

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Dewilde, J. and Creese, A. (2016), Discursive Shadowing in Linguistic Ethnography. Situated Practices and Circulating Discourses in Multilingual Schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 47: 329-339, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12158>. Published by American Anthropological Association.

# Discursive shadowing in linguistic ethnography.

## Situated practices and circulating discourses in multilingual schools

Joke Dewilde

Angela Creese

**Abstract:** We consider discursive shadowing as methodology in linguistic ethnography and how it refines our analyses of participants' situated practices. In addition to the constant and extended company the researcher and key-participant keep with one another in the field, shadowing in a linguistic ethnographic approach includes the ubiquitous audio-recording of interactions, which provides opportunities to collect interactional data as they circulate across speech events and sediment into durable teacher identities in multilingual schools.

**Running head:** Discursive Shadowing

**Keywords:** discursive shadowing, linguistic ethnography, bilingual education, bilingual teachers

### Introduction

In this paper we ask what *discursive shadowing* contributes to analysis in linguistic ethnography. Discursive shadowing involves the study of individuals over a period of time by means of participant observation and audio recordings and puts the conversations between researcher and participant at the core of the analysis. More precisely, we consider the possibilities of discursive shadowing as a methodological construct and ask whether it refines our analyses of participants' situated practices in educational research. Drawing on the study of the bilingual teacher Mohammed at Ullstad school in Norway (Dewilde, 2013), we will illustrate how a combination of the researcher and bilingual teacher's joint movement across the school, their common reflection on pedagogical issues, and the ubiquitous recordings of their conversation created rich opportunities for collecting material that provided new insights into the circulation of discourses in multilingual school settings and thus into the challenges, problems, and opportunities of Mohammed's work and collaboration with other teachers.

The education of more recent minorities is a highly politicized field in Norway and elsewhere, and students' home languages often have very little space in schools in general, and for teaching and learning in particular (Dewilde, 2013; Hvistendahl, 2009; Conteh, Begum, and Riasat, 2014). It is in this light that the bilingual teacher's work and collaboration with other teachers in the education of emergent bilingual students needs to be understood. Several researchers have drawn attention to their low status in the educational system (Dewilde, 2013; Engen and Ryen, 2009; Valenta, 2009), and there is a tendency in schools where professional discourse is subject focused and transmission oriented, which positions teachers providing support as on the periphery of the school (Creese, 2005; Martin-Jones and Saxena, 2003).

In this paper we consider how discursive shadowing allows the researcher to attend to the wider circulating discourses of the institution through mobility and audio recording and ask how a linguistic ethnographic perspective might contribute to a methodological literature aimed at establishing a 'movement-driven social science' in what researchers describe as the 'mobilities paradigm' (Büscher, Urry, and Witchger, 2011). Moreover, we will explore how linguistic ethnography can contribute to this paradigm through its investment in the strategic value of discourse analysis in ethnography (Copland and Creese, 2015).

It is worth saying at the onset that we are not arguing for the superiority of shadowing in relation to other data techniques in ethnography. Indeed, along with others (Jirón, 2011; Kusenbach, 2003) we view shadowing as a hybrid form of participant observation that allows for participation in the research setting while also affording opportunities for ethnographic interviews with participants. However, what is not emphasized in the shadowing literature is the nature of interactional data collected while on the move and the possibilities it allows for an inter-contextual and inter-textual analysis as researchers listen into, take part in and record the language practices of those we shadow. In fact, it is precisely the researcher and the participant's joint movement, combined with continuous reflection and audio recordings which provides insights into the (working) life of the participant. These insights would not have been

possible to obtain when only observing a participant as one of many, simply interviewing, or having the participant record him or herself without the researcher being in the field. In other words, shadowing in a linguistic ethnographic perspective more explicitly requires attention to the circulation of language practices in the institution and in the research process; to the chains of meanings created as discourses are picked up, developed, silenced, and ignored by different participants in the social setting. The researcher is present in a range of interactions some fleeting and some extended.

