

# World Anthropologies of Education

*Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt*

There is more than one tradition of anthropology and education, or more broadly of the ethnography of education, around the world. As the anthropology of education emerged in the 1950s in the United States, parallel literatures began to appear in Brazil and in Argentina (Gomes and Gomes, in press; Neufeld, in press). In the 1970s, when the US field was blossoming, ethnography of education likewise grew in popularity in Japan and in the United Kingdom (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995; Minoura, in press). Today, there is a Commission on Anthropology of Education within the German Educational Research Association (Wulf, in press), and the single largest concentration of anthropologists of education in any one institution may be the group of nine or more anthropologists in the Danish School of Education in Copenhagen (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press).

Yet scholarship that is not produced in the United States or the United Kingdom is often little known outside its own language zone and, even when published in or translated into English, may not be widely read outside its own region, or its significance appreciated. Indeed, US scholars demonstrate only shallow familiarity even with British scholarship (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995). Within the volume you are reading at the moment, although the editors have embraced international perspectives, less than 20 percent of the chapters are written by authors employed outside the United States.

This chapter alerts readers to the need to become familiar with world literatures in anthropologies of education and ethnographies of education. The “invisibility” of the scholarship that takes place beyond one’s borders might not matter if it were merely an extension of familiar research programs into other national settings or language zones. However, although there is arguably a family resemblance (van Zanten, in press),

worldwide anthropologies and ethnographies of education vary enough in intellectual focus to merit the attention of English-language readers. For instance, some “pedagogical anthropology” in Germany, with its emphasis on human universals, strikes US readers as more akin to philosophy than to the anthropology they know. Scandinavian anthropologists pose questions about children’s lives in groups that are quite unlike the questions US scholars pose about identity and participation. The Mexican literature pays proportionately more attention to teachers than does the US literature, while in France both anthropologists and sociologists focus more frequently on higher education as a topic than do their US counterparts. Much of the extensive literature in Japan examines schools seen by the locals as ordinary and unproblematic, illustrating by contrast how much US scholars have been drawn to the story of failing students and schools.

Literatures on the anthropology of education outside the English language zone not only offer a diversity of perspectives, but are simply too vast to ignore. Admittedly, US and British publishing dominates academia; the majority of academic journals on the subject of education – about 5000 of them – publish articles or at least abstracts in English. Nonetheless, there are another 3000 academic journals on the subject of education that do *not* publish so much as an abstract in English (analysis based on Ulrich’s *Periodicals Directory*, 2009). Or to use another indicator less constrained by the international pressure on academics to publish in English, there are articles on words glossed as “education” in 85 languages other than English in the collection of non-English language Wikipedias on the web (analysis based on Wikipedia, 2010).

Even as English appears increasingly to dominate academic discourse, many academic disciplines have recently renewed their interest in cross-national exchange and translation. In 2005, scholars from Brazil, Japan, and other countries founded the World Council of Anthropological Associations, an association of associations that includes the American Anthropological Association and also the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), an organization of individual scholars with roots in an earlier era of internationalism (Ribeiro, 2005). There have also been recent efforts at translating anthropologies across national and linguistic borders (such as Barth *et al.*, 2005; Boškovic and Ericksen, 2008; Dracklé, Edgar, and Schippers, 2003; Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006). Meanwhile, in the realm of educational research, 2009 saw the founding of the World Educational Research Association, another association of associations (AERA, 2009).

World literatures should interest us not only for intellectual reasons but also out of concern for equity. The US and British publishing industry dominates scholarship far out of proportion to the number of world English speakers, and in ways that arbitrarily constrict the global flow of knowledge. Decisions made by the keepers of bibliographical databases in the United States, such as ERIC and Thomson ISI, can affect tenuring decisions outside the United States and can render research invisible even within the researcher’s home country (Larsson, 2006: 192). Universities in Europe increasingly use English as a language of instruction, as is already common in Anglophone Africa, and as a result publishers of English-language textbooks see increased profits, while students’ ability to discuss scientific concepts in their maternal languages diminishes (Brock-Utne, 2001, 2007). Scholars from outside the English-language zone use shorthand labels to refer to US and British dominance in academia and publishing, calling it “the Anglophone world” (Boškovic and Ericksen, 2008: 10) or the “Anglo-Saxon world” (as in Meunier,

2007; Schriewer, 2009), even though the latter term would startle if not offend anyone who identifies as emphatically not Anglo-Saxon, and even though both terms collapse important differences between US and British scholarship while ignoring significant English-language publishing in places like India (cf. Hannerz, 2008).

