

## ETHNOGRAPHIC SPACES AND METHODOLOGICAL EXPLORATIONS

### What is an Ethnographic Archive an Archive of? A Telling Case of Challenges in Exploring Developing Interdisciplinary Programs in Higher Education

#### Judith Green

University of California, Santa Barbara, US  
judith.green@gmail.com

#### Ethny Stewart

University of California, Santa Barbara, US  
eastewart25@gmail.com

#### Monaliza Chian

University of California, Santa Barbara, US  
and University of Hong Kong, HK  
monalizachian@gmail.com

#### Stephanie Couch

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, US  
scouch@mit.edu

**Abstract.** *This paper seeks to (re)think what constitutes records within an ethnographic archive by making visible the challenges that our external IE team faced as we entered the records archived by the internal IE team that we were invited to support in the documentation and analysis of a developing Instructional Development Project. Although both teams shared a common conceptual logic-of-inquiry – Interactional Ethnography – It became evident that there were limits to certainty (Green & Baker 2007) that led us to (re)examine why some particular records were archived and what they were records of.*

**Keywords:** *ethnographic archive, higher education, interdisciplinary program.*

#### Theoretical Perspectives

##### Guiding this Study

Today, in educational ethnography, purposefully constructed archives have been developed that reflect the *epistemological decisions* and *logic-of-inquiry* guiding the ethnographer(s) constructing, collecting and seeking to analyze records relevant to an analysis of the problem under study once they leave, and/or (re)enter the field to construct data (e.g., Bateson, cited in Birdwhistell 1977; Heath & Street 2007;

Green, Skukauskaite & Baker 2012). From this perspective, in an ethnographic research project, an archive can be viewed as a developing, not a static, *ethnographic space* (cf. Agar 2006) that is (re)constructed over time as records are collected and data produced through the decisions of the ethnographer(s) (Ellen 1984).

The ethnographers who collect the archived records, including fieldnotes, and who (re)enter the archive once they have moved to an analysis of these records, of-

ten draw on *headnotes* of observed and experienced phenomena, gained through particular phases of their fieldwork. At such points of analysis, they engage in a series of decisions about where to begin the analyses, and what records are sources for constructing a data set. This process, according to Heath (1982), involves two principles of operation: bounding units of analysis and making connections between and among particular units and levels of analyses of particular phenomena. As this chapter will demonstrate, these processes also involve a series of principles for identifying anchor events that were created in a moment in which the ethnographer, according to Agar (1994; 2006), wondered what was happening.

The challenge that these ethnographers face is captured in the argument that ethnographers *produce data* as they *make connections* between and among records they collected to develop warranted accounts that support the development of *theoretical inferences* (Mitchell 1984). From this perspective, the records are not the phenomenon experienced or observed but rather a recording of what Hymes (1977) framed as a “bit of life” or Bateson (cited in Birdwhistell 1977) viewed as a written inscription or record of an observed phenomenon/a. This argument has led us to raise the question not only of what an *archive is an archive of*, but also *what a particular record in the archive is a record of*.

In this chapter, we seek to (re)think what constitutes records within an ethnographic archive as well as to (re)formulate what an ethnographic archive is an archive of. To explore this issue, we (re)present a series of challenges that our research team

faced as we joined the second year of a two-year ethnographic project and sought to enter an archive constructed by our colleagues at a sister university 300 miles north of our campus. The invitation to join this ethnographic project was designed to support the embedded ethnography team as they sought to document and analyze a developing Instructional Development Project (IDP). Although both the IDP team and our ethnographic research team shared a common conceptual logic-of-inquiry, *Interactional Ethnography* (Castanheira, Crawford, Green & Dixon 2001), we soon found that our *external* IE team (ExIE) faced a challenge in understanding what the records archived by the *internal* IE (InIE) team were *records of*. Although we had access to archived video, audio, texts and virtual as well as face-to-face meetings of the IDP team, we soon came to understand that there were *limits to certainty* (Heap 1980; Baker & Green 2007) about why these particular records were the ones made and/or collected; thus, we faced a challenge in understanding what they were records of.

Given that the goal of bringing our team into this project was to help the internal ethnographers and design team to step back from what Heath (1982) called *ethnocentrism*, or Heath and Street (cited in Green & Bridges, in press) called *the known*, this question became an anchor for an *iterative, recursive and abductive process* that paralleled the one undertaken by the InIE team in collecting the records. In this chapter, therefore, we present the processes that we undertook to accomplish our role within the IDP initiative, and how the *internal-external* IE process led

to new understandings of what is entailed in *entering/(re)entering* an ethnographic archive by both the original ethnographic team and the external team.

As part of this process, we make transparent the *principles of conduct* (Green & Bridges, in press), i.e., the analytic decisions and actions that our ExIE team undertook, which were guided by an IE logic-of-inquiry. This process, therefore, makes visible how we approached both existing records and why we added ones that we determined as necessary to interpret what was inscribed on existing records. These processes, as we will show, were central to constructing theoretical inferences of inter-relationships among events, texts, actors, spaces, times, meanings proposed, and actions constructed by participants. By making transparent the actions undertaken by our ExIE team, we make visible the range of actions necessary to construct warranted accounts (Heap 1995) of the understandings of knowledge of, and decisions made by, members of the IDP team (a Professor in Organizational Communication, the Administrative Director, a project consultant and the InIE team) that led to the construction of what the Lead Professor framed in 2014 as the “best course to date.” (Chian 2016). Thus, in the sections that follow, we make visible how this *point of entry* raised unanticipated questions about the limits of the initial set of archived records, and about what additional records were necessary to develop an understanding of the complex iterative, recursive and abductive processes that the IDP team undertook in this ongoing and developing IDP initiative.

## **An Archive as an Ethnographic Space**

In this section, we begin with a brief description of the records archived for the IDP program and then draw on these to frame a conceptual argument about what an archive is within an ethnographic research project. Records archived by internal and external IE teams across the two years of this developing project included: video and audio records, fieldnotes by internal ethnographers, interviews (virtual and face-to-face), transcripts of virtual meetings, email exchanges, web-based artifacts produced by participants in courses, (intra- and inter)institutional documents and curriculum design materials. These records constitute the full range of records that supported the processes that our ExIE team undertook to trace the roots and pathways leading to the statement that this was the “best course to date” and the final project report (Green et al. 2015).