We begin with the background of the study, which includes the Norwegian educational context and the case of Mohammed. We present shadowing as a mobile and reflexive method, before illustrating how a linguistic ethnography contributes to further developing shadowing as a methodical construct. The remainder of the paper describes the analysis of the circulation of discourses of one particular day in the field. This is presented to show the affordances of discursive shadowing. In the concluding section, we discuss some of the findings of using this approach and point to a number of implications made apparent through this method of data collection.

### The study

In the linguistic ethnographic study we describe below, Dewilde (2013) shadowed two bilingual teachers in a Norwegian school in a year-long ethnography. In this paper, we focus on the bilingual teacher Mohammed, whom the researcher studied at Ullstad lower secondary school. Mohammed was around 40 years old, was earning a Bachelor for Bilingual Teachers and had five years of teaching experience. His home language was Somali, and he had good skills in Norwegian. Besides his part-time position at Ullstad, Mohammed taught at two other primary schools, thus commuting between three schools on a weekly basis.

Ullstad is situated in a medium sized Norwegian town in East Norway in an area which is made up of fewer immigrants than the national average. With its approximately 320 students, it is a large lower secondary school according to Norwegian standards. The students are

between 13 and 15 years old and attend years 8–10, which is the final stage of their compulsory education. Twelve percent of them received bilingual subject teaching by one of the school's five bilingual teachers. At the time of the study, Mohammed was responsible for the teaching of emergent-bilingual students from a Somali background in the school. The students had been in Norway between eight months and five years, and it is common for them to have received little or no previous schooling upon arrival.

Prior to the study, Mohammed and Dewilde had agreed upon the following practicalities connected to the discursive shadowing of Mohammed: Dewilde would be present at the school before his arrival. She would wait for him in the staffroom, and accompany him to his desk after exchanging some greeting phrases. Mohammed would then clip a microphone onto his shirt, and put the corresponding digital-voice recorder into one of his trouser pockets. From then on, and until the end of Mohammed's working day, Dewilde would follow him in many different places and situations: for example, in the team rooms interacting with other teachers, reading the newspaper alone in the staffroom during a break, teaching small groups in the library, and being an assistant teacher in different subjects. As a rule, the researcher and Mohammed would talk while moving from one place to another. During those times they talked about a range of topics in particular about the pedagogic rationale for some of the decisions he made. These topics were equally initiated by Mohammed and the researcher. In line with an ethnographic approach, the researcher aimed at understanding the situation from Mohammed's point of view, rather than taking the role of supervisor in order to improve practice, which is common in an action research design. When Mohammed was in conversation with other teachers and students, Dewilde would keep more in the background and listen in. Also, Mohammed would sometimes wander off, leaving Dewilde behind. Since his conversations were taped, she could access and treat them as interactional data. Sometimes Mohammed would turn off the recorder, for example during his lunch breaks or when parents came to the school to talk to him. In order to empower Mohammed as a key participant, he was the only

one wearing a microphone, leaving him in charge of the recordings. The rest of the staff were informed about the recordings through the school's management and had been given the opportunity to refrain from being recorded.

#### Discursive shadowing as mobile linguistic ethnographic method

Across the social sciences, existing interpretive methods are criticized for dealing poorly with movement, diversity, and change. John Law and John Urry (2004:403) argue for an approach that deals with the fleeting, the *slips* and slides, and the 'time-space compressed outbursts' which follow movement and displacement. Monika Büscher, John Urry, and Katian Witchger's (2011) work is part of a body of research aiming at developing a mobility paradigm. For them, the term 'mobility' does not just refer to movement, but also to the broader project of 'establishing a 'movement-driven' social science in which movement, potential movement, and blocked movement, as well as voluntary/temporary *immobilities*, practices of dwelling and 'nomadic' place-making are all viewed as constitutive of economic, social and political relations' (Büscher et al., 2011:4). Mobility theorists argue that it is commonplace to think of mobility as secondary to forms of sedentarism in the social sciences and this should be reversed to view mobility as a primal state (Cresswell and Martin, 2012). In other words, mobility and fluidity should not be viewed as exception in a solid world. Indeed, we are told '[s]olid bodies are just exceptionally slow moving fluids' (Webb 2000: xi, in Cresswell and Martin, 2012:520). Mobility theorists work to show 'the irreducible complexity in the order of events' (Webb, 2000:xii), and 'the lack of predictability and stability in such unfolding circumstances' (Cresswell and Martin, 2012:523). There is an ongoing tensional dynamic between order and disorder.