This chapter will outline some of the barriers to the free global flow of ideas within anthropologies of education. It will consider the borders created by language zones – regions that share a common language usually because of former colonial relationships. It will note other regional variations that transcend language differences, including the difference between the global North and the global South. It will also consider national differences shaped by each country’s unique history and social organization. The chapter will not attempt to survey the literatures nor to map every region and language zone, as we attempt in a forthcoming volume (Anderson-Levitt, in press). Rather, it will simply draw on chapters in that volume and on a number of collections and published literature reviews (e.g., Batallán, 1998; Jociles, 2007; Larson, 2006; Maclure, 1997; Osborne, 1996; Rockwell, 1998; Rockwell and Gomes, 2009; Souza Lima, 1995) to illustrate how anthropologies of education vary around the world, and why this matters.

In spite of the focus of this volume as a whole on anthropology, this chapter includes ethnographers of education who do not identify themselves as anthropologists. It does so in part because the definition of academic disciplines varies across nations, as we shall see, and partly because certain non-anthropologists (such as Paul Willis, Hugh Mehan, and Michelle Fine) have greatly influenced anthropology of education. However, it does so also because many non-anthropological ethnographers define ethnography more or less as anthropologists would. Thus, the editors of the British-based journal *Ethnography of Education* refer to 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). To rule out ethnographers on the basis of their disciplinary affiliation would have been premature in this initial scan of work around the world.

## **ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION IN TRANSLATION**

Of course, this chapter would not be possible were there not some communication among scholars around the world, or at least the means for establishing it. 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. Scholars also move from country to country in an international job market, sometimes making it difficult to make a claim about which scholars “belong” to which part of the world. (For the purposes of this chapter, I consider scholars to belong to the country of the institution in which they currently work, regardless of their original nationality, first language, or early training, on the assumption that expectations of their place of employment tend to shape the topics and form of their publications.) Nonetheless, there are barriers to the flow of scholarly knowledge, and the first of these is the linguistic barrier.

The very task of defining “education” reveals the challenges of crossing linguistic boundaries; there is no one-to-one correspondence among terms across languages. Anthropologists of education in different parts of the world seem to agree on a broad definition of our object of study, “education,” as all deliberate and systematic interventions in learning, whether the intervention takes place in schools, at home, or in other settings (as Hansen defined it in the United States, 1979: 28). However, although Danes usually translate the English word “education” as *uddannelse*, the term *uddannelse* misses the focus on personal development denoted by another Danish word, *dannelse*, much like the German term, *Bildung*, and by the French terms *éducation* and *formation* (Anderson, 2009). Therefore, rather than labeling educational anthropology with the literal translation *uddannelsesantropologi*, Danish scholars increasingly call it “pedagogical anthropology” (as do German anthropologists of education; Wulf and Zirfas, 1994). In English, “pedagogy” is an old-fashioned term for teaching methods, but in Danish the word connotes “moral, social and cultural formation of educated persons” (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press). As we shall see in the following section, the word “anthropology” likewise challenges easy translation.

More generally, the organization of the world into languages makes some scholarship invisible outside its language zone. For example, much of the copious literature of Japan is never translated and therefore not read and cited outside Japan (Minoura, in press). Linguistic barriers may even divide single nations: Belgium and Switzerland each have two different faces, one directed toward the United States, the United Kingdom and perhaps toward Germany, the other toward the Francophone world.

