and Montero-Sieburth (1998), Levinson et al. (2002), Rockwell (1998), and Rockwell and Gomes (2009). This volume includes chapters on three of the largest Latin American centers—Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil.

In Mexico, Elsie Rockwell and her colleagues in the DIE (Departamento de Investigaciones Educativas) have built up a rich collection of studies of classrooms and schools and of the education of rural and indigenous students. Their team uses ethnographic methods similar to approaches used in the United States, but adds a sensitivity to social history influenced by French scholars and an attention to discourse shaped by sociolinguistics. From this blend, they have developed new concepts such as the idea of *el trabajo docente*, teaching work. Rockwell and González in this volume review themes of the research conducted by the DIE and by ethnographers across Mexico.

With support from the Canadian government and in conversation with Mexican ethnographers, Latin America has developed a network of researchers clustered in several teams in Argentina and Chile. In this volume, María Rosa Neufeld shows how anthropology of education developed in Argentina—specifically, in the Department of Anthropology and Education within the Institute of Anthropology of the University of Buenos Aires—as part of a postmilitary regime renaissance of the social sciences. The department hosted the eleventh Simposio Interamericano de Investigación Etnográfica en Educación, the first such symposium held in South America. Neufeld shows that, as in Mexico, anthropology of education in Argentina is firmly rooted in the discipline of anthropology and has strong links to history.

In Brazil, according to Ana Gomes and Nilma Gomes in this volume, there has been an interest in anthropology of education since the 1950s;

however, the influence of the "precursor studies" faded under the "myth of racial democracy" and the military regime, until new scholars returned to questions of ethnicity, race, and schooling in the 1980s. Meanwhile, in Brazil there is also a neo-Vygotskian current (Souza Lima 1995) as well as a bubbling up of research inspired by Freire and pedagogical action projects (Oliviera Gonçalves and Gonçalves e Silva 1998).

The French-Speaking World

In this volume, Raveaud and Draelants present a concise survey of ethnographies of education in French-speaking Europe and Canada. They show that this language zone functions as a single domain not only because of shared language but also because of collegial ties within the international association of French-speaking sociologists (AISLF). They demonstrate that ethnographic studies have usually been conducted by sociologists of education in a reaction against the primarily quantitative approach that had dominated France for so long, although they point to a few developments among anthropologists as well. French ethnographers have gradually expanded their focus on social class to recognize and analyze ethnicity among the children of immigrants, while Belgian, Swiss, and Québecois ethnographers have demonstrated greater interest in linguistic diversity—not surprisingly, given the linguistic diversity of their respective nations.

In France, sociology of education focuses almost exclusively on schooling (Duru-Bellat and van Zanten 2006), as does the chapter in this volume. Although anthropologists of the French-speaking world have paid little attention to either schooling or learning, ethnologists of France, practitioners of the discipline that evolved from earlier folklore studies, occasionally turn their attention to the acquisition of culture (e.g., Delbos and Jorion 1984). Recently, the journal *Ethnologie française* has also published anthropological studies of schooling (Filliod 2007; Garcion-Vautour 2003), and has noted the establishment of the European Society of Ethnographers of Education (Boumard and Bouvet 2007).

Other Language Zones in Europe

Interest in ethnography also flourishes in European countries outside of the English-, German-, and French-language zones.

In Italy, as Francesca Gobbo explains in this volume, traditional anthropologists have attended to the question of how schooling "creates illiteracy" and have written broad treatises on anthropology of education that border on philosophical anthropology. Meanwhile, as ethnographers working in a faculty of education, Gobbo and her students focus on fieldwork, which calls into question the cultures of the school as well as the cultures of ethnic minority children.

In Central Europe, as Gábor Eröss details in this volume, the disciplines of "ethnography" (in the sense of folklore studies) and of Roma studies have been the main inspirations for ethnographic research on education, and the Roma and other minority ethnic groups have been the principal topic, with the exception of Poland, where a German-style philosophical anthropology of education has prevailed. Eröss notes new trends, however, including a political anthropology of education inspired by developments in French sociology.

Scandinavia, where Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish scholars find one another's languages mutually intelligible, is particularly rich in anthropologists of education. Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin in this volume describe a long tradition of ethnographic studies and a more recent stream of specifically anthropological work in Scandinavia, much of it focusing on childhood and youth (see also Larsson 2006). Like the Flemish-speaking scholars of Belgium and the Netherlands (e.g., Eldering 1996; Timmerman 2000), Scandinavian ethnographers publish regularly in English as well as in their own languages.

At this writing, except for a reference to some discussion of qualitative research and action research drawing on hermeneutics or phenomenology in Lithuania,[9] I have not encountered ethnography of education in the Baltic states, in Greece, in Turkey, or in Russia. However, it is important to note that in Russia, the ideas of Lev Vygotsky have experienced a renaissance since the 1960s (Shepel 1995). Known in the United States as "cultural psychology" or "cultural historical activity theory," Vygotsky's ideas have been an important inspiration for the anthropology of learning in the United States and other countries including, as noted, Brazil and Spain (e.g., Rogoff 2003; Souza Lima 1995).

