Globalization of Waldorf education: an ethnographic case study from the Philippines
Schie, T.J. van

Citation

Teachers as Ethnographers in Schools

Abstract This chapter provides for a rationale for ethnographic research by teachers in schools, drawing on fieldwork in a Waldorf school in the Philippines. It explores how teacher-ethnographers navigate the dual role of educator and ethnographer, and how this influences access, perspective, and data collection. Using personal vignettes and fieldnotes, the chapter highlights classical ethnographic dilemmas, such as the tension between insider familiarity and analytical distance, the influence of professional biases, and the risk of homeblindness. It argues that while objectivity may be challenged, the insider position enables deep engagement and potential for educational transformation. Reflexivity and defamiliarization are presented as key tools for ensuring critical distance and research validity.

Introduction

This chapter discusses challenges and opportunities that arise when teachers become ethnographers in schools. The discussion draws on examples of ethnographic research dynamics, presented as vignettes, from fieldwork in a school setting in the Philippines. Central questions are: Is it possible to do research while teaching? What are the challenges and opportunities that emerge from a dual role in the field? And is it desirable or not that teacher-researchers become co-producers of data and are active agents for change in their research settings?

These interrelated and overlapping topics are linked to classical dilemmas related to the ethnographic method of *participant observation* (as described by many scholars, for example Spradley, 1980; Agar, 1980; and Bernard, 2006). In many ways, all participant observation – whether it is done in a remote tribal community or in a high school classroom – shares similar characteristics and requires similar skills and techniques. Researchers are always striving to "experience the lives of the people you study as much as [one] can," (Bernard 2006, 343–344) but, at the same time, "being able to switch back and forth between the insiders' view and that of an analyst" (Bernard 2006, 371). The primary dilemma, presented in the first vignette, is about becoming a participant observer, instead of an ordinary participant (Spradley 1980, 53–58); in other words, becoming a teacher-researcher instead of just a teacher. The second dilemma, in the next vignette, is about gaining access to the field. How does one present him- or herself and how does one deal with the multiple roles that are ascribed in addition to the researcher's role? (Agar 1980 54–62). Lastly, the third dilemma, in the final vignette, is about forging a research partnership with research participants and working together to improve education. This chapter argues that the teacher-ethnographer is uniquely positioned to carry out ethnographic research from and insider perspective, including eliciting in-depth information from multiple perspectives, and with great potential for empirical impact.

Ethnography in Familiar Educational Settings

The strange-familiar dichotomy has a long tradition in anthropology and beyond (Myers 2011). Traditionally, ethnographers aimed "to make the strange familiar" by doing fieldwork in faraway exotic cultural contexts, distinct from their own backgrounds, and, once back in their home context, by introducing unknown cultural practices to home audiences. In these classic colonial ethnographies, the strange was made familiar by focusing on universal human themes such as ritual, kinship, and exchange. They showed us that, despite cultural differences, people everywhere deal with similar issues in life.

Current ethnography also tries "to make the familiar strange." This concept is especially important in the growing number of ethnographic studies carried out in more or less familiar settings to the ethnographer, such as the ethnographer's own locality or one's own workplace (Gmelch and Gmelch 2018, 238; Shore 2012, 90). Underlying structures, assumptions, and values are pointed out in order not to take things for granted (Delamont

2016, 34–37). In educational research, for example, designing better tests without questioning the assumption that standardized mass testing is valuable should be avoided, as should coming up with recommendations for classroom management without any discussion of the underlying structure of uniformly graded classes.

The trend for ethnography in familiar settings coincides with another tendency: the *professional as researcher*, as opposed to the *researcher as professional* (Mosse 2006, 938; Shuttleworth 2004, 46). Undertaking such *insider-ethnography* provides an interesting new perspective (Brannan et al. 2007, 399–400), also in education (inter alia Klippel, 2017; Bakbie and Provost, 2004), with teachers positioned as ethnographers in education as opposed to ethnographers of education. The doctoral research that this chapter is based on is an example of the professional becoming a researcher. It is funded by the Doctoral Grant for Teachers of NWO, the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research.

Ethnographic Research Dynamics at a Waldorf School in the Philippines

The examples used in this chapter originate in a research project on the globalization of Waldorf education. Waldorf education is an alternative educational approach based on the pedagogic and didactic ideas of its founder, Rudolf Steiner, who espoused a specific spiritual worldview called anthroposophy. Since the turn of the century, Waldorf education has spread globally; consequently, its educational philosophy and practice was transformed and adapted to fit the new local contexts (see e.g. the studies of Boland, 2015 or Hoffmann, 2016). The research project investigates this process, the local manifestation of Waldorf education as a globalizing phenomenon, via an ethnographic case study in the Philippines.