As previously stated, at the center of our process of entry are three conceptual arguments that constitute a *reflexive turn* in anthropological approaches to ethnographic inquiry. The central argument that guided our understanding was Bateson’s argument (cited in Birdwhistell 1977) that what is experienced and recorded in the field is not the actual phenomena but rather written/inscribed accounts of an observed language, actions and interactions recorded by the ethnographer. This argument supports Hymes’ (1977) argument for ethnography of communication that such records are a “bit of life” that are recorded on video and other forms of records (written texts) by an ethnographer (or ethnographic team). These arguments

further support conceptualizations by Ellen (1984) and others in the social sciences that ethnographers produce data, not find data (e.g., Clifford & Marcus 1985; Atkinson 1990; Heap 1995; Kelly 2016).

By using the term *ethnographic archive*, we refer to the *ethnographic spaces* (cf. Agar 2006) that constitute the range and kinds of records that an ethnographer constructs (i.e., produces) to support the analysis and interpretation of patterns of life within particular level(s) of social organization being studied (Mitchell 1984). This argument builds on the concept of *telling cases* as proposed by British anthropologist Clyde Mitchell. Mitchell argues that the level of social organization studied by an ethnographer may be a whole society, a family, a particular setting or an individual, whose actions and lived experiences are traced across times, actors and a particular configuration of events. The goal of this process, he argues, is to make theoretical inferences that have been previously unknown ethnographically.

Thus, an archive, based on the theoretical arguments above, can be conceptualized as a purposefully created *ethnographic space* (Agar 2006), in which ethnographers conceptually collect, archive (not simply store) and engage with multiple forms of written, graphic and audio/video records as well as artifacts collected within a particular project. These records can be revisited, (re)searched, and (re)examined throughout a project. They can form the basis of a further collection of future projects by the original ethnographers, or by others, who are given access to the archived records. Additionally, as others have argued, archived records provide a

basis for constructing points of triangulation (e.g., Denzin 1978; Corsaro 1981; Seigny 1981; Green & Harker 1988; Atkinson et al. 2001; Green, Dixon & Zaharlick 2003 and Green & Chian, in press) of perspectives, theories, data and researcher interpretations of what was inscribed within different forms of recordings of the bits of life in which particular actors or social groups were engaged.

### **On Entering an Ongoing Archive: Challenges and Conceptual Directions**

In this section, we make visible a series of *principles of conduct* guiding our analyses and interpretations of the IDP designers' actions that led to the statement that this was "the best course to date" (Chian 2016). The first principle is focused on a process of selecting an *anchor event*. To frame this process, we draw on Agar (1994; 2006) who, as defined previously, argued that a point where the ethnographer wonders what is happening constitutes a *rich point*. At such points, he argues, the ethnographer begins to trace the *roots* and *pathways* leading to what was happening that raised a challenge that led the ethnographers to (re)examine what they thought that they knew or assumed was happening.

This challenge initiated a process of constructing a *bounded data set* as well as *bounded units of analyses* (Heath 1982), a second set of principles of conduct. Central to this process was the identification of *intertextual web(s)* of events, actions and actors (a further principle of conduct). This process was accomplished by engaging in discourse analyses that made visible who was involved in *proposing*,

*recognizing, acknowledging and interactionally accomplishing*, through their discourse-in-use, a set of *socially significant intertextual ties* among events (Bloome & Bailey 1992; Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993; Bloome & Clarke 2006). From this perspective, by tracing the pathways leading to the rich point (i.e., “This is the best course to date”), we make visible how we constructed theoretical inferences of both what the existing archive was an archive of and the processes involved in developing warranted accounts of the actions of the IDT team across times, events and actors.

### **IE as a Logic-of-Inquiry Guiding the Internal and External Ethnography Teams**

IE, as a *logic-of-inquiry*, an epistemological process, brings together ethnographically framed forms of discourse and textual analyses to trace ways in which participants, in and across particular levels of social organization, interactionally accomplish bits of life (Castanheira et al. 2000; Baker & Green 2009; Green & Bridges, in press). This process involves an iterative, recursive and abductive logic (Agar 1994; 2006) to trace how actors, in intertextually-tied events, signal historically grounded meanings, actions and events to each other (and thus to the ethnographer(s)); that is, they signal past, present and potential future ties between and among actors and actions leading to, underlying and leading from an observed bit of life. Through these processes, Interactional Ethnographers *engage with* participants whose lifeworlds they have entered in order to create opportunities for *ongoing conversations* (i.e., virtually, email and face-to-face) as well as to

engage in formal face-to-face interviews. In the following sections, we present a series of analytic and archiving processes critical to understanding what the Lead Professor meant when he stated that the 2014 Spring Course was “the best course to date.”

The primary records in the initial archive were video records of meetings and of five courses developed in the first year (2012–2013) of the two-year project as well as the 2013 Annual Report (Couch et al. 2013) of work undertaken by the IDP team for this externally funded project. As argued previously, we viewed these records as *forms of fieldnotes* (cf. Bateson cited in Birdwhistell 1977), which were constructed by the InIE team that had deep understandings of the context of their construction, understandings that were not possible for our external ethnography team to (re)construct *without in-depth interactions with these team members as cultural guides* (Chian 2016). Additionally, although we had access to these archived records, what was missing from the initial archive was *contextual information on how the records were made, and what decisions led to their inclusion*.

### **Levels of Analyses Undertaken: Principles of Conduct**

The first level of analysis undertaken involved identifying the *boundaries in time* of the project being developed, a process that involved entering the archive and locating the phases of development of the project from its initial phases (2012) to the presentation of the final phase in 2014 (Green et al. 2015). Table No. 1 (re)presents the timeline of the project and actions for each phase.