Shadowing is an example of a mobile and a reflexive method. As already mentioned in the introduction, it involves 'following selected people in their everyday occupations for a time' (Czarniawska, 2007:17). Seonaidh McDonald (2005:456) also points to what she calls the 'running commentary' from the person being shadowed in response to the researcher's

questions. Her usage of the adjective ‘running’ fits well with the constant movement in shadowing, whereas her emphasis on ‘commentary’ highlights the interactions that go on between researcher and participant, which are at the heart of discursive shadowing. In fact, the close company kept between researcher and participant in shadowing offers unique opportunities for relationship building and ‘reflectional’ data (Dewilde, 2013). Paola Jirón (2011) offers an account of becoming ‘la sombre’ (the shadow) and describes entering into practices, dialogues and interaction in a constant engagement through moving with people physically and interactionally.

Linguistic ethnographers of education study language use in educational contexts and how this presupposes wider circulating discourses which participants draw on to make meaning. In attending to the interactions of participants in classrooms, hallways, and other school spaces we investigate how language is used to create and maintain social relationships and create ‘durable identities’ across events (Wortham, 2008a). We study the social consequences of these interactions as they sediment into recognized ideologies used in particular domains. Researchers, like the participants we study, cannot understand what signs mean in context without ‘attending to the more widely circulating models or ideologies that provide a starting point for local interactional work’ (Wortham, 2008b:91). In the school contexts we study, we investigate which ‘social models of language’ (Silverstein, 1992) or registers are most salient to our participants. An example of a silence we found in Dewilde’s (2013) study is the subject teachers’ frequent informative tone in conversations with the bilingual teacher, which left the bilingual teacher with few opportunities to actively contribute to the development of the topic. This became apparent in Mohammed’s frequent minimal responses. These signs are linked to and understood as part of the wider circulating ideologies of the low status of bilingual education in Norwegian schools.

In this framework, the continuous conversations between the researcher and the key participant not only have the status as ordinary field conversations where the researcher shares

and discusses early analysis. They also serve as an additional source of interactional data in which the researcher plays an active role in the everyday school events. This means that the researchers' voices are worked into the analysis as we play our part in shaping and representing the social action we observe. This is in line with what may be called the reflexive enterprise of doing ethnography, which requires the researcher to tell the story we think the analysis of the data warrants. Accordingly, Monica Heller (2008:251) points out that in telling our story we must find our own voice, reflecting on and taking responsibility for what we say, how we say it, and to whom it is said. This brings up issues of relationship boundaries, ethics, and perspective (Dewilde, 2013).

Discursive shadowing, because of its mobility and its audio-recording, allows for the study of discourse chains or trajectories to be viewed across speech events with the potential to understand how enduring patterns become established in institutional settings. In other words, the analysis of 'interactional chains' (Linell, 1998:156) amounts to looking for series of communicative situations in which the 'same' content is treated. These recontextualisations at different levels involve the recycling and reinterpretation of meanings, such as 'shifts of meaning, new perspectives, accentuation of some semantic aspects and the attenuation or total elimination of others' (Linell, 1998:157).

In sum, discursive shadowing involves the study of individuals over a period of time. The joint movement, common reflection and ubiquitous recordings create opportunities in terms of understanding key participants everyday lives, and of investigating how the interactions they engage in are infused with institutionally salient discourses. It also provides for opportunities for fruitful partnerships between the researcher and the participant where both parties mutually invest in the pedagogical relationship. In the next section, we provide examples of discursive shadowing in action through the case of Mohammed.