The fieldwork at the basis of the research project was planned in several short periods (of about one to two months) in 2017 and 2018, and it continued into 2020. In practice, doing ethnographic fieldwork in a specific Filipino Waldorf school means hanging out in the teachers' lounge; chatting with students in the school yard; sitting in the back of classrooms observing; interviewing teachers, parents, and students; participating in various school activities, such as school camps, festivities, and teacher meetings; taking notes of casual conversations with parents and villagers; and, also, teaching occasionally.

Despite the fact that the research location used as an example in this chapter, namely the Philippines, is not home to the teacher-researcher (who lives and works in the Netherlands), the research setting is familiar, in the sense that research about Waldorf education is combined with the profession of being a Waldorf teacher. The notion of Waldorf is de-territorialized in the sense that ideas about it circulate within an international Waldorf network. It is also territorialized, in the sense that it is practiced and reformulated in a particular school in a particular locality. De-territorialized and territorializing notions of familiarity therefore go hand in hand in international (educational) networks (Inda and Rosaldo 2008, 12–15).

In the case study used in this chapter, the research setting is familiar to the teacher-researcher insofar as numerous school practices at the Filipino Waldorf school show similarities with Waldorf schools in the Netherlands. To some extent, the researcher and the research participants (especially the Filipino teachers) share the same knowledge and experiences. They are both familiar with the Waldorf philosophy and with numerous practices in the school, including curricular content, pedagogical principles, and didactics.

More generally, many aspects of school life are more familiar and thus easier for the teacher-researcher to identify with than those of non-teacher-researchers, including typical classroom and schoolyard dynamics and efforts and struggles of teachers and students.

However, the assumption of such familiarity may also mask seeing potential differences and distract from the fact that day-to-day school practices are undeniably embedded in their local context and that Filipino culture is evident in teaching, in working together, and in interacting with students.

Research Setting 1: Studying Oneself

When teachers do research, it might be the case that – sooner or later – they study themselves. That is to say, they study the pedagogical and didactical approaches they use as well as educational ideologies that they themselves follow and put into practice. This may occur in the school setting in which they are employed or in a different school. For example, teachers may be asked to temporarily replace a teacher or to participate in other occasional work activities, such as guidance during a school camp or class trip, making or grading tests, etc.

This was the case during the research on Waldorf education in the Philippines, when a request was made to co-teach a series of geography les-sons on the topic of meteorology. As a result, participant observation partly turned into self-observation.

Diary excerpt:
Every day we start the lesson with a morning verse. Because the students were rattling off that verse quite monotonically and mechanically, the co-teacher of the course, John [note that all names in this article are pseudonyms] asked me to experiment a bit to gain more awareness of the verse lines. So, we tried various things. For example, just saying the word "I" out loud but reciting the rest of the verse in our heads. Or standing backwards, while reciting. Today, we stand in a circle.
After the verse, the lesson usually proceeds with an inspiring story. Today, it is the story of the photo "earth rise," the first photo of the earth made from space. It is supposed to make the students aware of the vulnerability of our planet. It is typical of the Waldorf way of teaching, to use images and stories without being explicit about the underlying message of those images and stories. John does that very well. A bit too extensive perhaps, but the scope is clear: We must be careful with our planet.

> [. . .] Now it is my turn to elaborate on the revolutions of the earth in space, causing day and night, different seasons, and different climate zones on earth. As difficult as it may be to distinguish four seasons in the Philippines, students still have to learn about the tilted axis of the earth, the angle of incidence of solar radiation, the solstice, and the latitudes of the tropics and polar circles. Everyone listens attentively, even when I use students to demonstrate the earth's revolutions in space by walking these movements through the classroom or when I let someone shine the torch on his smartphone on the blackboard to depict the bundling of the sun's rays in different angles.
>
> But, no matter how animated the lesson, or how great the enthusiasm and attention of the students, when they have to process their notes into their lesson books, they apparently find it difficult to articulate things well. This is partly due to some students' low-level knowledge of English, which isn't their native tongue, while it is the language of instruction in almost all lessons at school. They also seem to experience a heavy homework burden, even though, in my opinion, they get little homework compared to my Dutch students. Apparently, they are not used to it.

In the example above the teacher has become a participant observer while teaching. That means that he has a dual purpose, both engaging with his work as a teacher and observing like an ethnographer (Spradley 1980, 54). In addition to the dual purpose, the role of participant observer also requires *explicit awareness* of the class situation, a *wide-angle lens*, and personal skills in order to distance oneself from one's own teaching practices and allow for being introspective (Ibid, 55–58). Lastly, and obviously, one should *record objective observations and subjective feelings* (Ibid, 58). One has become an *active participant*, but should guard against becoming a *complete participant* (Ibid, 60–61).