*Table No. 1. Timeline of Project Phases and Boundaries of Actions*

|   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Prior to July 2013</b></p> <p>LTFT Research Team (LTFT Team)– LTFT Planning and Ongoing records collection begins Fall 2012</p> | <p><b>July 2013– December 2013</b></p> <p><b>July 30, 2013</b> – LTFT Team’s Lead Professor and IE Team’s first conversation<br/>Time: 1pm<br/>Location: IE Team met at one location and LTFT Team’s Lead Professor virtual through Google Hangout (GH)<br/>Participants: IE Team (1 member virtual) and LTFT Team’s Lead Professor virtual</p> <p><b>August 1, 2013</b> – IE Team negotiating with Funder for Long Term and Futures Thinking project contract<br/>Time: 1–6pm<br/>Location: At IE Team’s home campus<br/>Participants: Funder, IE Team, LTFT Team’s Principal Investigator, IE Team’s Department Personnel (faculty member and departmental developer)</p> | <p><b>January– March 2014</b></p> <p><b>February 19, 2014</b> - Long Term and Futures Thinking Meeting<br/>Time: 11am to 12pm<br/>Location: LTFT Team on home campus and IE Team on home campus - both teams interact virtually through GH<br/>Invitees: Funder, LTFT Team, and IE Team</p> | <p><b>April–June 2014</b></p> <p><b>April 25, 2014</b> – Lead Professor interview- conversation<br/>Time: 12:30– 1:45pm<br/>Location: LTFT Team’s Lead Professor, IE Team members at different locations - all members engage virtually from different locations though GH<br/>Participants: LTFT Team’s Lead Professor and IE Team (2 members)</p> | <p><b>July–Sept. 2014</b></p> <p><b>July 7–9, 2014</b> –Lead Professor and Project Consultant in-person interview- conversation at IE Team’s home campus for Interviews- conversations<br/>Time: Variable<br/>Location: IE Team’s home campus<br/>Participants: IE Team’s Lead Professor<br/>July 7, 2014 – Lead Professor (individual meeting)<br/>July 8, 2014 – Lead Professor and Project Consultant (joint meeting)<br/>July 9, 2014 – Project Consultant (individual meeting)</p> | <p><b>Oct. –Dec. 2014</b></p> <p><b>October 2, 2014</b> – First Day of face-to-face course observations by IE Team in Lead Professor’s Course Fall 2014<br/>Time:<br/>Location: LTFT in class at home campus classroom and IE Team members at home campus engage virtually through GH<br/>Participants: IE Team, Lead Professor, and Lead Professor’s course</p> <p><b>October 21, 2014</b> – Interim Report discussion<br/>Time: 4:00–10:00pm<br/>Location: LTFT Team’s Lead Professor is virtual, IE Team’s Lead Graduate Student Researcher is virtual, IE Team (3 members) face-to-face – IE Team connects virtually with LTFT Team’s Lead Professor and IE Team’s Lead Graduate Student Researcher through GH<br/>Participants: IE Team and LTFT Team’s Lead Professor</p> | <p><b>January – March 2015</b></p> <p><b>January 11, 2015, January 19, 2015, January 26, 2015, March 10, 2015, through March 19, 2015, March 21, 2015, March 22, 2015</b> – IE Team Final Report Group Meetings<br/>Time: Variable<br/>Locations: IE Team’s home campus, IE Team’s Principal Investigator’s residence, and virtual through GH<br/>Participants: Includes a variable combination of IE Team members</p> |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|

**Table No. 1 (continuation). Timeline of Project Phases and Boundaries of Actions**

| Prior to July 2013 | July 2013– December 2013  | January– March 2014  | April–June 2014   | July–Sept. 2014  | Oct. –Dec. 2014   | January – March 2015 |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------|
|                    | <p><b>October 21, 2013</b><br/>- First official intersegmental meeting between funder, IE Team, and LTFT Team<br/>Location: LTFT Team and Funder on LTFT Team's home campus and IE Team home campus - both teams interact virtually through GH<br/>Participants: Funder, LTFT Team, and IE Team</p> | <p><b>March 19, 2014</b><br/>- Long Term and Futures Thinking Meeting<br/>Time: 11am to 12pm<br/>Location: LTFT Team and Funder on LTFT Team's home campus and IE Team home campus - both teams interact virtually through GH<br/>Participants: Funder, LTFT Team, IE Team, and PRU faculty member</p> | <p><b>May 7, 2014</b> – Project Consultant interview- conversation<br/>Time: 11:00am–1:00pm<br/>Location: LTFT Team's Project Consultant, IE Team members at different locations – all members engage virtually from different locations though GH<br/>Participants: Project Consultant and IE Team (3 members)</p> | <p><b>August 1, 2014</b> – IE Team's discussion with LTFT Team Lead Professor and Project Manager regarding possible joint publication on project<br/>Time: 12:00–1:30pm<br/>Location: All participants engage virtually from different locations through GH<br/>Participants: LTFT Team's Lead Professor and Project Manager, and IE Team members (4 members)</p> | <p><b>October 22, 2014</b> – LTFT Interim Report conference call<br/>Time: 11:00–12:30pm<br/>Location: LTFT Research Team together, IE Team's Lead Graduate Student Researcher virtual through GH, and IE Team members together - both teams engage virtually through GH<br/>Participants: IE Team (3 members), Funder, and LTFT Research Team (4 members)<br/><b>November 8, 2014</b> – IE Team meeting to discuss course video analysis methods and methodologies<br/>Time: 2:00–6:00pm<br/>Location: IE Team's home campus<br/>Participants: IE Team (5 members)</p> |                      |

As indicated in Table No. 1, for each point of contact, we identified the actors and the location of each event. The construction of this table, therefore, can be viewed as a map of the archived records as well as of the dialogic and interactional nature of this developing project that makes visible:

- The complexity of the work in developing a new educational program;
- The *pre-fieldwork phases* as well as the *formal fieldwork phases*;
- The importance of *tracing the phases of ethnographic work* from informal entry and negotiations phases to formal collection and analysis processes through which the grounded accounts of everyday life were constructed.