The science test episode



To illustrate how discursive shadowing allows for discourse chains to be viewed across speech events, we draw on linguistic ethnographic material from the case of Mohammed at Ullstad school (Dewilde, 2013). In our analysis, we look for chains, linkages, and trajectories across events and the potential of discursive shadowing to analyze processes of repetition and circulation. That is, how topics related to a science test are discursively recast, reiterated or silenced as Mohammed interacts with a range of people, including the science teacher Mette and the researcher, throughout the school day. On the basis of five conversational excerpts, labelled ‘the science test episode’, we consider the wider implications of these five events in relation to the larger data set. In this particular episode, Mohammed is teamed up with his colleague Mette. Mette is a general teacher who specializes in science and mathematics. She has more than 15 years of teaching experience and has a permanent position at Ullstad. As most teachers in the school, she has some experience in teaching emergent bilingual pupils, but she has no formal education in the field. At the time of the study, Mohammed joined Mette in one out of three science lessons a week with class 10B, particularly being responsible for the emergent bilingual pupils from a Somali background. The other lessons, Mette taught alone. There was little or no collaboration between the teachers in terms of content, organization or the pupils’ learning needs.

Mette was responsible for the science lesson, while Mohammed was to adapt Mette’s teaching to the needs of three Somali students. Even with Mohammed’s weekly help, science proved to be a challenging subject for the three students, who had little previous schooling. This led them to frequently skip classes, especially when there was planned a test, as on this particular day. When Mohammed and the researcher arrive at the science classroom, Mohammed discovers that none of them have come to class. In the extracts below we have retained non-standard Norwegian in the English translations.

*Excerpt 1*

Mohammed: “Ingen.” [No one.]

Mette: “Jeg har ikke hatt klassa her før engang så jeg veit-” [I haven’t had this class before so I don’t know-]

Mo: “Åkei jeg veit Zakaria at er her så jeg skal prøve å finne ham. Jeg har ikke sett Ahmed. Joke, jeg prøver å finne noen.” [OK I know that Zakaria is here so I’ll try to find him. I haven’t seen Ahmed. Joke, I’ll try to find someone.]

Me: “Skal vara naturfagprøve i klassa nå, før dom fikk beskjed om det i går men- eh, jeg trur det er kanskje derfor døm ikke kommer da for det det-” [There’ll be a natural science test in class now, cause they were told about it yesterday but- eh, I think maybe that’s the reason why they don’t come cause cause-]

Mo: “Åkei.” [OK.]

Me: “Men det kan vara like greit kanskje at du får med deg prøva også kan dekk snakke litt om det.” [But maybe it’s just as well that you take the test with you and then you can talk a bit about it.]

Mo: “Mm men hvorfor skal skal-” [Mm but why should should-]

Me: “Men da kan du få med deg prøva.” [But then you can take the test with you.]

Mo: “Åkei.” [OK.]

Me: “Men jeg har jo som sagt ikke sett dem, men jeg trur kanskje at dom er borte fordi det er prøve nå. Hehe.” [But as I said, I haven’t seen them, but I think that maybe they aren’t here because there’s a test now. Heheh.]

Mo: “Det kan godt være. Det kan godt være ja.” [It may well be. It may well be, yes.]

Me: “Vet ikke om dere finn et anna rom å vera på eller hva dere gjør.” [Don’t know if you’ll find another room to be in or what you’ll do.]

Mo: “Det skal jeg snakke med dem først, hvis jeg finner dem, mm hehehe.” [I’ll talk to them first, if I find them, mm heheheh.]

Excerpt 1 is a typical conversation between Mohammed and Mette, more so it is a typical conversation between Mohammed and all other subject teachers in the study, both in terms of topic and structure (Dewilde, 2013). As the teacher in charge, Mette is concerned with the students’ presence and where Mohammed will teach them. She suspects that Zakaria, Ahmed and Deeq have skipped the lesson because a test has been planned, but as we see, the reasons for their non-attendance are not discussed. Mohammed contributes either with minimal responses or with short answers. At one point, he starts an utterance with ‘Mm but why should should’, but he is interrupted by Mette. We have no possibility of knowing what Mohammed was about to say, but this conversation illustrates how he is left with few opportunities to reflect upon possible reasons why the students have not turned up for class, or how a bilingual teacher should adapt a subject science test for bilingual students.

In the next excerpt Zakaria, one of the students, turns up in the hallway while Mette has started the lesson. Drawing on Somali, Mohammed asked the boy to find a Somali-English-Somali dictionary and explained to the researcher that he will teach him how to use a dictionary to answer the test questions.