Translation is a partial solution, but translations flow asymmetrically; the prestige or power of a language can trump geographic proximity. For example, although France borders Germany, French publishers translate from English six times more often than they translate from German, just as Germany translates six times more often from English than from French (analysis of data from UNESCO, 2010). In general, translations flow from world centers, particularly from the English-language “super-center,” to the periphery, and not nearly so often in the other direction. Since 1932, over a million books have been translated from English into other languages, but only about 116,000 from other languages into English, whereas for most other languages, there is more import than export of translations (UNESCO, 2010; compare Heilbron, 1999). Thus, scholars who are monolingual in English experience the largest “blind-spot” vis-à-vis literatures originating outside their language zone.

Translating more works into English would help to remedy this great asymmetry. However, translation alone cannot guarantee that the new readers will understand and appreciate a work. Even when linguistic barriers are overcome, ideas can be lost in translation. One reason is that conventions of writing unfamiliar to an audience can obscure the significance of the work (e.g., see Uribe, 1997). For example, because of different conventions for scholarly writing, to European and Latin American readers US anthropology of education may seem to lack sufficient theoretical grounding, while to US readers European and Latin American work may seem overly theoretical and to lack empirical findings and discussion of research methods. As a result, each set of scholars may fail to take the other seriously.

## DISCIPLINARY ROOTS AND ALLIED DISCIPLINES

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 the United Kingdom, it includes the study of human beings in biological as well as social and cultural terms, although few anthropologists take the opportunity to pursue 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. To take an example quite different from US anthropology of education, cultural historical anthropology of education evolved in Germany in reaction to philosophical anthropology, which asked how humans differ from animals or from machines, and examined culture in general rather than specific cultures. German anthropology of education also draws on the history of mentalities from France, and on US anthropology’s cultural relativism, but the original philosophical interests are still faintly visible in its deep exploration of everyday learning as a process of mimesis accomplished through ritual and performance (Wulf, 2002, in press). Philosophical anthropology of education can also be found in Poland, Spain, and Italy.

In contrast, an anthropology of learning that emphasizes social and cultural context – a line of inquiry once associated with culture and personality theory and psychological anthropology in the United States – is prominent in different form in countries like Mexico and Spain. It is allied with an international community that has built cultural historical activity theory on the early insights of Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky (ISCAR, 2009; Souza Lima, 1995). Meanwhile, an anthropology of the institution of schooling, which has roots in social and cultural anthropology, dominates in countries like the United States.

In many countries of Europe the term “ethnology” refers not to a science of culture built on comparative work, as it does in the United States, but to the study of people in one’s home country, especially of people culturally and linguistically distinct from the ethnologist – a research thread that grew out of folklore and museum studies. To this day, ethnology of education in Central Europe focuses heavily on Roma populations and rarely examines mainstream schooling or topics such as the political anthropology of schooling, according to one of its reviewers (Eröss, in press). Meanwhile, ethnology in France has evolved from the study of peasants into an anthropology of France that is institutionally quite separate from mainstream French anthropology, and which has generated studies of cultural transmission outside of school (e.g., Delbos and Jorion, 1984) and, very recently, of schooling (Filiod, 2007).

However, as noted above, not all ethnography of education originated in anthropology or ethnology. In France, reacting against the over-determinism of quantitative sociology, qualitative sociologists use ethnographic methods to explore the strategies of parents, students, and other actors (Raveaud and Draelants, in press). They have

been influenced more greatly by the Chicago School of sociology than by US anthropology of education (Duru-Bellat and van Zanten, 2006); moreover, they have had only occasional interaction with the handful of French ethnologists and anthropologists who study education. In Britain, those early educational ethnographers who were actually trained in social anthropology, as were Sara Delamont (at Edinburgh) and Colin Lacey (at Manchester, in the combined sociology and social anthropology department), did not find a disciplinary home in anthropology and hence do not self-identify as anthropologists (Delamont, in press). Many of their fellow ethnographers were educated in educational sciences or in sociology, with a focus on symbolic interaction, Marxist critique, or feminist critique.

In other countries, the ethnography of education tends to be affiliated with yet other disciplines. In Japan, it appeals to educational psychologists as well as to sociologists (Minoura, in press). In Italy and the Netherlands, we see it used in the service of intercultural education (e.g., Gobbo, in press). In Mexico and Argentina, there is a strong connection to the broader discipline of anthropology and, as in Germany, anthropologists of education are also attracted to a historical approach.