Asia

Japan has had a long history of anthropology of education, which began in conjunction with studies by ethnographers of education visiting from the United States (Minoura, this volume). Some Japanese ethnographers publish in English and, in my experience, Japan has been the

country with the second largest representation in the Council on Anthropology and Education of the American Anthropological Association. However, by detailing the rich body of literature published in the last two decades, Minoura in this volume opens a vista on the extensive literature available only in Japanese. Although some of this literature focuses on ethnic minority students, a large part of it analyzes ordinary educational practices and life in mainstream schools, presenting an interesting contrast to the US focus on failure. Dr. Minoura also notes the interest in ethnography of education among educational psychologists in Japan.

In China, programmatic statements on the anthropology of education have been published for some time, but ethnography of education is burgeoning just now (Ouyang, this volume). Elsewhere in Asia, a few anthropologists in Malaysia, Vietnam, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan express interest in educational problems, according to the Worldwide Email Directory of Anthropologists (Jarvis n.d.; see also http://www.academia.edu). India in particular, which has a strong tradition of applied anthropology and also of sociology of education, as manifested in the work of Krishna Kumar, has published ethnographies of education (contrary to my earlier mistaken impression in Anderson-Levitt 2006a). Anthropologist and sociologist Meenakshi Thapan conducted an ethnographic case study of an innovative private school in 1991, and more recently Indian scholars have published ethnographic studies on teacher and school culture in public schools (Clarke 2001; Sarangapani 2003).

The Middle East and Africa

Ethnographers of education are active in Israel (Shalsky, Alpert, and Sabar-Ben Yehoshua, this volume) and although many publish in English, the chapter in this volume notes the literature available in Hebrew. The chapter demonstrates a strong interest in immigrants and Sephardic Jews, and more restrained interest in politically difficult topics such as Arab students and Orthodox Jewish schools.

In the Arabic-speaking world, ethnographic studies appear to be rarer. Most typical is work by insider-outsiders like Christina (2006). However, Herrera and Torres (2006) bring together critical ethnographies by Egyptian researchers, which were published simultaneously in an Arabic version. There is also interest in action research and ethnography among Palestinian scholars; Nakhlen and Wahbeh (2005) report on 432 master's theses granted by three Palestinian universities,

from 1997 to 2004, and note occasional instances of fieldwork and of collaboration with teachers as researchers (see also Khaldi and Wahbeh 2000), while qualitative research is conducted by faculty of the Academic Institute for Arab Teachers of Beit Berl College in Israel.[10]

In sub-Saharan Africa, conducting research is not easy, nor do researchers necessarily control the topics of research, as Diallo reports in this volume. He shares here an analysis of 654 African studies by Maclure (1997) alongside his own recent survey of scholars, showing that qualitative and quantitative methods are often combined. As in Palestine, there is an interest in applied, practitioner, and action research. Many anthropologists in Africa find education a high priority and urgent topic of study. For example, in Cameroon, the Association of Research Students in Anthropology at the University of Yaoundé I reported that one of its members, Nkongho Manchang, recently completed a study of educational reforms and their effects on the community; another member, Abamboh Robert, was writing a thesis on illiteracy and its long-term socioeconomic effects on communities).[11]

African researchers in doctoral, postdoctoral, and professorial positions in Europe, Canada, and the United States are also publishing important ethnographic research. See, for example, Egbo's study of women's literacy in Nigeria (2000) and Diallo's study of girls' successes in middle school in Guinea (2004).

Conclusion

The world is vast. In every country visited here, there are dozens if not hundreds or thousands of educational researchers who practice ethnography or who use anthropological ideas. Although this rapid tour has surely missed or misinterpreted important scholarship, we can nonetheless draw tentative lessons from it to address the three questions posed at the beginning: How do practices of the anthropology or ethnography of education vary, if they do? Why do they vary, or not vary? And why it is important to attend to research beyond one's own national and linguistic boundaries?

Commonalities and Variation

The literatures visited here manifest certain similarities. By definition their research methods are similar; everywhere ethnographers of education use participant observation and open-ended interviewing to get at insiders' understandings of the situation, as I note elsewhere: "The

participant-observation is usually of long duration, although lack of time and resources can require 'condensed fieldwork,' particularly in the Global South (Crossley and Vulliamy 1997)" (Anderson-Levitt 2011: 16). More specific supplementary research techniques vary. For example, scholars in West Africa are open to combining ethnographic methods with quantitative methods (Diallo, this volume), while in Israel and in China one finds strong interest in narrative inquiry (Shlasky et al. this volume; Ouyang this volume). Practitioner research, action research, and research to shape policy emerge as particular themes among Palestinian, West African, and Chinese ethnographers (Nakhlen and Wabeh 2005; Diallo this volume; and Ouyang this volume, respectively).

Another commonality is that the concept of culture is used by scholars in all the nations surveyed here, even if French researchers treat it with "suspicion" (Raveaud and Draelants this volume). Indeed, the concept of cultural difference has been borrowed by teachers and the general public to the point that US and Argentine anthropologists, among others, worry about its misuse to reify differences and explain away differential school performance (González 1999; Neufeld this volume).