Thus, what the table makes transparent are sets of distinctive actors who had participated in interactive work within particular points in time across the two year-development of this initiative. It also makes visible the embedded institutional contexts that framed the need for the IE research team to situate the IDP team's work in relationship to the programs of the Department of Communication and the university.

In the next analysis, we will show how, and in what ways, the ExIE research team conducted cycles of analyses and constructed multiple sources of records *to situate* the developing instructional project within the larger university contexts (an additional principle of conduct). Missing from this timeline of dialogic work, however, was an unanticipated process of data collection—the collection of an ongoing series of email exchanges (300) between

the ExIE team and the Lead Professor. This ongoing dialogue (presented in a later section) involved a developing set of exchanges that were *instrumental* in making visible how the instructor played the role of the *cultural guide* in the analysis work undertaken by our ExIE team.

### **Situating the Instructional Design Project in the Institutional Contexts**

By exploring the interdependence of sites, events and actors inscribed in the developing ethnographic archive(s), our ExIE team identified the relationship of different segments of the institution within which the IDP initiative was embedded (Bloome & Egan-Robertson 1993; Baker & Green 2009). *To locate information that was not present in the initial archive*, which focused on the classroom processes and meetings, our ExIE team collected and analyzed:

- The university website;
- The Department of Communication website;
- The annual Project Reports;
- The Project's website;
- Eight course syllabi.

The purpose of these angles of analysis was to explore the part-whole relationship of the IDP goals within the larger university contexts (a principle of conduct). Table No. 2 provides a graphic (re)presentation of the university context, situating the IDP within the Department of Communication and the university.

As indicated in Table No. 2, an additional series of analyses focused on an intertextual web of levels of *social organization (a principle of conduct)*, that formed a map of the relationship of the courses offered in each quarter of the two-year IDP



**Table No. 2.** *Situating the Instructional Design Project within the Department of Communication and University*

|  |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
|--|-----|-----|--------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|-----|-----|---|-------------------------|-----|-----|--|--------------------|-----|---|-----------|-----|--|--|
| Public Regional University   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Academic Degrees: 50 Baccalaureate Degree and 62 Minors; 5 Master’s Degrees; 39 Credentials and Certificates; Doctorate in Educational |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| College of Business and Economics  |     |     |                    |   | College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS) |                               |   |     |     | College of Education and Allied Studies   |                         |     |     |  | College of Science |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS)  |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| 17 Departments including Communication, 5 Programs, 38 Degrees   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Department of Communication  |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Chair Person (1)   |     |     | Lead Professor (1) |   |   | Assistant Lead Professors (7) |   |     |     |   | Teaching Assistants (7) |     |     |  | Lectures (7)       |     |   | Staff (2) |     |  |  |
| Degree Requirements: 52 unit core courses and 44 units in 1 of 2 options   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Professional, Public, and Organizational Communication   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     | Media Production  |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Organizational Communication   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Assistant Lead Professor (Appointed 2003): Lead Professor for Long Term and Futures Thinking Initiatives                               |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Pilot Instructional Project (LTFT)   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Academic Year One: 2012–2013   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     | Academic Year Two: 2013–2014  |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| Fall Quarter   |     |     |                    | Winter Quarter  |   |                               | Spring Quarter  |     |     | Fall Quarter  |                         |     |     | Winter Quarter   |                    |     | Spring Quarter  |           |     |  |  |
| Sept   | Oct | Nov | Dec                | Jan   | Feb   | Mar                           | Apr   | May | Jun | Sept  | Oct                     | Nov | Dec | Jan  | Feb                | Mar | Apr   | May       | Jun |  |  |
| COMM 4107: Relational Communication: New Media and Organizational Life   |     |     |                    | COMM 3107: Introduction to Organizational Communication: Taking Long Term Futures Thinking Perspectives |   |                               | COMM 4207: Introduction to Communication: Organizational Transformation |     |     | COMM 4107: Relational Communication in Organizations: Personal and Collective Futures |                         |     |     | COMM 3107: Introduction to Organizational Communication: Taking a Long Term Futures Thinking Perspective |                    |     | COMM 4107: Relational Communication in Organizations: Exploring Responses to Societies Collapse: Past, Present, and Futures |           |     |  |  |
| COMM 4510: Public Relations Theory and Practice: Long Term Thinking in Public Relations: Energy Innovations 2037                       |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |
| COMM 4500: Gender and Identity and Representation in Media: Envisioning Gender Roles in 2112   |     |     |                    |   |   |                               |   |     |     |   |                         |     |     |  |                    |     |   |           |     |  |  |

process and their relationship to layers of organization within the university.

An analysis of part-whole relationships (a principle of conduct) within the IDP initiative revealed multiple configurations of actors and contexts within each institutional level, who had indirectly or directly contributed to this project. This analysis made visible the complex range of actors with particular sets of expectations and norms

that the Instructional Development project leadership and instructional team needed to consider and understand in order to construct and integrate a new disciplinary framework, *Long Term and Futures Thinking* (societal changes 5 000–20 000 years in the past and future for particular societies), with the established Organizational Communication Program curriculum. Table No. 2, therefore, (re)presents a range of data

collection processes necessary to develop a profile of the *part-whole/whole-part relationships* of the IDP within the larger educational systems of the university.

### **Intellectual Histories of Participants: *Unanticipated Contextualizing Sources***

In the previous sections, we identified a range of different configurations in which the Lead Professor and the external project consultant worked dialogically on particular dimensions of the different courses across six quarters from 2012 to 2014. This relationship was visible in the actual course sessions periodically but most of the *dialogic* work was not directly observable. The role of the external project consultant, whose expertise in forecasting and futures thinking was part of the funded work, was not visible in course sessions with the exception of those specifically dedicated to forecasting. Therefore, this section focuses on the work we undertook to explore the *roots* and *convergences* of the intellectual histories of the two key actors who were responsible for (re)formulating the courses being developed.

The tracing of intellectual histories, as we will show, made visible what was not visible in the archived records of institutional meetings and course videos. Figure No. 1 presents the critical information that our IE team needed to build a deeper understanding of the actions these actors undertook together. Specifically, it examines how, and in what ways, their professional histories led to the acceptance of the differences in expertise that each brought to the common process of designing materials to support the opportunities that the students

had to develop new ways of thinking about societal influences on organizational communication. It also makes visible the importance of understanding the ways in which historical contexts influence the instructional design processes and practices possible in particular institutional and/or social settings of particular configurations of people.