#### *Excerpt 2*

Mo: “Jeg skal lære han hvordan han kan bruke ordbok for å svare spørsmålene.” [I will teach him how he can use a dictionary to answer the questions.]

Auth. A: “Ja.” [Yes.]

Mo: “Ikke sant. For hvis det blir for vanskelig, skal jeg forklare men jeg vil at han skal prøve først uten hjelp.” [Right. Cause if it gets too difficult, I’ll explain, but I want him to try first without help.]

Excerpt 2 is a typical conversation where Mohammed comments and explains his choice of action to the researcher (cf. McDonald, 2005:456), that is, he wants the student to fetch a dictionary in order to try and make sense of the test questions himself. The use of dictionaries is also an acknowledged bilingual pedagogical strategy to encourage pupil autonomy. It is the nature of their dialogic relationship which encourages Mohammed to comment on his pedagogical decisions to the researcher.

Once in the group room, however, Mohammed apparently doubted his decision to let the boy use a dictionary. He informed the researcher that he needed to check with Mette, who was in the science class further down the hall. Even though Mohammed left the researcher behind, the audio-recording allows us to study their conversation at a later point in time.

### *Excerpt 3*

Mo: “Har han lov til å bruke hjelpemidler?” [Is he allowed to use aids?]  
 Me: “Han skal egentlig ikke det.” [He’s not really supposed to.]  
 Mo: “Ingenting?” [Nothing?]  
 Me: “Nei.” [No.]  
 Mo: “Ok.” [Ok.]

In Excerpt 3 we see how the science teacher is of a different opinion when it comes to aids. At no point does Mohammed share his thoughts or challenge Mette’s decision. In fact, they hardly talked together at all during the fieldwork, and consequently are not able to mutually invest in some sort of reflexive partnership. In order to understand Mohammed’s ‘pedagogic silence’ here, we need to pay attention to the intertextual links across speech events

in the school which endorse secondary school ‘professional discourse’ as subject focused and transmission orientated (Creese, 2005). In her analysis of Mohammed’s conversations with colleagues, Dewilde (2013) found that there were few opportunities for him to discuss issues related to his work, and that it was the subject teachers who set the agenda.

Back in the group room, Mohammed removed Zakaria’s dictionary and explained that Mette did not allow for any form of aids. The boy then asked to leave to use the toilet and disappeared for about ten minutes. In the meanwhile, Mohammed started a conversation with the researcher and explained Zakaria’s absence.

*Excerpt 4*

- Mo: “Det er veldig tøft for han. Han skjønner, han sier at han ikke forstår.” [It’s very hard for him. He realises, he says he doesn’t understand.]
- Au: “Nei.” [No.]
- Mo: “Han forstår spørsmålet, men veit ikke hva han skal svar. Og han er den eneste av de andre som tør egentlig å være her.” [He understands the question, but doesn’t know what to answer. And he is the only one of the others who dares to be here.]
- Au: “Ja, ikke sant. Det er kanskje for strengt til å ikke få lov til å bruke hjelpemidler.” [Yes, right. Maybe it’s too strict not to be allowed to use aids.]
- Mo: “Ja, det er for strengt. Ja, det er litt for strengt.” [Yes, it’s too strict. Yes, it’s a bit too strict.]

Excerpt 4 shows Mohammed opens up and initiates talk on issues of pedagogic concern. The researcher takes the role of listener (cf. Excerpt 2), but increasingly feels able to voice her views as she more actively engages in pedagogical reflection with the key participant. This active researcher role, however, would not have been possible without the preceding discursive shadowing which allowed for the researcher to develop the relationship over time, through

common experiences and mutual investment. The researcher's presence revealed Mohammed's pedagogical commitment to his student. Their conversations also brought greater clarity to the pedagogical silence between the teacher pair, Mette and Mohammed. Analytically what has not been said between two teachers becomes more easily interpretable in relation to what is said between researcher and key participant. Mette and Mohammed's non-interaction about pedagogy points to the unexploited potential of teacher collaboration and support for bilingual pupils.