More surprisingly, the anthropology or ethnography of education is defined largely as the study of schooling in most places, even though early anthropologies of education originated from an interest in learning in all kinds of settings. Scandinavia seems to be an exception with its focus on children and youth, but even there most of the research examines children and youth in institutional contexts. Another exception is the German research, which focuses consistently on learning, but it too begins from a school setting.

Another commonality is that ethnographers of education are more likely to study schooling or learning "at home" rather than "abroad," even in countries where most anthropology is conducted away from home. Research abroad is more common in countries of the global North with a history of colonialism (and now of international aid)—particularly in the United States, Scandinavia, and Japan, but also, as noted, in the United Kingdom and Australia as well as in France (in Filiod 2007) and Germany (in Qvarsell and Wulf 2003). In every nation where it exists, however, anthropology of education conducted away from home appears to be a minority tradition.

In spite of the common interest in schooling as an institution in society, particularly in one's own society, however, this survey has revealed considerable variation. There are really several different anthropologies of education and ethnographies of education around the world.

First, there are older and newer traditions. Anthropologies of education can be traced back to the 1950s or earlier in Germany, the United

States, Japan, Brazil, and Mexico, whereas ethnographic studies of learning or schooling have emerged only since the 1970s or later in countries like France, Israel, Hungary, China, and Guinea.

Secondly, as anticipated, anthropologists and ethnographers of education publish in many languages besides English. There are hefty literatures in Japanese, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Chinese, and even where scholars publish frequently in English—as in the Netherlands, Scandinavian countries, Israel, and perhaps Germany—many of their works do not appear in English.

Moreover, anthropologies and ethnographies of education have grown from distinct disciplinary roots that show different geographical distributions. Philosophical anthropology of education is an important tradition in Germany and Poland, and can be found in Spain and Italy. An anthropology of learning flourishes in Mexico, Spain, and anywhere that scholars make use of cultural historical activity theory. An anthropology of schooling is well institutionalized in the United States, while an ethnography of schooling with roots in sociology and social anthropology structures the field in the United Kingdom and France. Meanwhile, locally focused ethnology turns out to be the source discipline for ethnography of education in China and in Central European countries, and also contributes in countries like France.

Perhaps as a result, ethnography of education as a research philosophy also tends to be affiliated with different disciplines in different countries. It is practiced largely by sociologists in France, while in Japan it appeals to educational psychologists as well as sociologists. In Central Europe, ethnography of education serves Roma studies, while researchers in Italy and the Netherlands use it in the service of intercultural education. In Mexico and Argentina, there is a strong reliance on the broader discipline of anthropology and in those two countries as well as in Germany, anthropologists of education are also attracted to a historical approach.

Finally, the most common research themes vary from region to region. For example, as noted, Scandinavian ethnographers of education pay a great deal of attention to the anthropology of children and youth, perhaps because Scandinavian welfare policies emphasize "good childhoods" (Anderson et al. this volume). The rituals of schooling draw particular attention in Germany and in Israel—in Germany perhaps because of the intellectual interest in mimesis, but in Israel because of the deliberate use of rituals by the state to create a new national identity. In the United States, central themes are racial and ethnic minorities, the cultural gap between home and school and, as Delamont argues in this volume, school failure.

Global Flow and Local Inventions and Reinventions

First, why the similarities? One explanation of commonalities across these cases is the global flow of academic knowledge. "Books and articles do get distributed beyond their home countries, the web and email make texts much more widely available, and some scholars are privileged to attend international conferences" (Anderson-Levitt 2011: 13). There is also an international flow of students and postdoctoral fellows going to study in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Quebec, and elsewhere; for example, Gobbo, Minoura, and van Zanten, authors in this volume, studied in the United States. There is another flow of scholars employed outside their birth countries. Visiting scholars sometimes transmit ideas, as in the influence on Japan of the US scholars who conducted early ethnography of education there. Finally, participation on joint projects, such as the European projects mentioned in this volume by Eröss, provide opportunities for mutual intellectual influence.

Chapter authors make explicit reference to the borrowing of ideas as a result of these flows. The Chicago school of sociology seems to have had particularly wide impact, as have US anthropology of education, UK ethnography of education, and Vygotskian ideas, but the chapters also reveal many further instances of borrowing.

While ideas have been borrowed, there have also been occasional cases of independent invention. Sometimes this led to differences, as where distinct disciplinary traditions, such as philosophical anthropology in Germany and cultural anthropology in the United States, seem to have independently inspired different kinds of anthropology of education. At the same time, a common situation—the spread of Western-style schooling, which now touches at least 90 percent of the world's children (EFA 2011)—may have independently inspired a similarity, the common focus on schooling, among anthropologists and ethnographers in different parts of the world.[12] On a more mundane level, the apparent fact that most ethnographers of education work in faculties of education and educational research institutes would likewise tend to direct their attention toward schools. Like the focus on schooling, the tendency to study problems at home rather than abroad underscores that anthropologies and ethnographies of education are commonly organized as applied disciplines. Social scientists and policy makers around the globe agree on the common goal of equal access to quality education (Meyer 2001), and ethnographers who work closely with families, students, and educators feel the urgency of that goal.