The tracing of the intellectual histories was accomplished through an analysis of numerous ethnographic interviews conducted individually as well as collectively, with both the Lead Professor and the external project consultant. These interview conversations (Skukauskaite 2012) were designed to uncover the roles undertaken by each actor as inscribed.

Records explored in addition to the interviews include emails exchanged between these actors as well as the analyses of their CVs, professional websites and other written information available on the internet. Through the analyses of these records, we uncovered an invisible and unanticipated history of these two key actors. This history, as related analyses, course syllabi and video records showed, provided a grounding for the work of the IDP Team, given that they did not need any extended time to learn each other's disciplinary languages or histories. Rather, they were able to create transdisciplinary dialogues and to work at a fundamental level – often impossible when actors unknown to each other come together.

Figure No. 1 presents a graphic representation of this history on three dimensions:

- Education;
- Employment;
- Public Regional University and the LTFT Project.

| Project Consultant's Timeline |   | Joint Inter-actions  | Lead Professor's Timeline |            |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|------------|
| Education                     | 1980-1984   |  | 1980-1984                 | [Youth]    |
|                               | Harvard University – B.A. Hispanic Studies                      | Shakespearean Theater Group and influence on his performance as instructor   | 1990                      | Education  |
|                               | University of California Berkeley – M.A. Latin American Studies |  | 1995                      |            |
|                               |   | Ph.D. Candidate in Communication, University of California, San Diego  | 1995-February 2004        | Employment |
|                               |   |  | 1994-1995                 |            |
| <b>Employment</b>             | September 1987 – September 2008                                 | Institute for the Future Palo Alto, California<br>Research Director<br>Director of the Technology Horizons Program | 1994-1995                 | Employment |
|                               | November 2008   | Project Consulting   | 1996                      |            |
|                               | Prior Summer 2012   | PRU Working with Developer on another futures program  | 1997                      | Employment |
|                               |   |  | 1997-1998                 |            |
|                               |   |  | 1998-2002                 | Employment |
|                               |   |  | 1998-2009                 |            |
|                               |   |  | 2000                      | Employment |
|                               |   |  | 2000-2002                 |            |
|                               |   |  | 2000-2002                 | Employment |
|                               |   |  | 2000-2002                 |            |

Figure No. 1. Intersecting intellectual histories and points of contact.

| Project Consultant's Timeline    |                 | Joint Interactions  | Lead Professor's Timeline   |                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|
| Intersegmental Team LTFT Project | August 2012     | PRU Working to construct course with Lead Professor   | PRU Begin teaching in Department of Communications  | Fall 2003         |
|                                  | May 7, 2014     | Interview-conversation between Project Consultant and MROU [Virtual]  | PRU Working to construct course with Project Consultant   | August 2012       |
|                                  | July 8, 2014    | Interview-conversation with Project Consultant, Lead Professor, and MROU [In-Person]                                  | Long Term and Futures Thinking Meeting [MROU Team Virtual]  | February 19, 2014 |
|                                  | July 9, 2014    | Interview-conversation with Project Consultant and MROU [In-Person]   | Long Term and Futures Thinking Meeting (MROU Team Virtual)  | March 19, 2014    |
|                                  |                 |   | Individual interview- conversation between Lead Professor and MROU [Virtual]  | April 25, 2014    |
|                                  |                 |   | Interview-conversation with Lead Professor, Project Consultant, and MROU [In-Person]  | July 8, 2014      |
|                                  |                 |   | Meeting with Lead Professor, Project Manager, and MROU regarding submission to CAE.   | August 1, 2014    |
|                                  | August 13, 2014 | Working with Lead Professor to construct for Fall 2014 regarding: Mapping Fall Quarter during the week of August 25th | Lead Professor detailing upcoming plans for Fall 2014 regarding:<br>-Mapping Fall Quarter during the week of August 25th;<br>-Working with Ecology Professor to develop joint classroom projects;<br>-Publications – 1. [Submitted] Communication Teacher (a National Communication Association journal) and 2. [In-progress] Anticipatory anthropology journal (based on our deep time approach) 3. [In-progress] Games & Culture journal (classroom forecasting and long term thinking literacy);<br>-Voiceover project for pace layers for online learning [Fall 2014];<br>-Tracer student list – compiling Spring 2014 list [Fall 2014] | August 13, 2014   |

Figure No. 1 (continuation). Intersecting intellectual histories and points of contact.

While not a comprehensive timeline for each actor, it is a graphic (re)presentation of their education, employment and their relationship to the Instructional Design project initiative.

One invisible layer that was made visible by tracing these actors' histories was one unknown to members of the IDP leadership team – they were both employed by the Institute of the Future and the fact that the Lead Professor had interviewed the project consultant as part of his dissertation study. These prior histories signal a *shared vision* of “futures thinking” as a professional area of knowledge generation, a fact that served as the fundamental core of their logic for the course (re)formulation design.

Another crucial invisible convergence, made visible through the interview-conversations, was that they both had knowledge of ethnography, which was the foundation of the research agenda of the IDP project, as indicated previously. Given this knowledge of ethnography, the Lead Professor took up position as a research partner, a form of embedded ethnographer within the analysis phases of the IDP process. His willingness to engage in dialogues across time via computer-mediated communication (emails and Google Hangout), as previously mentioned, enabled the ExIE team to trace the logic of design in (re)formulating the courses within the IDP project. It also laid a foundation for answering unanticipated questions that arose about the roots of these courses, answers not possible even by triangulating events within a robust corpus of archived records. In the following section, therefore, we present further evidence of dialogic relationships

between the IDP team and the ExIE team to make visible the limits of archived records and thus the need to (re)enter the field to collect additional information.