Not only do authors in each strand tend to cite distinct bodies of literature but, as suggested for the German case and for ethnologists of education in Central Europe, they are sometimes drawn to distinct research themes – a topic to which I will return.

## **RESEARCH: METHODS AND OBSTACLES**

When they conduct research, ethnographers of education everywhere use participant observation and open-ended interviewing to capture the perspectives and practices of local participants, more or less explicitly in pursuit of cultural description (e.g., Beach *et al.*, 2004). 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). However, more specific research techniques vary. Scholars in West Africa are open to combining ethnographic methods with quantitative methods, often in work conducted by research teams (Diallo, in press). In Israel, some ethnographers define ethnography loosely to encompass a wide array of narrative and qualitative methods (Shlasky, Alpert, and Sabar Ben-Yeshoshua, in press). There also seems to be particular interest in practitioner research or action research in West Africa and Brazil (Diallo, in press; Gomes and Gomes, in press).

Ethnographers in some parts of the world face obstacles to doing research that would surprise most US or Western European scholars. Some state regimes have seen ethnographic research as threatening and have severely discouraged its use. Batallán (1998) observes that ethnography of education could not have developed under the former authoritarian regimes of Chile and Argentina (see also Neufeld, in press). Ethnography may have been similarly perceived as a threat in China (Ouyang, in press). Meanwhile, in parts of the world with poorly funded university systems, economic constraints make it difficult to carry out ethnography – or almost any empirical field research.

## RESEARCH THEMES SHAPED BY CANONS, CONTEXT, AND PLACE IN THE WORLD ECONOMY

Ideas get lost in translation not only because of rhetorical conventions, but also because outside readers do not grasp the significance of the translated scholarship. They may not find the subject matter relevant because it does not correspond to research questions perceived as central in their own academic setting. This section points out some of the reasons why the most common research themes vary from place to place.

Often a research theme makes sense in the context of ongoing local conversations on particular topics. By virtue of who has trained whom, who sees whom in face-to-face meetings, who can publish easily in which venues, and who is reading whom, scholars tend to engage in research conversations with a particular group of colleagues, and their writing makes reference to those local conversations. Such conversations may point to different canons of literature that grow from historically different disciplinary roots, as noted above. Language barriers and persisting difficulties of accessing literature from other parts of the world also channel scholars into certain conversations and not others, as also noted above. As a result, for the handful of scholars who gain an international audience beyond their original publications in languages like French, German, Russian, or Portuguese, their translated work is read outside the context of the research and debates within the home country that shaped it (Larsson, 2006: 191).

As an example, the question of how human beings learn, which was originally of interest to psychological anthropologists and now to cognitive anthropologists in the United States, attracts a surprisingly small amount of attention among US anthropologists of education (for a call to arms, see Varenne, Chapter 4, below). However, it is studied in Germany, as noted above, because of the disciplinary roots of Germany's pedagogical anthropology. Learning is also a topic of great interest within the international network of scholars working on cultural historical activity theory, who carry on a conversation distinct from the mainstream of educational anthropology that crosses many national boundaries, but which seems to be particularly prominent in countries such as Spain, Mexico, and Brazil (ISCAR, 2009).

Another example is the study of schooling that local participants take to be ordinary or reasonably successful. Ethnographic work in Japan, particularly among sociologists and psychologists, often describes the kind of schooling that local participants take as the implicit norm (Minoura, in press). This is generally public schooling that serves the middle-class, urban, ethnically Japanese population – the unmarked case – as opposed to schools perceived as failing or as serving mainly under-represented students. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, where much of the ethnographic work is conducted by sociologists, the unmarked case of schooling taken as normal is an important topic of research (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995).