In spite of a transnational traffic in ideas and the common framework of worldwide schooling, however, there are also barriers to intellectual

exchange. Distinct disciplines develop in different zones or regions or countries because scholars may be politically or economically isolated, because they cannot read one another, or because when they can read they do not understand and appreciate what they read.

Political isolation has happened when political regimes have discouraged ethnography of education. "Batallán (1998) observes that ethnography of education could not have developed under the former authoritarian regimes of Chile and Argentina" (Anderson-Levitt 2011: 16), as does Neufeld in this volume, and Ouyang in this volume comments on the threat that ethnography may seem to pose to people in power. Meanwhile, economic isolation happens because not everyone enjoys the resources to participate in international conferences or to access international journals.

More generally and in more complex ways, ideas do not flow freely because anthropologies and ethnographies of education appear in multiple languages. Language barriers constrict the flow even between adjoining territories; thus, to judge by reference lists in articles and books, Francophone authors read English-language work much more often than German-language work, and Anglophone authors rarely read anything published in languages other than English. There are two Canadas, one more strongly linked to the literature of the United States and Britain, the other to the literature of France and French-speaking Belgium. Belgium and Switzerland likewise have two different faces, while the copious literature in Japanese is not read outside of Japan (Anderson-Levitt 2011). Of course, some work gets translated, but the flow of translations is remarkably uneven. In the last seventy-five years, over a million books have been translated from English into other languages, but only a little more than 100,000 books have moved in the opposite direction, from other languages into English (UNESCO 2010). As a result, scholars who are monolingual in English suffer from a huge "blind spot" by missing most of the literatures originating outside their language zone.

However, translation alone does not guarantee that ideas flow, for readers can fail to understand and appreciate what they read. One reason is that conventions of writing unfamiliar to an audience can obscure the significance of the work. Thus, to European and Latin American readers, US anthropology of education seems to lack sufficient theoretical grounding, while European and Latin American work may seem to lack empirical findings and discussion of research methods to US readers (compare the introductory comments in Levinson et al. 2002). Each set of scholars may fail to take the other seriously.

In addition, readers of a translated or imported work can mistakenly dismiss it as unimportant when they lack familiarity with the implicit

assumptions, terminology, local canons, and ongoing conversations to which it refers. Thus the disciplinary differences noted above, compounded by linguistic barriers, can make it difficult to appreciate the intellectual significance of a work. If readers have not been "keeping up with" the literature in German philosophical anthropology or Hungarian ethnology, not only because these are not their disciplines but also because they do not read German or Hungarian, can they properly interpret a new work in these fields? If readers do not know the significance of, say, Max Scheler or Marianne Gullestad or Kazuhiro Ebuchi, all influential scholars cited in this volume, will they miss the importance of arguments that take the work of such scholars as implicit background?

Readers can also fail to grasp the significance of "foreign" research when they do not recognize the relevance of the topic. Yet, as pointed out above, common research themes vary by location. One reason is that the favorite themes of anthropologists or ethnographers derive from their nation's particular history. As argued in Anderson-Levitt (2011), it is hardly surprising, for example, that in countries formed by recent conquest like Canada and the United States or Mexico and Chile, a focus on indigenous education has emerged. Similarly, given their peculiar histories of slavery, it is not surprising that race and racism preoccupy researchers in the United States and in Brazil.[13] Not by chance, the ethnography of education in France, the Netherlands, Italy, and Central Europe shows increased interest in immigrants as the number of immigrants to Europe rises. The place of a country in the world economy can also shape how researchers choose topics. As Diallo notes in this volume, international donors tend to control research topics in poorer countries since they fund almost all scholarship except for master's theses, and it is thus the influence of Western donors that explains, for example, why West African research focuses so heavily on gender equity. Place in the world economy also affects attitudes toward schooling, for where schooling cannot be taken for granted, it can serve to undo stratification rather than to stratify; thus, as pointed out in Anderson-Levitt (2011: 18), "whereas in the United States and Europe, educational literature sometimes compares schools to factories or prisons," in Mexico "public schools can sometimes be seen as a liberating force that offers a relatively equalizing experience" to the nation's children, which Rockwell (1998) demonstrated.

There are many reasons, then, that good and significant research conducted in your country may remain unexplored and unknown in mine: people in my country may not read your language, and no one has bothered to translate your work; we may not understand the arguments your scholars are making because we do not know your canon

of key works; or we may not care about the issues you analyze because our country's history and social structure directs our attention to other issues. Even if you publish in English in an "international" journal, you may have reshaped your argument to align with the reviewers' canon or to address the relevance of North American or British problems, so that readers do not encounter the most typical or most central ideas from your nation or language zone in your English-language article.