The many challenges related to the method of participant observation, and to becoming or being a participant observer in an educational setting, include incidental confusion about what is observed, biases related to one's educational ideology and frame of reference, and suffering from the so-called homeblindness, meaning that certain blind spots are neglected. Three related examples to these challenges from the diary entry are explained.

First, the diary entry above provides an example of confusion about what is observed, as noted when the teacher-researcher was asked to think about experiments to make students more aware of the contents of a morning verse. Do these experiments such as standing backward or in a circle reveal anything about the educational practices of this particular school because they resulted from a pedagogical question raised by one of the teachers at the school? Or should they be seen as the outcome of a creative approach by the teacher-researcher; in other words: an observation of the self?

Similarly, the above example also reveals potential biases related to being a Waldorf teacher. Agar (1980) suggests that biases are not only personal and cultural, but "[they] also have been programmed with some powerful professional ones" (42). Inevitably, one has profound ideas about professional competence: about good or bad lessons, capable or non-capable teachers, and so on.

It was stated in the diary excerpt, for example, that the Filipino teacher used a typical

Waldorf way of teaching and that he did this *very well*. One must inquire on what basis the teacher-researcher is observing and judging certain professional competences and on what basis is teaching *well done* in *a Waldorf way*? To some extent, it can be said that the use of strong images is typical for the Waldorf pedagogy, since it is mentioned in many Waldorf resource books that are used both in the Philippines and in the Netherlands. On the other hand, this judgment is also one of personal taste and interpretation.

Third, there may be *homeblindness*, a classical anthropological concept referring to a very small analytical distance between observer and observed, causing certain blind spots. A famous analogy attributed to Kluckhohn (1949) is that of a fish forgetting about the water around it because the water is always there. Spradley (1980) is especially cautious of home-blindness in cases of ethnography in familiar settings: "The more you know about a situation as an ordinary participant, the more difficult it is to study it as an ethnographer" (61).

In the diary entry, such a blind spot can be observed in relation to the contradiction between the students' enthusiasm for and involvement with the subject matter and the difficulties they experienced with processing their notes and managing their homework. Does this say something about a specific learning culture, or does it instead speak to the learning abilities of the students? Does the teacher's non-native background make him simultaneously interesting and difficult to understand, for example? In fact, there can be many reasons, but certain blind spots can easily influence analysis of such a contradiction.

How should teacher-ethnographers approach these challenges of potential confusion, biases, and blind spots? It is important to understand that ethnographic research is subjective by definition, and its quality does not depend on neutrality, but rather on a reflexive epistemological stance. "[Ethnography] has always meant the attempt to understand another life world using the self [. . .] as the instrument of knowing" (Sherry Ortner 1995, in Shuttleworth 2004, 47) in which "subjective experiences and selfhood are part and parcel of fieldwork and its results" (Robben and Sluka 2007, 63).

Reflexivity, then, includes the art of "making the familiar strange," meaning that one is able to see oneself from a distance when operating in the field and navigate between different identities, for example, teacher or researcher, man, white, European, a father, Dutch. Another method for transcending one's own viewpoints is to imagine new viewpoints by empathizing with the other actors in the school, that is, students, parents, or support staff. Thus, defamiliarization is not just a technique, it provides a range of new experiences and perspectives.

Above all, studying one's own familiar educational context provides opportunities. Specific professional competences and knowledge not only provide the teacher-ethnographer with easier access to the field but also allow for a more profound exploration: "The insider is potentially better positioned [. . .] to reveal the 'true story'" (Alvesson 2003, 178). The positioning of ethnographers in familiar settings facilitates in-depth research, allows for an easier grasp of sensitive issues, and grounds theories in practice in a more or less natural way, resulting in thorough empirical accounts (Ibid. 2003, 181).

In addition to easy access and in-depth information, there are a number of practical advantages to ethnography done in familiar settings, compared to ethnography in less familiar settings: It is usually less costly, easier to set up, and less time-consuming (Ibid. 2003, 172).

Research Setting 2: Dual Roles

The previous example in which the researcher is submerged in his own research setting as a result of teaching practices, clarifies how teacher-researchers can take on dual roles in the field. To a certain extent, all ethnographers deal with multiple roles in the field and must continuously navigate between them. There are many more possible roles in addition to those of researcher and teacher. For example, the teacher-researcher might have and/ or might be perceived as having the role of project manager, advisor, colleague, coach, trainer, supporter, donor, policymaker, sparring partner, confidante, and/or friend. As the diary excerpt below illustrates, there was confusion about the role of the researcher in the Filipino research setting.