Research themes also vary because of the distinctive historical, social, and political contexts of different nations. It is hardly surprising, for example, that in countries of conquest like Canada and the United States, anthropology of education has always included a focus on Indigenous education. There is a similar interest in Indigenous

populations in Mexico and Chile, other countries of conquest. Given the peculiar history of slavery in the United States, it is likewise not surprising that racial differences and racism preoccupy its researchers. Canada and the United States are also countries of massive immigration, and that is one explanation for the enormous interest in differences between school culture and home culture in these countries. Not by chance, the ethnography of education in France, the Netherlands, Italy, and Central Europe has shown increased interest in immigrants as the number of immigrants to Europe rises (e.g., Gobbo, in press; Eröss, in press). In several parts of Europe and now in Japan, intercultural education is a research focus, and the subjects are both indigenous minorities like Roma and new immigrants (Minoura, in press).

US anthropologists of education are so driven by the local political and historical need to alleviate racially and ethnically shaped inequities in the school system that the US literature, seen from the outside, appears to be fixated on the topic of school failure (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995). Thus, a review of articles published by the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* from 1995 to 2005 found that 63% of the articles concerned schooling and, of those, 52%, or 39 articles, addressed success and failure; meanwhile, the 37 articles that were not about schooling tended to address culture and ethnicity, language, and identity (Jacquin, 2006). In contrast, research on social class, gender, and rural–urban inequities is less abundant in the United States, as is research on schooling that is perceived by the locals as serving mainstream populations.

The example of Denmark and other Scandinavian countries illustrates a different common theme shaped by a different political and historical framework. In the context of social welfare states concerned with the provision of “good childhoods” and socially safe environments for growing moral human beings, pedagogical anthropology in Scandinavia takes as its topic not schooling per se but rather the lives of children and youth (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press). It is only because “over 90 percent of all children between age 2 and 15 attend state-funded nurseries, kindergartens, schools, after-school centers, youth clubs and state-subsidized sport associations” that the ethnography of children leads to studies of life in schools and other institutions (Anderson, 2009: 3). The Danish focus is on integration into the group rather than on academic success and failure.

The place of a country in the world economy also results in variation in common research themes. Whereas in the United States and Europe, educational literature sometimes compares schools to oppressive places like factories or prisons, in the global South – for instance, in Mexico – public schools can sometimes be seen as a liberating force that offers a relatively equalizing experience in the context of strong gender, class, and ethnic distinctions outside school (Rockwell, 1998, although schooling for indigenous students is viewed with less enthusiasm in Rockwell and Gomes, 2009). Given the difference in perspective, readers from the global North might mistakenly interpret approaches from the global South as naive, while scholars from the South might find literature from the North too jaded.

Meanwhile, in the global South, economic constraints make it difficult to carry out ethnography, and local ethnographers must often rely on international donors for funding. In west and central Africa, for example, international donors tend to control research topics since they fund almost all scholarship except for master’s theses.

Because of donor interest, research in west and central Africa focuses much more heavily on gender disparities than does the anthropology of education in North America or almost anywhere else (Diallo, in press).

Finally, position in the world economy seems to influence how much scholars conduct comparative research outside their home country. Whereas anthropologists from much of the global North, have historically gone “abroad” more often than conducting research at “home,” ethnographers of education more typically conduct research “at home.” However, in certain countries a significant minority of ethnographers of education conduct studies outside their home countries. In general, it is in countries of the global North with a history either of colonialism or of international aid in which one finds some ethnographers of education studying learning or schooling abroad; this includes the United States, Japan, the Scandinavian countries and, to a limited extent, the United Kingdom and France.

## LESSONS

Across many parts of the world, scholars conduct anthropologically or sociologically informed ethnographic studies of learning and of schooling. These studies are similar enough that we can identify, if not a common subdiscipline, at least a set of family resemblances (van Zanten, in press). The family resemblances include a commitment to analyzing issues in local context, to grasping the meaning made by local participants, and to conducting relatively long-term participant observation to gain those insights. The researchers in question tend to offer social and cultural explanations rather than purely psychological analyses, and many of them, aware of the misuse of the culture concept to reinforce stereotypes, offer sophisticated concepts of culture as a dynamic and creative process (e.g., Neufeld and Thisted, 1998; Rockwell, 2007).