Some Lessons and Next Steps

This survey suggests that anthropologies and ethnographies of education, in the plural, have emerged in different places at different times, sometimes from different roots. Some traditions appear to have been independently invented as expressions of different disciplinary interests or different historical and social concerns. Some were borrowed from visiting researchers or imported by scholars who studied abroad.

Wherever borrowing occurred, however, the literature on borrowing suggests that it was probably selective, designed to suit local interests and needs (Steiner-Khamsi 2004; Anderson-Levitt and Alimasi 2001). Moreover, even where anthropologies of education flow from a common source or share common literatures, one can expect them to diverge over time because when researchers import an idea, they "creolize" what they borrow, transforming it to make it their own (Hannerz 1987, 1992). For example, as I note in Anderson-Levitt (2011), Ouyang has reported elsewhere how he has combined his US-inspired sociolinguistics and anthropology of education with Chinese-inspired sociology of societal transformation, psychology, politics, and educational reform history (Ouyang 2006). "In the same manner, scholars in Mexico, Brazil, and the Netherlands borrow from the United States and the United Kingdom and creolize what they borrow to create new approaches and novel analyses. UK and US scholars creolize imported concepts as well, such as Bourdieu's ideas from France, Freire's from Brazil, and Vygotsky and his colleague's from Russia" (Anderson-Levitt 2011: 21). Creolization is a process rich in creativity. It means that when an idea is borrowed it never remains the same; hence, one must always expect national or regional or linguistic variations.

Because research traditions develop in response to local concerns (as is appropriate for an applied field, or even inevitable as Eröss demonstrates in this volume), it is worth the effort to break the language barrier and decode unfamiliar canons. On a purely pragmatic note, deciphering other peoples' literatures is a skill that facilitates publishing in "international" journals, a task increasingly demanded of scholars around

the world. More importantly for development of the social sciences, travel into unfamiliar literatures challenges habitual ways of thinking. For example, I have learned from interactions with Mexican scholars, as just noted, that schooling is not necessarily oppressive. Would it be useful in France or the United States or China to reflect more on school as liberating? Would it meanwhile behoove educators in West Africa to beware the oppressive side of schooling? I have learned from Delamont's chapter in this volume that the United States may focus so closely on school failure, albeit out of passionate commitment to rescue failing children, that US scholars miss opportunities to analyze the deeper problems or to recognize what successful learning requires. Would more emphasis on what local participants take to be normal, unproblematic schooling as conducted in Japan or the United Kingdom provide US educators with fresh models for improving education for all? Meanwhile, would more attention to ethnicity or "race" be salutary in Germany, and might US scholars gain from deeper reading of work on gender from the United Kingdom, Australia, and West Africa? Finally, what could all of us who focus too narrowly on schooling learn from a close look at the study of learning in other settings as practiced, for example, in Germany or Denmark?

As anticipated, anthropologies and ethnographies of education also offer rich ground for practicing the sociology of social science, as Larsson (2006) has pointed out. The chapters here help us understand why the social sciences have been strongly marked by national traditions in recent centuries (Heilbron, Guilhot, and Jeanpierre 2008), but also may point to prospects for a global discipline (as van Zanten concludes in this volume). I hope the volume will inspire some readers to further explore whether good analyses of social problems are necessarily place-bound and time-bound or a global anthropology of education is possible.

In the meantime, authors of this book and many others who have contributed to our initial conversations will work to continue the discussion. We are establishing a web site to share some of the chapters in their original languages or in more detailed versions, and to share longer bibliographies of recommended work. We hope to see the cases expanded to many other countries, and to entertain rebuttals and additions to the current volume. This book is simply the beginning of the journey.

Notes

1. An earlier analysis appeared in Anderson-Levitt (2006a) and a related discussion appears in Anderson-Levitt (2011).

2. Analysis based on Ulrich's Periodicals Directory 2009.

3. Thanks to Bayero Diallo for pointing out this important report.

4. World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA). http://www.wcaanet.org/. Retrieved 2 September 2010. Note that the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, IAUES, active since the 1930s, brings together individual scholars rather than national and regional associations.

5. Ana Gomes, e-mail communication, 16 June 2009.

6. See http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/fias/cye, accessed 22 September 2010.

7. Working Papers on Culture, Education and Human Development, http://www.uam.es/otros/ptcedh/default.htm, accessed 8 September 2010.

8. http://www.fpce.up.pt/ciie/revistaesc/, accessed 22 September 2010.

9. Audra Skukauskite, e-mail communication, 18 August 2010.

10. Personal communication, Dr. Abdel Mana, Director, February 13, 2011.

11. Nkongho Manchang, e-mail communication, 25 May 2005.

12. Thanks to Francesca Gobbo for this point.

13. History could explain lack of research as well. Beach and Lunneblad (2011) offer historical and political reasons for avoidance of the topics of "race" or "color" in Scandinavian ethnography.

Bibliography

AERA (American Educational Research Association). 2009. "Singapore Meeting of Education Research Associations Sets the Stage for Establishing a World Education Research Association." *Educational Researcher* 38: 70–72.