Excerpt 5 below is a rare instance of Mohammed calling on Mette, but as we will see, very little is said. Later that day, Mohammed was able to trace down Ahmed, one of the students who had skipped science, and he made him do the test. Below we see what happened when Mohammed returned Ahmed's test to Mette at the end of the day.

*Excerpt 5*

- Mo: "Hei, eh, Mette?" [Hi, eh, Mette?]
- Me: "Der har du prøven?" [There you've got the test?]
- Mo: "Ahmed, han kom i siste økt." [Ahmed, he came in the last teaching period.]
- Me: "Ja." [Yes.]
- Mo: "Jeg ga- Jeg ga han-" [I gave- I gave him-]
- Me: "Så bra. Takk. Zakaria kom og leverte sin så det var euh-" [Good. Thanks. Zakaria came and handed in his so that was eh-]
- Mo: "Mm." [Mm.]
- Me: "Takk skal du ha." [Thank you.]
- Mo: "Takk i lige måde." [Thank you too.]

Again, we see the lack of pedagogical reflection between the two teachers (cf. Excerpt 3). Mohammed explains that he had made Ahmed do the test in the last teaching period of the day, and Mette informs Mohammed that Zakaria has handed in his test to her after all. There is

no talk on possible reasons for students skipping the test, on how Mohammed had experienced the test situation in the group room, or if Mette has had a chance to look at Zakaria's sheet. This pedagogical silence is in stark contrast to the continuous pedagogical reflection Mohammed and the researcher engaged in, and the close relationship they were able to build on the basis of this. Dewilde's fieldnotes also record:

After class, Mohammed and I walk to Mette's team room to return the test. We are still deeply engaged in discussing the challenges and opportunities the test provides for the students when we arrive at her desk. Mohammed returns the test, and the silence between the teachers is confronting. We walk to Mohammed's team room further down the hall in silence. I don't really know what to say. The silence is a painful reminder of the structural hierarchies and Mohammed's pedagogical loneliness in the school.

This vignette is a reminder of how discursive shadowing has the potential to break down power structures, create meaningful partnerships, and generate learning opportunities within the relationship. Also, if the continuous discursive shadowing had not taken place, it would not have been possible to show the potential of bilingual teachers in the education of emergent bilingual pupils, and the challenges these students face, in the same way.

In sum, we have illustrated how discursive shadowing, based on joint movement (Büscher, Urry, and Witchger, 2011), common reflection (Jirón, 2011), and ubiquitous recording, provides us with the linguistic ethnographic material needed to analyze wider discursive chains or trajectories, a possibility that was missing from the current shadowing literature. In the next section, we discuss the social consequences of these interactions and end by summarizing the contribution of discursive shadowing in relation to mobility, space, and relationship.

Discussion

To conclude, discursive shadowing contributes to what Büsher et al. (2011) have called a ‘mobilities paradigm’ as it allows for the analysis of intertextual chains, in line with approaches in linguistic ethnography. This analysis requires the researcher to pay attention to co-existing, but competing ideologies indexed by the participant’s situated interaction.

In this paper, we have explored discursive shadowing as a means to describe the intertextual links across five speech events through the school day, and how circulating ideologies about secondary school education characterize our participants. We have viewed the interactional and ideological as mutually informing and agree with others who argue that even though messages are highly institutionalized they are always subject to further negotiation (Agha, 2005; Blommaert and Varis, 2011). An episode recorded during a time frame of four hours was used to illustrate how discursive shadowing as a mobile method refines our analyses of participants’ situated practices across the yearlong fieldwork in several ways. The researcher’s discursive shadowing of the bilingual teacher allows for viewing discourse chains across speech events recorded at different places with different interlocutors (Linell, 1998; Wortham, 2012). In our paper we illustrated this by showing how the theme of the science test was recontextualized in different situations. There is a repetitive pedagogical silence in Mohammed and Mette’s (and other subject teachers’) conversations, both before, during, and after the teaching. The marginalization of bilingual teachers and the repercussions for the students they support is a common finding in the research literature (Creese, 2005; Dewilde, 2013, Martin-Jones, 2003).