However, there is enough variation across language zones and regions that we cannot afford to ignore the literatures beyond our local boundaries. One reason is that, because languages of publication vary, anthropologies of education in different parts of the globe offer terminology and metaphors that may not translate easily into our home language, for instance, *el trabajo docente* (“the work of teaching,” Rockwell and González, in press) or *dannelse* or *Bildung* (“education with a focus on personal development”). We thus have much to learn from fresh definitions and fresh concepts. Another reason is that, because specific research techniques vary, we can look to other people’s anthropologies of education for sophisticated models of desirable methods, from narrative inquiry to teacher research. A third reason is that, because common research themes vary, anthropologies of education around the world can suggest research questions that help us break out of conversations that have become too fixated on one way of seeing a problem.

The last point is particularly important. Without the broader comparative perspective, we tend to focus too narrowly on a few nationally relevant questions, such as race and ethnicity in the United States, failing to realize 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). Dialogue with colleagues doing related but not

identical kinds of work in other parts of the world can make us aware of our own taken-for-granted paradigms and can provoke us to ask questions we had not previously thought of asking. For example, would more emphasis on what local participants take to be normal, unproblematic schooling provide Americans with fresh models, or solutions, or templates for providing quality education for all? Meanwhile, would more attention to ethnicity or “race” be salutary in Germany? 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?

Besides raising questions about the subdiscipline, this chapter also raises questions of broader significance to the study of academic disciplines, higher education, and the flow of academic knowledge in general. Further study of who cites whom and of how ideas get transformed as they cross borders would raise our self-consciousness about our own enterprise as scholars and teachers.

This chapter underlines the need for several practical steps to improve communication across linguistic and economic barriers. Beyond the need to translate more work into English, I would emphasize the importance of requiring doctoral students to establish a reading knowledge of at least one language besides English, and to demonstrate that knowledge by making use of relevant literature published in that language, because there will always be research that does not get translated. We should learn and ask our students to learn to consult on-line research reports and reviews such as the open access *Reseñas Educativas/Resenhas Educativas*, edited by Gustavo Fischman, for books in Spanish and Portuguese ([edrev.info/indexs.html](http://edrev.info/indexs.html)); Spain’s open access database to research articles, “Summarios ISOC, Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades” ([bddoc.csic.es:8080/isoc.html](http://bddoc.csic.es:8080/isoc.html)); France’s open access link to journal articles ([revues.org](http://revues.org)); and the English-language *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* (indexed at [www.soc.nii.ac.jp/jasca/publication-e/frame-e.html](http://www.soc.nii.ac.jp/jasca/publication-e/frame-e.html)). As suggested at an open editorial forum on “Transnationalizing Scholarly Communication” at the 2009 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, we should recruit truly international editorial boards for journals and book series, and could practice the occasional acceptance of articles reviewed by panels of reviewers from the author’s home country rather than by the journal’s regular reviewers. Publication of reviews of the literatures from many regions and language zones on a regular basis, as the journal *Current Anthropology* used to do, would also be helpful. Finally, equitable indexing of articles and books in multiple languages will become even more important as multilingual bodies of literature burgeon. Anthropologists of education need to work with librarians and scholarly organizations to develop search engines and indexes that can help scholars find their way through an increasingly vast world literature (Brenneis, 2009). Ultimately, the most effective way to translate ideas across borders may be to form transnational research teams (Victor Zúñiga González, personal communication), but not all scholars will find the resources to conduct such studies.

There is no reason to fear that increased dialogue will lead to homogenization or to any more dominance by English speakers than exists already. Even as scholars share ideas, diversity regularly reappears, for when the “same” idea is adopted in a new setting, local users adapt its meanings and applications. Scholars “creolize” imported knowledge (Hannerz, 1987). For example, Ouyang reports how he has combined his

US sociolinguistics and anthropology of education training with Chinese sociology of societal transformation, Chinese psychology, Chinese politics, and Chinese educational reform history (in press). 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, too, such as Bourdieu's ideas from France, Freire's from Brazil, and Vygotsky's and his colleagues' from Russia. Rather than leading to homogenization, increased dialogue promises fresh ideas imported and adapted creatively into English-language anthropology and ethnography of education.