Alexander, R. J. 2001a. "Border Crossings: Towards a Comparative Pedagogy." *Comparative Education* 37: 507–23.

Alexander, R. J. 2001b. *Culture and Pedagogy: International Comparisons in Primary Education.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Anderson, Gary L., and Martha Montero-Sieburth. 1998. *Educational Qualitative Research in Latin America: The Struggle for a New Paradigm.* New York: Garland.

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M., 2006a. "Les divers courants en anthropologie de l'éducation." *Éducation et Sociétés* 17: 7–27.

———. 2006b. "Ethnography." In *Handbook of Complementary Methods in Educational Research,* 3rd ed., eds. Gregory Camilli, Patricia B. Elmore, and Judith Green. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

———. 2011. "World Anthropologies of Education." In *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education,* ed. Bradley A. U. Levinson and Mica Pollack. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M., and Ntal-I'Mbirwa Alimasi. 2001. "Are Pedagogical Ideals Embraced or Imposed? The Case of Reading Instruction in the Republic of Guinea." In *Policy as Practice: Toward a Comparative Sociocultural Analysis of Educational Policy,* ed. Margaret Sutton and Bradley A. U. Levinson. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Atkinson, Paul, Sara Delamont, and Martyn Hammersley. 1988. "Qualitative Research Traditions: A British Response to Jacob." *Review of Educational Research* 58, no. 2: 231–50.

Barrio Maestre, José María. 2004. *Elementos de Antropología Pedagógica.* Madrid: Ediciones Rialp.

Barth, Fredrik, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman. 2005. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French and American Anthropology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Batallán, Graciela. 1998. "Appropriating Ethnography for Research in Education: Reflections on Recent Efforts in Argentina and Chile." In *Educational Qualitative Research in Latin America: The Struggle for A New Paradigm,* ed. Gary Anderson and Martha Montero-Sieburth. New York: Garland.

Beach, Dennis, and Johannes Lunneblad. 2011. "Ethnographic Investigations of Issues of Race in Scandinavian Education Research." *Ethnography and Education* 6, no. 1: 29-43.

Bollnow, Otto Friedrich. 1987. *Crisis and New Beginning: Contributions to Pedagogical Anthropology.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Boškovic, Aleksandar. 2008. *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Boumard, Patrick, and Rose-Marie Bouvet. 2007. "La Société européenne d'ethnographie de l'éducation." *Ethnologie française* 4: 689–97.

Breidenstein, Georg. 2007. "The Meaning of Boredom in School Lessons. Participant Observation in the Seventh and Eighth Form." *Ethnography and Education* 2: 93–108.

Candela, Antonia, Elsie Rockwell, and César Coll. 2004. "What in the World Happens in Classrooms? Qualitative Classroom Research." *European Educational Research Journal* 3, no. 3: 692–713.

Caria, Telmo H. 2003. *Experiência etnográfica e teoria social.* Porto, Portugal: Afrontamento.

Carrasco Pons, Sílvia. 2003. "La escolarización de los hijos e hijas de inmigrantes y de minorías étnico-culturales." *Revista de educación,* no. 330: 99–136.

Christina, Rachel. 2006. *Tend the Olive, Water the Vine: Globalization and the Negotiation of Early Childhood in Palestine.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Clarke, Prema. 2001. *Teaching and Learning: The Culture of Pedagogy.* New Delhi: Sage.

Connell, R. W. 1989. "Cool Guys, Swots and Wimps: The Interplay of Masculinity and Education." *Oxford Review of Education* 15, no. 3: 291–303.

Crossley, Michael, and Graham Vulliamy. 1997. "Qualitative Research in Developing Countries: Issues and Experience." In *Qualitative Educational Research in Developing Countries,* ed. Michael Crossley and Graham Vulliamy. New York: Garland.

del Río, Pablo, and Amelia Álvarez. 1995. "Directivity: The Cultural and Educational Construction of Morality and Agency. Some Questions Arising from the Legacy of Vygotsky." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 26: 384–409.

Delbos, Geneviève, and Paul Jorion. 1984. *La transmission des savoirs.* Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Derouet, Jean-Louis, Agnès Henriot-van Zanten, and Régine Sirota. 1990. "Approches ethnographiques en sociologie de l'éducation: L'école et la communauté, l'établissement scolaire, la classe." In *Sociologie de l'Éducation: Dix ans de recherche. Recueil de notes de synthèse publiées par la Revue Française de Pédagogie,* ed. Jean Hassenforder. Paris: Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique and l'Harmattan.

Diallo, Boubacar Bayero. 2004. *Parcours scolaires des filles en Afrique: le cas de la Guinée.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université de Québec à Montréal, Montréal, Canada.

Dolby, Nadine. 2002. "Making White: Constructing Race in a South African High School." *Curriculum Inquiry* 32, no. 1: 7–29.

Dracklé, Dorle, Iain R. Edgar, and Thomas K. Schippers. 2003. *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Duru-Bellat, Marie, and Agnès van Zanten. 2006. *Sociologie de l'école,* 3rd ed. Paris: Armand Colin.