This is in contrast to Mohammed and the researcher’s conversations, which most often occurred in the hallways walking to and from classrooms and the team room, and which were used for Mohammed’s pedagogical comments and Mohammed and the researcher’s joint pedagogical reflection. We showed how discursive shadowing allowed for the formation of partnerships to which the researcher and the key participant mutually invested. These comments and joint reflections show a different side of Mohammed. He has more initiatives,



expresses his concern about the education of his students, and shares his teaching decision. It is during these running conversations that the researcher's voice comes to the fore, at all times attempting to balance empathy with ethical responsibility and researcher positionality. Importantly, the discursive shadowing technique used in the study is rooted in linguistic ethnography, and not in action research which aims at improving practice. Since joint pedagogical reflection is lacking in the conversations with colleagues, Mohammed's conversations with the researcher proves to be an important dimension when representing the bilingual teacher's voice. It opens up new perspectives on his professional role as bilingual teacher and allows for reflection on possible reasons for the conversations' different character, such as social positioning, and language uses and beliefs seen in the light of political arrangements in linguistically diverse schools.

To finish then, we wish to outline the key reasons we believe discursive shadowing contributes to linguistic ethnography. First, discursive shadowing makes visible who is moving around the school, and when and where they are moving. Schools are typically viewed as classrooms full of students with one teacher who is relatively sedentary in teaching and learning processes. But discursive shadowing reveals a great deal of activity in non-teaching spaces during lesson time. The mobility of the bilingual teacher, Mohammed, as he and the researcher rush around the corridors searching for young people, brings into sharp focus the dynamic between attempted order and disorder in the school community. While subject lessons carry on in the school's sanctioned teaching and learning spaces, Mohammed attempts to bring order to the entanglements of non-attendance in the school's hallways. These school corridors are the 'imposed conduits' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988) of Mohammed's teaching world, which sees him managing students fleeing lessons because of their lack of meaning and relevance. Meanwhile other teachers are more deskbound. Mobility in the school is linked to wider structures of power associated with subject discipline, academic testing and achievement. More

precisely, people's situated (non-)movement is embedded in, and can be understood through the study of wider discourses.

Second, discursive shadowing makes observable and audible the conversations between researcher and key participant. It creates an additional corpus which can be investigated dialogically and intertextually within and across speech events. The cross-event presence of researcher and participant provides the researcher with access to their co-constructed meta-commentary in which the two explore wider beliefs, values, and ideologies about pedagogy, language, identity, ethics, and methodology.

Third, discursive shadowing recognizes the importance of the relationship developed between the two. It highlights the tensional and dynamic nature of this relationship. In this example of discursive shadowing the researcher consciously and strategically used her experience to engage Mohammed in conversation. In their treks around the school they 'forged new forms of conviviality out of everyday' interactions (Kerfoot and Bello-Nonjengele, 2014:20), not insignificant in a context where Mohammed was often side-lined from other pedagogic discussions in the school community. But beyond these important daily conversations, their constant presence together, provided sustained, engaged and reflexive 'learning' conversations.

As we stated earlier, we are not claiming that discursive shadowing is different from practices in linguistic ethnography. Discursive shadowing belongs securely in this paradigm. However, because context is permanently in a state of unfolding, and mobility and fluidity are the general state of things rather than an exception, we find it useful to describe the making and unmaking of social processes in interaction between researcher and key participant through analysing their on-going relationship while on the move.

*Acknowledgements.*

We would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments helping us improve the article.

## References

Agha, Asif

2005 Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 15(1):38–59.

Blommaert, Jan, and Pia Varis

“Enough is enough: The heuristics of authenticity in superdiversity,” *Tilburg Papers in Language and Literature Paper 2* (2011), accessed January 9, 2015,

[https://www.academia.edu/4141134/Enough\\_is\\_enough\\_The\\_heuristics\\_of\\_authenticity\\_in\\_superdiversity\\_Blommaert\\_and\\_Varis\\_2013\\_](https://www.academia.edu/4141134/Enough_is_enough_The_heuristics_of_authenticity_in_superdiversity_Blommaert_and_Varis_2013_)

Büscher, Monika, with John Urry and Katian Witchger

2011 Introduction: Mobile methods. *In* Mobile methods. Monika Büscher, John Urry, and Katie Witchger, eds. Pp. 1–19. London: Routledge.