## REFERENCES

- AERA (American Educational Research Association)  
 2009 World Education Research Association Founded: Two-Year Effort Leads to New International Forum for Collaboration. *Educational Researcher* 38:388–389.
- Anderson, Sally  
 2009 “Søren's Class Is Out on Strike”: Pedagogies of “the Social” (In)forming the Anthropology of Education in Denmark. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association's Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, PA, December 6.
- Anderson, Sally, Eva Gulløv, and Karen Valentin  
 In press *Educational Anthropology in a Welfare State Perspective: The Case of Scandinavia*. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M., ed.  
 In press *Anthropologies of Education: A Global Guide to Ethnographic Studies of Learning and Schooling*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- 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*. Gary Anderson and Martha Montero-Sieburth, eds. Pp. 35–50. New York: Garland.
- Beach, Dennis, Francesca Gobbo, Bob Jeffrey, Geri Smyth, Geoff Troman, and the ECER Ethnography Network Coordinators  
 2004 *Ethnography of Education in a European Educational Researcher Perspective*. Introduction. *European Educational Research Journal* 3:534–538.
- Boškovic, Aleksandar, and Thomas Hylland Ericksen  
 2008 Introduction: Other People's Anthropologies. *In Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*. Aleksandar Boškovic, ed. Pp. 1–19. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Brenneis, Don  
 2009 Anthropology in and of the Academy: Globalization, Assessment and Our Field's Future. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 17:261–275.
- Brock-Utne, Birgit  
 2001 The Growth of English for Academic Communication in the Nordic Countries. *International Review of Education* 47:163–184.  
 2007 Language of Instruction and Research in Higher Education in Europe: Highlights from the Current Debate in Norway and Sweden. *International Review of Education* 53:367–388.

- Crossley, Michael, and Graham Vulliamy, eds  
1997 *Qualitative Educational Research in Developing Countries*. New York: Garland.
- Delamont, Sara  
In press *The Parochial Paradox: Anthropology of Education in the Anglophone World*. In *Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Delamont, Sara, and Paul Atkinson  
1995 *Fighting Familiarity: Essays on Education and Ethnography*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Delbos, Geneviève, and Paul Jorion  
1984 *La transmission des savoirs*. Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Diallo, Bayero Boubacar  
In press *Sociological and Ethnographic Research in French-speaking West Africa: The Educational Research Network for West and Central Africa (ERNWACA)*. In *Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- 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 edition. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Eröss, Gabór  
In press *Central Europe (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia)*. In *Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Filiod, Jean-Paul, ed.  
2007 *Anthropologie de l'école*. Theme issue. *Ethnologie française* 4:581–595.
- Gobbo, Francesca  
In press *Anthropology of Education in Italy*. In *Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Gomes, Ana Maria R., and Nilma Lino Gomes  
In press *Anthropology and Education in Brazil: Possible Pathways*. In *Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Hannerz, Ulf  
1987 *The World in Creolisation*. *Africa* 57:546–559.  
2008 *Anthropology's Global Ecumene*. In *Other People's Anthropologies*. Aleksandar. Boškovic, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Hansen, Judith Friedman  
1979 *Sociocultural Perspectives on Human Learning: An Introduction to Educational Anthropology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Heilbron, Johan  
1999 *Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translation as a Cultural World-System*. *European Journal of Social Theory* 2:429–444.
- Herzog, John D.  
1984 *The Socialization of Juveniles in Primate and Foraging Societies: Implications for Contemporary Education*. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 15:70–79.
- ISCAR (International Society for Cultural and Activity Research)  
2009, available at <http://www.iscar.org>, accessed April 4, 2009.
- Jacquín, Marianne  
2006 *La revue Anthropology and Education Quarterly*. Analyse des dix dernières années. *Éducation et Sociétés* 17:89–104.