EFA Global Monitoring Report Team. 2011. Education for All 2011. The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education *EFA Global Monitoring Report.* Paris: UNESCO.

Egbo, Benedicta. 2000. *Gender, Literacy and Life Chances in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Clevedon, UK/Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Eldering, Lotty. 1996. "Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education in an International Perspective." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 27, no. 3: 315–30.

Filiod, Jean-Paul. 2007. "Anthropologie de l'école. Perspectives." *Ethnologie française* no. 37: 581–95.

Fisher, A. D. 1988. "Anthropology and Education in Canada, the Early Years 1850–1970." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 29, no. 1: 89–102.

Forsey, Martin. 2007. *Challenging the System?: A Dramatic Tale of Neoliberal Reform in an Australian High School.* Greenwich, CT: IAP.

Franzé Mudanó, Adela, ed. 2007. "Antropología de la educación y la escuela" (theme issue). *Revista de Antropología Social,* no. 16. Available at http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/revista?codigo=1517.

Garcion-Vautour, Laurence. 2003. "L'entrée dans l'étude à l'école maternelle. Le rôle des rituels du matin." *Ethnologie Française,* no. 33: 141–47.

Gibson, Margaret A. 1997. "Complicating the Immigrant/Involuntary Minority Typology." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 28, no. 3: 431–454.

Gillborn, David. 1997. "Ethnicity and Educational Performance in the United Kingdom: Racism, Ethnicity, and Variability in Achievement." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 28, no. 3: 375–393.

González, Norma. 1999. "What Will We Do When Culture Does Not Exist Anymore?" *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 30: 431–35.

Goodman, Roger. 1990. *Japan's International Youth: The Emergence of a New Class of Schoolchildren.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. "Education: Anthropological Aspects." In *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Gordon, Tuula, Janet Holland, and Elina Lahelma. 2001. "Ethnographic Research in Educational Settings." In *Handbook of Ethnography,* ed. Paul A. At-

kinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn H. Lofland. London: Sage.

Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. *Languages of Africa.* The Hague: Mouton.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1987. "The World in Creolisation." *Africa* 57: 546–59.

———. 1992. *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning.* New York: Columbia.

Heilbron, Johan L., Nicolas Guilhot, and Laurent Jeanpierre. 2008. "Toward a Transnational History of the Social Sciences." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 44: 146–60.

Henriot-van Zanten, Agnès, and Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt. 1992. "L'Anthropologie de l'éducation aux États-Unis: méthodes, théories et applications d'une discipline en évolution." *Revue Française de Pédagogie,* no. 101: 79–104.

Herrera, Linda, and Carlos Alberto Torres, eds. 2006. *Cultures of Arab Schooling: Critical Ethnographies from Egypt.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Hünersdorf, Bettina, Christoph Maeder, and Burkhard Müller, eds. 2008. *Ethnographie und Erziehungswissenschaft: Methodologische Reflexionen und empirische Annäherungen.* Weinheim/München: Juventa Verlag.

Ingold, Tim. 1994. "General Introduction." In *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture, and Social Life,* ed. Tim Ingold. London: Routledge.

Jacquin, Marianne. 2006. "La revue *Anthropology and Education Quarterly.* Analyse des dix dernières années." *Éducation et Sociétés,* no. 17: 89–104.

Jarvis, Hugh W. *Worldwide Email Directory of Anthropologists.* http://anthropology.buffalo.edu/WEDA/. Retrieved 2 September 2010.

Jociles, María Isabel. 2007. Panorámica de la antropología de la educación en España: estado de la cuestión y recursos bibliográficos. *Revista de Antropología Social,* no. 16: 67–116.

Khaldi, M., and Nader Wahbeh. 2000. "Teacher Education in Palestine: Understanding Teachers' Realities and Development through Action Research." In *Teacher Education in the Euro-Mediterranean Region,* ed. R. G. Sultana. New York: Peter Lang.

Kipnis, Andrew. 2001. "Articulating School Countercultures." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 32: 472–92.

Larsson, Staffan. 2006. "Ethnography in Action. How Ethnography Was Established in Swedish Educational Research." *Ethnography and Education* 1: 177–95.

Levinson, Bradley A. U., Sandra L. Cade, Ana Padawer, and Ana Patricia Elvir, eds. 2002. *Ethnography and Educational Policy across the Americas.* Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.

Maclure, Richard, Ed. 1997. *Overlooked and Undervalued: A Synthesis of ERNWACA Reviews on the State of Education Research in West and Central Africa.* Washington, DC: USAID Bureau for Africa/Office of Sustainable Development.

Mayer, Phillip, ed. 1967. *Socialization: The Approach from Social Anthropology.* London: Association of Social Anthropologists of the Commonwealth.

Meyer, John W. 2001. "Reflections: The Worldwide Commitment to Educational Equality." *Sociology of Education* 74: 154–58.

Meyer, John W., David Kamens, and Aaron Benavot. 1992. *School Knowledge for the Masses: World Models and National Primary Curricular Categories in the Twentieth Century.* Washington, DC: Falmer.