### **Building of Dialogue between Lead Professor and Researcher**

This section provides a telling case of how, and in what ways, the ExIE team engaged in sustaining dialogic interactions via computer-mediated communication to gain insiders' knowledge that was not available in public texts (e.g., university or department website, the Project website, and archived artifacts). These limitations led to the necessity for the Lead Analysts (the Second Author) to (re)enter the archive and to analyze transcripts of a series of interview-conversations (6 two-hour interview-conversations with the Lead Professor, Project Consultant and Administrator of the IDP team). While helpful in adding additional contextual information, the (re)analysis of these transcripts did not provide the answers surrounding one critical dimension of the course descriptions – the reason for the different sub-titles of each iteration of what appeared initially to be a single course, given the similar catalogue number. Consequentially, this led to a series of additional interactions with the Lead Professor, who, because of his interest in what the ethnographic process was revealing, was willing to engage in this ongoing dialogue, a process that provided evidence of his reflexive stance to the development of the course integration process.

Table No. 3 provides a (re)presentation of an extended exchange with the Lead Instructor to confirm the contents of the Preliminary Report being presented by

the ExIE team to the full IDP team. This exchange makes visible a point of triangulation to illustrate a further principle of conduct. The following chain of email conversations between the Lead Analyst and the Lead Professor occurred in a span of three days (October 25–27, 2014). It demonstrates the crucial role of such email conversations, a process that enabled the ExIE team to develop understandings of insiders’ knowledge in situ without being physically present in the site of study.

As indicated in Table No. 3, the chain of email conversations was initiated by the Lead Analyst by asking questions about the difference in the subtitles of a course with

the same catalogue number as was corroborated by an analysis of the course catalogue published in the university website. This exchange makes visible how the Lead Analyst identified a series of unanticipated questions that could not be answered through observations of class sessions, previous interviews from key participants, or analysis of printed texts (course syllabi and annual reports). Evident in this dialogic exchange was the Lead Professor taking up the role as an embedded ethnographer, providing rich insider information that he thought was necessary to know and understand if our ExIE team was to appropriately analyze the course and implementation design process.

**Table No. 3.** *Email Exchange to Gain Insider (Emic) Understanding of Course Syllabi.*<sup>1</sup>

| <b>Initiator: Lead Analyst</b>   | <b>Respondents in Chain: Lead Professor and Lead Analyst</b> |
|--|--|
| <p>From Lead Analyst to Lead Professor<br/>10/25/2014</p> <p>Hi Lead Professor,<br/>It was great “hanging out” (Google Hangout) with you last Tuesday. I am in the process of doing my first phase of the analysis and what I was not able to figure out was the difference in the subtitles for the COMM 4107 courses:<br/>Fall of 2012: COMM 4107: Relational Communication: New Media and Organizational Life<br/>Fall of 2013: COMM 4107: Relational Communication in Organizations: Personal and Collective Futures<br/>Spring of 2013: RCinO: Exploring Response to Societal Collapse, past, present, future</p> <p>Please help me understand some of my wonderings:<br/>1) Are the different subtitles serve a particular program (minor, certification)? Or is it the focus of the LTFT concept that shifted?<br/>2) Given that there were five different courses that integrated LTFT; what aspect/dimension of LTFT were integrated to each one?</p> <p>I thank you for guiding me gain a deeper understanding of how LTFT concepts were integrated within the traditional course.</p> <p>Best,<br/>Lead Analyst</p> |  |

<sup>1</sup> We do not correct any speech errors in the texts of the spoken or written language of the participants.

**Table No. 3 (continuation). Email Exchange to Gain Insider (Emic) Understanding of Course Syllabi.**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>From Lead Analyst to Lead Professor<br/>10/26/2014</p> <p>I also discovered another syllabus of COMM 6551: Critical Ethnic Media Studies, Winter 2014</p> <p>Is this part of the sequence of the courses of the project?<br/>Thank you,</p> | <p>From Lead Professor to Lead Analyst 10/25/2014</p> <p>I can explain my rationale later this evening.</p> <p>From Lead Analyst to Lead Professor<br/>Thank you... Enjoy your day...</p>   |
|  | <p>From Lead Professor to Lead Analyst 10/27/2014</p> <p>Hi Lead Analyst,</p> <p>Great to be on the Google Hangout with all of you! So fun!</p> <p>Thanks for taking an interest in this subject and looking forward to your analysis. I am currently writing an article to submit to the Journal of Futures Studies about my integration of futures studies and organizational communication too and I will share my draft with you later today. Too often, this is not mentioned as much and this is perhaps why forecasting is not as widely understood across the disciplines and integrated among them... the integration has not been accomplished :-)</p> <p>Subtitles for the COMM 4107 courses:<br/>Fall of 2012: COMM 4107: Relational Communication: New Media and Organizational Life</p> <p>Comments: When I created this course, we were using this first course as a platform for looking 5000 years ahead with students and it was the first quarter that we were initiating our ideas without a firm administrative home yet except the Communication Dept. The PI for the LTFT had not been approached yet and we just wanted to get started. I had ambitious goals to include futures thinking across three courses in one quarter! This was way too much! However, I wanted to look to connect to student interests and my own from a communication perspective with New Media and to connect it to long term thinking. At the same time, I had to connect it to issues of relational communication. My question for the quarter was how would we relate in the future with emerging new media and how would we sustain organizations for 5000 years using new forms of media? The Project Consultant and I created an elaborate role-playing scenario for groups to use and some groups came up with some great ideas; others did not get it as well.</p> <p>Fall of 2013: COMM 4107: Relational Communication in Organizations: Personal and Collective Futures</p> <p>Comments: For this course, a year after our first start and covering similar course material, we had learned what not to do and how to improve our approach. The Project Consultant and I lowered the time horizon to 2040 for this course and taught students a specific forecasting framework known as the cone of uncertainty by Paul Saffo for mapping uncertainties based on Saffo's article in the Harvard Business Review. Students created a story imagining their future career trajectory around a specific moment in time in 2040. Up to that point they worked on exercises that prepared them to create a story. <b>For this exercise, they had to think not only about their personal futures but had to outline and imagine what the institutional and organizational context would be as well.</b> So the title reflects this approach. We will repeat this approach in Winter 2015 for organizational transformation.</p> |