- Jociles, María Isabel.  
2007 Panorámica de la antropología de la educación en España: estado de la cuestión y recursos bibliográficos. *Revista de Antropología Social* (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) 16:67–116.
- Larsson, Staffan  
2006 *Ethnography in Action. How Ethnography Was Established in Swedish Educational Research*. *Ethnography and Education* 1:177–195.
- 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 – SARA Support for Analysis and Research in Africa and HHRAA Health and Human Resources Analysis for Africa.
- Meunier, Olivier  
2007 *Approches interculturelles en éducation: Étude comparative internationale*. Lyon, France: Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique. Service de Veille Scientifique et Technologique.
- Minoura, Yasuko  
In press *The Development of Ethnographic Studies of Learning and Schooling in Japan*. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Neufeld, María Rosa, and Jens Ariel Thisted  
1998 *Los usos de la diversidad cultural en la escuela: un balance al fin de tres años*. Presented at 1er Congreso Virtual de Antropología y Arqueología, Buenos Aires/Ciberespacio, Octubre 1998, organized by Equipo Naya; available at <http://www.naya.org.ar/congreso>.
- Neufeld, María Rosa  
In press *Anthropology and Education in the Argentine Context: The Research Experience of the University of Buenos Aires Group*. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Osborne, A. Barry  
1996 *Practice into Theory into Practice: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy for Students We Have Marginalized and Normalized*. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 27:285–314.
- Ouyang, Huhua  
In press *Educational Anthropology and Ethnography in Mainland China*. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Raveaud, Marissa, and Hugues Draelants  
In press *Ethnographies of Education in the French-speaking World*. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins  
2005 *A Different Global Scenario in Anthropology*. *Anthropology News* 46(7):5–6.
- 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*. Gary Anderson and Martha Montero-Sieburth, eds. Pp. 3–34. New York: Garland.  
2002 *Constructing Diversity and Civility in the United States and Latin America*. *In Ethnography and Educational Policy Across the Americas*. Bradley A.U. Levinson, Sandra L. Cade, Ana Padawer, and Ana Patricia Elvir, eds. Pp. 3–19. Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.

- 2007 Huellas del Pasado en las Culturas Escolares: Hacia una Antropología Histórica de Procesos Educativos. *Revista de Antropología Social* 16:175–212.
- 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* 40:97–109.
- Rockwell, Elsie, and Erika González Apodaca  
In press Anthropological Research on Educational Processes in México. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Schriewer, Jürgen  
2009 “Rationalized Myths” in European Higher Education: The Construction and Diffusion of the Bologna Model. *European Education* 41:31–51.
- Shlasky, Simha, Bracha Alpert, and Naama Sabar Ben-Yehoshua  
In press Ethnography of Education in Israel. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Souza Lima, Elvira  
1995 Vygotsky in the International Scene: A Brief Overview. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 26:490–499.
- Troman, Geoff, ed.  
2010 Aims and Scope. *Ethnography and Education*, available at <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/17457823.asp>, accessed May 31, 2010.
- Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory  
available at <http://www.ulrichsweb.com/ulrichsweb>, accessed June 4, 2009.
- UNESCO  
2010 Index Translationum – World Bibliography of Translation, available at [http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=7810&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=7810&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html), accessed May 16, 2010.
- Uribe, Carlos  
1997 A Certain Feeling of Homelessness. Remarks on Esteban Krotz’s “Anthropologies of the South: Their Rise, Their Silencing and their Characteristics.” *Critique of Anthropology* 17:253–261.
- van Zanten, Agnès  
In press Concluding Comments. *Ethnography of Education Around the World: A Thousand Varieties, A Shared Paradigm*. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Wikipedia  
2010 Education (and links to corresponding pages in other languages, lower left-hand column), available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education>, accessed May 6, 2010.
- Wolcott, Harry F.  
1987 On Ethnographic Intent. *In Interpretive Ethnography of Education at Home and Abroad*. George D. Spindler and Louise Spindler, eds. Pp. 37–57. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wulf, Christoph  
2002 *Anthropology of Education*. Muenster/New York: Waxmann.
- Wulf, Christoph, and Joerg Zirfas, eds.  
1994 *Theorien und Konzepte Pädagogischer Anthropologie*. Donauwörth.
- Wulf, Christoph  
In press Towards a Historical Cultural Anthropology of Education: The Berlin Ritual Study. *In Anthropologies of Education*. Kathryn M. Anderson-Levitt, ed. New York: Berghahn Books.