Middleton, John. 1970. *From Child to Adult: Studies in the Anthropology of Education.* Garden City, NY: Natural History Press for the American Museum of Natural History.

Nakhlen, Khalil, and Nader Wahbeh. 2005. "Doing Research on Improving the Quality of Basic Education in Palestine." Paper presented at the Global Conference on Education Research in Developing Countries sponsored by Global Development Network. Prague, Czech Republic.

Ogbu, John U., ed. 2008. *Minority Status, Oppositional Culture and Schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Okano, Kaori. 1997. "Third-generation Koreans' Entry into the Workforce in Japan." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 28: 524–49.

Oliviera Gonçalves, Luis Alberto, and Petronilha Beatriz Gonçalves e Silva. 1998. *Jogo das Diferenças: o Multiculturalismo e Seus Contexto.* Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

Osborne, A. Barry. 1996. "Practice into Theory into Practice: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy for Students We Have Marginalized and Normalized." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 27, no. 3: 285–314.

Ouyang, Huhua. 2006. Author's note preceding "Un aller simple. Parcours d'une enseignante novatrice en Chine continentale." *Éducation et Sociétés*, no. 17: 49–72.

Poveda, David. 2001. "La Ronda in a Spanish Kindergarten Classroom with a Cross-Cultural Comparison to Sharing Time in the U.S.A." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 32, no. 3: 301–25.

Qvarsell, Birgitta, and Christoph Wulf, eds. 2003. *Culture and Education.* Munich: Waxmann Münster.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins, and Arturo Escobar. 2006. *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power.* New York: Berg.

Rockwell, Elsie. 1998. "Ethnography and the Commitment to Public Schooling: A Review of Research at the DIE." In *Educational Qualitative Research in Latin America,* ed. Gary Anderson and Martha Montero-Sieburth. New York: Garland.

———. 2002. "Constructing Diversity and Civility in the United States and Latin America." In *Ethnography and Educational Policy Across the Americas,* ed. Bradley A. U. Levinson, Sandra L. Cade, Ana Padawer, and Ana Patricia Elvir. Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.

Rockwell, Elsie, and Ana Maria R. Gomes. 2009. "Introduction to the Special Issue: Rethinking Indigenous Education from a Latin American Perspective." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 40, no. 2: 97–109.

Rogoff, Barbara. 2003. *The Cultural Nature of Human Development.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarangapani, Padma. 2003. *Constructing School Knowledge: An Ethnography of Learning in an Indian Village.* New Delhi: Sage.

Sharpe, Keith. 1992. "Educational Homogeneity in French Primary Education: A Double Case Study." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 13: 216–37.

Shepel, Elina N. Lempert. 1995. "Teacher Self-Identification in Culture from Vygotsky's Developmental Perspective." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 26, no. 4: 425–42.

Souza Lima, Elvira. 1995. "Vygotsky in the International Scene: A Brief Overview." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 26: 490–99.

Spencer, Jonathan. 2000. "British Social Anthropology: A Retrospective." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 1–23.

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita, ed. 2004. *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Thapan, Meenakshi. 1991. *Life at School: An Ethnographic Study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Timmerman, Christiane. 2000. "Secular and Religious Nationalism among Young Turkish Women in Belgium: Education May Make the Difference." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 31, no. 3: 333–54.

Troman, Geoff. 2010. "Ethnography and Education. Aims and Scope." Retrieved August 30, 2010, from http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/17457823.asp

UNESCO. 2010. Index Translationum—World Bibliography of Translation. http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=7810andURL_DO=DO_TOPICandURL_SECTION=201.html. Retrieved 16 May 2010.

UNESCO & ISSC (International Social Science Council). 2010. *World Social Science Report: Knowledge Divides.* Paris: UNESCO Publishing & ISSC.

van Zanten, Agnès, and Stephen Ball. 2000. "Comparer pour comprendre: Globalisation, réinterprétations nationales et recontextualisations locales des politiques éducatives néolibérales." *Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie* 14: 113–31.

Velasco Maillo, Honorio M., F. Javier García Castaño, and Ángel Díaz de Rada. 1993. "Lecturas de antropología para educadores. El ámbito de la antropología de la educación y de la etnografía escolar." In *Colección Estructuras y Poresos. Serie Ciencias Sociales.* Madrid: Trotta Editorial.

Vermuelen, Hans F., and Arturo Alvarez Roldán. 1995. *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology.* London: Routledge.

Walker, James C., and Christine Hunt. 1988. *Louts and Legends: Male Youth Culture in an Inner-City School.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Wolcott, Harry F. 1987. On Ethnographic Intent. In *Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad,* ed. George Dearborn Spindler and Louise Spindler. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wulf, Christoph. 2003. *Anthropology of Education,* Lit Verlag. (*Anthropologie de l'éducation*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1999; *Anthropologie der Erziehung.* Weinheim: Beltz. 2001).

Yamashita, Shinji, Joseph Bosco, and J. S. Eades. 2004. *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia.* New York: Berghahn Books.