**Table No. 3 (continuation).** *Email Exchange to Gain Insider (Emic) Understanding of Course Syllabi.*

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Spring of 2013: RCinO: Exploring Response to Societal Collapse, past, present, future<br/> <b>Note:</b> This was for Spring 2014 right? I think our title for Spring of 2013 was different? For Spring 2013 we explored the future of Hayward and discussed the future of cities. I'll have to go back and check the syllabus title. I think the first time we used Societal collapse was in Spring 2014 and I could be wrong of course...</p> <p>Comments: This course was <i>our best course to date</i> [emphasis and color added] in part because our framework we adopted was to look at responses to societal collapse using Jared Diamond's account of the Norse in Greenland and using the novel Creative Fire. So the title was the best fit for what we decided to do.</p> <p>Please help me understand some of my wonderings:<br/>         1) Are the different subtitles serve a particular program (minor, certification)? Or is it the focus of the LTFT concept that shifted?</p> <p>So it really is a question of the LTFT concepts shifting with the catalog title staying constant and at the same time the subtitle shifted to signal to students what to expect and what I wanted to emphasize. This wasn't going to be your ordinary course...</p> <p>2) Given that there were five different courses that integrated LTFT; what aspect/dimension of LTFT were integrated to each one?</p> <p>I would say that in Winter 2013, we were trying to integrate the podcasts of Long Now Foundation in having students listen to long term thinkers.</p> <p>However by Fall 2013, we taught them a specific forecasting approach using Paul Saffo's cone of uncertainty more explicitly and by Spring 2014, we used pace layers more explicitly.</p> <p>The Grad course in Media and Ethnicity is one where we talked about the future of race and ethnicity using space exploration as an example and metaphor for questioning the future of new media and futures studies as dominated by white angle perspectives. We used pace layers in this course as well and my course in Organizational Transformation taught in the same quarter Win 2014 used a similar framework.</p> <p>Hope this helps,<br/>         Thanks much for asking,<br/>         Lead Professor</p> <p>Lead Analyst to Lead Professor 10/27/2014<br/>         Hello Lead Professor,<br/>         Yes, your response is very helpful! I will give you an update this week.<br/>         Best,<br/>         Lead Analyst</p> |
|--|--|

Also indicated in Table No. 3 is how the Lead Professor shared his *logic of design* for the particular courses in question and provided the rationale for the differences in subtitles. By making visible the

series of actions that were crucial for the ExIE team to understand the layers of work that he and the Project Consultant had undertaken, both prior to and following the official entry of the IE research



team, he provided evidence of the reflexive thinking and range of decision-making that they undertook, with the support of the Administrative Director and the InIE team. As indicated in this exchange, the IDP process led to the (re)formulation of undergraduate courses that engaged students in long-term and future thinking in the context of organizational communication theories.

The richness of this information that the Lead Professor shared played a crucial role in the developing ExIE team's understandings of what was meant when the Lead Professor stated that the 2014 Spring Course was "our best course to date." This thread of email conversations, therefore, also contributed to the ExIE team's understandings of the importance of *triangulating* information gained through this process with the course syllabi, and how this process of triangulation was critical in contextualizing and developing understandings of why particular Organizational Communication frameworks and LTFT constructs were integrated. This process also made visible why particular texts were selected for the courses, and assignments and activities were constructed to engage students in inter-relating and/or integrating long-term and future thinking with Organizational Communication theories. It also made visible a series of different levels of instructional development over the two years of the IDP project.

### **Some Closing Thoughts**

The four sets of graphic analyses presented in this chapter, although not the full scope of our analysis (See Green et al. 2015; Chian 2016), make visible the logic and principles of conduct necessary to explore

what the archived *records were records of* and how the initial archive, if used as the sole level of analysis, would lead to *limits to certainty* in developing warranted claims of the processes undertaken by the IDP team. These analyses made visible the levels of analytic scale and time that was important to consider when situating a particular course within the developing program, and the program within the levels of the university system that were shaping what was possible for the IDP team to undertake. Our goal in framing these layers of work, and the complexity of the contextual milieu of this project, was to answer the question of *what is an archive an archive of*. What became visible as we sought to identify the levels of contextual surround and influence was that it was necessary to reformulate the initial question to ask *when is an archive complete* and *what is missing from a particular archive that is necessary to construct grounded accounts of factors involved in, supporting and/or constraining the development of a particular program*.

The analyses presented in this chapter show that within an ongoing Interactional Ethnography, the archive becomes an actor in, and an ethnographic space for, the analysis process. That is, the archive is a living space that the ethnographers (re)enter, engage with records included and add to, as new questions or phenomena are identified when considering the part-whole/whole-part relationships of the bits of life being studied. This dynamic process, therefore, is part of a reflexive stance, and one that future work might explore to uncover the complex work of ethnographic research that focuses not on whole socie-

ties but on tracing particular configurations of actors or events to create situated understandings of the *particularities of life* within particular social groups and/or institutional spaces. Finally, the layers of analysis for this project demonstrated the role that external ethnographers can play in an ongoing project in supporting not only further analyses but also ways that

the internal team can step back from what they have learned to (re)consider the roots of this learning. Without the dialogues between the internal and external teams, we would not have been able to understand both what the records were records of and what and how the archive itself became an actor in an ethnographic space.