Conteh, Jean, Begum, Shila, & Riasat, Saiqa

2014 Multilingual pedagogy in primary settings. From the margins to the mainstream. *In* The multilingual turn in languages education: opportunities and challenges. Jean Conteh and Gabriela Meier, eds. Pp. 211–233. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Copland, Fiona, and Creese, Angela

2015 Linguistic ethnography. Collecting, analysing and presenting data. Los Angeles: Sage.

Creese, Angela

2005 *Teacher collaboration and talk in multilingual classrooms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cresswell, Tim, and Martin, Craig

2012 On Turbulence: Entanglements of Disorder and Order on a Devon Beach. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*. 103(5): 516–529.

Czarniawska, Barbara

2007 Shadowing and other techniques for doing fieldwork in modern societies. Malmö:

Liber.

Deleuze, Gilles, & Guattari, Félix

1988 A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia. London: Athlone Press.

Dewilde, Joke

2013 *Ambulating teachers. A case study of bilingual teachers and teacher collaboration.*

(Doctoral dissertation), University of Oslo, Oslo.

Engen, Thor Ola, and Else Ryen

2009 Lærermangfold og flerkulturell opplæring. Tospråklige lærere i norsk skole [Teacher diversity and multicultural education. Bilingual teachers in Norwegian school]. NOA: norsk som andrespråk. 2:41–57.

Heller, Monica

2008 Doing ethnography. *In* The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism. Lie Wei and Melissa G. Moyer, eds. Pp. 249–262. Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Hvistendahl, Rita

2009 Multilingualism in school – introduction and overview. *In* Flerspråklighet i skolen. Rita Hvistendahl, ed. Pp. 197–214. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Jirón, Paola.

2011 On becoming 'la sombra/the shadow'. *In* Mobile methods. Monika Büscher, John Urry and Katian Witchger, eds. Pp. 36–53. London: Routledge.

Kerfoot, Caroline, and Bello-Nonjengele, Basirat Olayemi

2014 Game changers? Multilingual learners in a Cape town primary school. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 1–24.

Kusenbach, Margarethe

- 2003 Street phenomenology: The go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*. 4(3):455–485.
- Law, John, and John Urry
- 2004 'Enacting the social'. *Economy and society*. 33(3):390–410.
- Linell, Per
- 1998 *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn, and Saxena, Mukul
- 2003 Bilingual resources and 'funds of knowledge' for teaching and learning in multi-ethnic classrooms in Britain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 6(3&4): 267–282.
- McDonald, Seonaidh
- 2005 Studying actions in context: A qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative Research*. 5(4):455–473.
- Silverstein, Michael
- 1992 The indeterminacy of contextualization: When is enough is enough? *In* The contextualization of language. Aldo DiLuizio and Peter Auer, eds. Pp. 550–575. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Valenta, Marko
- 2009 'Who wants to be a travelling teacher?' Bilingual teachers and weak forms of bilingual education: The Norwegian experience. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 32(1):21–33.
- Webb, David.
2000. Introduction. *In* The Birth of Physics. Michel Serres, ed. Pp. vii–xx. Manchester: Clinamen Press.

Wortham, Stanton

2008a The objectification of identity across events. *Linguistics and Education*.  
19:294–311.

2008b Linguistic Anthropology. *In* The handbook of educational linguistics. Bernard  
Spolsky and Francis M. Hult, eds. Pp. 83–97. Oxford: Blackwell.

2012 Beyond macro and micro in the linguistic anthropology of education: An  
introduction to the special issue. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*.  
43(2):128–137.

---

Joke Dewilde is postdoctoral fellow at the University of Oslo, Norway

([j.i.dewilde@ils.uio.no](mailto:j.i.dewilde@ils.uio.no))

Angela Creese is professor at the University of Birmingham, UK ([a.creese@bham.ac.uk](mailto:a.creese@bham.ac.uk))