## REFERENCES

- Agar, M. (1994). *Language Shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Agar, M. (2006). An ethnography by any other name. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol.7(4). Retrieved July 16, 2014, Retrieved from .
- Atkinson, P. (1990). *The ethnographic imagination: Textual constructions of reality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont S., Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. (Eds.) (2001). *Handbook of Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Baker, W. D. & Green, J. L. (2007). Limits to certainty in interpreting video data: Interactional Ethnography and disciplinary knowledge. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, Vol. 2(3), p.1–13.
- Bateson, G. (1972). The logical categories of learning and communication. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, p. 279–308.
- Birdwhistell, R. (1977). Some discussion of ethnography, theory, and method. In J. Brockman (Ed.) *About Bateson: Essays on Gregory Bateson*, p. 103–144. NY: Dutton.
- Bloome, D., and Bailey, F. (1992). Studying language and literacy through events, particularity, and intertextuality. In R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil & T. Shanahan (Eds.) *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Literacy Research* (pp. 181–209). IL: NCTE.
- Bloome, D., and Clark, C. (2006). Discourse-in-use. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, P. B. Elmore, & E. Grace (Eds.). *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 227–242). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bloome, D. and Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lesson. *Reading Quarterly*, Vol. 28(4), p. 305–333.
- Castanheira, M. L., Crawford, T., Dixon, C. N., and Green, J. L. (2001). Interactional ethnography: An approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. *Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 11(4), p. 353–400.
- Chian, M. (2016). *A reflexive in coming to know: Uncovering the logic-of-inquiry in ethnographic research* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. University of California Press.
- Corsaro, W. (1981). Entering the child's world: Research strategies for field entry and data collection in a preschool setting. In J. L. Green and C. Wallat (Eds.). *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 117–146). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Couch, S., Stewart, A., Brooks, L. & Saveri, A. (2013). *Long term thinking project annual report*. Unpublished manuscript. California State University East Bay, Hayward, CA.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Ellen, R. F. (1994). *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*. New York: Academic.
- Green & Bridges, in press Interactional Ethnography. In F. Fischer, C. E. Hmelo-Silver, S. R. Goldman & P. Reimann (Eds.), *International Handbook of the Learning Sciences*, NY: Routledge/ Taylor & Francis
- Green, J. L., Chian, M., Stewart, E., Stewart, A., and Dai, Y. (2015). *Final research/evaluation report:*

*Pilot instructional project the long term and futures project at California State University, East Bay (2012–2014)*. Unpublished manuscript. California State University East Bay, Hayward, CA.

Green, J., Dixon, C. and Zaharlick, A. (2003). Ethnography as logic of inquiry. In Flood, J., Lapp, D., Squire, J., & Jensen, J. (Eds.), *Research in the Teaching of the English Language Arts* (pp. 201–224). Mahwan, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

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

Heap, J. L. (1980). What counts as reading: Limits to certainty in assessment. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol. 10, p. 265–292.

Heap, J. L. (1995). The status of claims in “qualitative” educational research. *Curriculum Inquiry*, Vol. 25(3), p. 271–292.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Ethnography in education: Defining the essentials. In P. Gillmore, & A. A. Glat-

thorn (Eds.), *Children in and out of school: Ethnography and education* (pp. 33–55). Washington, DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Heath, S. B. and Street, B. V. (2008) *On Ethnography: Approaches to Language and Literacy Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hymes, D. (1977). Critique. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Vol. VIII (2), p.91–93.

Kelly, G., (2016). Methodological Considerations for the Study of Epistemic Cognition in Practice. *Handbook of Epistemic Cognition*, p.393–408.

Mitchell, C. J. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In P. F. Ellen (Ed.). *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct* (pp.238–241). New York: Academic.

Sevigny, M. (1981). Triangulated inquiry: A methodology for the analysis of classroom interaction. In J. Green & C. Wallat (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 65–85). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Skukauskaite, A. (2012). Transparency in transcribing: Making visible theoretical bases impacting knowledge construction from open-ended interview records. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 13(1). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1532>

## KAS ARCHYVUOJAMA ETNOGRAFINIAME ARCHYVE? PARODOMASIS ATVEJIS: IŠŠŪKIAI TIRIANT AUKŠTAJAME MOKSLE BESIVYSTANČIAS INTERDISCIPLININES PROGRAMAS

Judith Green, Monaliza Chian, Ethny Stewart, Stephanie Couch

S a n t r a u k a

Straipsnyje gilinamasi į tai, kokias dedamąsias apima etnografinio archyvo įrašai, ir parodoma, su kokiais iššūkiais susidūrė mūsų interakcinės etnografijos (IE) grupė, tyrusi vidinės interakcinės etnografijos grupės surinktus archyvuotus įrašus, kai buvome pakviesti prisidėti prie vykdomo Mokyimo plėtros projekto (MPP, angl. *Instructional Development Project*) dokumentavimo ir analizės. Išorinėje IE grupėje dalyvavo pagrindinis tyrėjas ir trys doktorantai, o vidinė IE grupė sudarė administracijos direktorius, profesorius iš organizacinės komunikacijos srities, projekto konsultantas ir du etnografai. Nors abi grupės rėmėsi interakcinės etnografijos (angl. *Interactional Ethnography*) (IE) tyrimo logika, vis dėlto atliekant

analizę teko susidurti su *užtikrintumo ribų* (Green, Baker, 2007) problema – kilo klausimas, kodėl buvo archyvuojami būtent tokie įrašai ir kas juose įrašyta. Siekiant atsakyti į šį klausimą, daryta papildomų įrašų, kuriais norėta plačiau išskleisti pradiniam įrašų archyve (vaizdo ir garso įrašuose, lauko užrašuose, dalyvių dialogų stenogramose ir artefaktuose) inskribuotas prasmės, veiksmus ir projekto kūrimo procesus. Įrašus papildžius susirašinėjimais su instruktoriumi el. paštu bei interviu su projekto nariais, tapo lengviau suprasti iteracinius ir rekursinius MPP procesus, kurių pagrindu sukurtas „geriausias šiuo metu siūlomas kursas“. Įsigilinimas į visą IE programos sudarymo procesą, kurio pagrindu sukurtas minėtas

kursas, padėjo mūsų išorinei IE grupei geriau suprasti MPP grupės pristatomus įvykius, tekstus, dalyvius, erdves, laiką, prasmes ir konstruojamus veiksmus. Archyvo papildymas buvo naudingas tiriant istorinių įvykių ir institucinių kontekstų lygius, turėjusius

įtakos tam, kuria kryptimi vystėsi MPP. Visa tai išskėlė papildomų klausimų: *kada archyvas gali būti laikomas pilnu ir ko archyve gali trūkti nuodugniai vertinant konkrečios programos kūrimą skatinančius arba stabdančius veiksmus?*

*Įteikta 2017 08 01*

*Priimta 2017 11 02*