Diary excerpt:
After I had introduced myself during the plenary meeting, I wondered how people saw me: As a Waldorf teacher? A Waldorf consultant? A supporter of the school? A potential donor? Or as a researcher? I had the feeling that my background as a Waldorf teacher was more valued than my intended role as researcher. [. . .]

I even wondered if everyone really realized that I was a researcher. I had stressed the fact that I – unlike most foreign visitors [the school had been frequently visited by foreign advisors and sympathizers] – did not come to bring things, such as money or advice, but that – instead – I had come to get things from them, namely research data. [. . .]

Despite my firm and clear introduction, I noticed, quite quickly, that teachers regularly saw me as an advisor and colleague rather than as researcher. They also asked for feedback about their teaching after I had observed their classes. They pretty much expected it. They asked, for example: Did I do it right? How would you do it? Do you have any tips? I repeatedly reminded them that I was not here to judge. But that didn't stop them from asking time and again for my opinion. [. . .] Like Ms. Kristine. Based on my casual feedback of the day before, she had chosen a different approach in her lesson today.

The example above deals with the theme of entering the field and presenting oneself as a researcher, an issue of access that all ethnographers are confronted with. Agar (1980) explains that what one is doing in the field is very important in relation to research ethics, but people initially "will draw on their own repertoire of social categories to find one that fits [them]" (54). Sometimes, research participants value other roles more than that of the researcher.

In the context of ethnography in familiar educational settings, and especially in cases of dual roles in those settings, entering the field is often relatively easy. But such a smooth

connection to the field comes with its own set of challenges. The challenges inherent to having dual roles include fostering multiple loyalties and having an engaged insider's perspective, making it difficult to distance oneself analytically. Moreover, if the role of the researcher is overruled by other roles, dual roles can conceal the fact that there is actually research being conducted for those who are part of it. These challenges will now successively be discussed on the basis of the above example from the field.

First, multiple loyalties relating to multiple roles can come into conflict with each other. The loyalty of the researcher towards research outcomes, for example, can be in conflict with the loyalty of the professional towards the institution in which she or he works or is associated with. In fact, "the more roles and statuses ethnographers occupy in relation to their informants, the higher the likelihood that conflicts of interest, ethical dilemmas, and/or points of contention will occur" (Shuttleworth 2004, 46). Moreover, some roles could lead to "too strong of an identification with one's research subjects" (Ibid, 51). This can result in self-restraint with respect to research outcomes, such as omitting sensitive information in order to prevent the organization from being shown in a bad light (Alvesson 2003, 167).

Furthermore, critique of Waldorf education can be marginalized in the research, even unconsciously, in order to present a positive image of the Waldorf school under investigation. This happens especially when one identifies too strongly with the educational ideology of Waldorf education as a core element of one's professional identity. This is not obvious in the example above, but it is applicable to the research literature on Waldorf education, which is often accused of being biased. It is seen as being too positive about the educational approach or too negative, with almost no middle ground or neutral considerations (Dhondt et al., 2015).

In classical ethnography, when an amalgamation of roles occurs, it is sometimes referred to as going native (Bernard 2006, 348–349). When one is too close, one might become reluctant to talk about sensitive issues or taboos. And even when one tries to be as neutral as possible, sometimes research environments or participants put pressure on the researcher – explicitly or implicitly – to choose sides in a conflict. This occurred, for example, in the research of Forsey (2004), *He's Not a Spy; He's One of Us.*

Teachers who conduct research in schools are already familiar with or are "native" in their research setting. Their challenge is to adapt a non-teacher lens in their research setting by questioning everyday commonalities, underlying structures, assumptions, and values. Instead of getting close by "breaking into" their "field," they might distance themselves by "breaking out" (Alvesson 2003, 176), by simultaneously being "immersed and estranged" (Ybema and Kamsteeg 2009, 103), and alternately "social" and "anti-social," in order to be able to be both socially connected to research participants and be analytical towards the research outcomes (Mosse, 2006). "In fact, closer relations in the field [. . .] have made exit rather than entry the significant shift in location" (Ibid, 936).

The diary excerpt shows how difficult this is in practice. Despite the researcher's conscious attempts to present himself as a researcher, people continued to treat him as a colleague,

as another teacher, or as an advisor. On the one hand, this is about how one presents oneself. Bernard (2006) is clear about the rules related to such presentation: "Be honest, be brief, and be absolutely consistent [and] understand that not everyone will be thrilled about your role as researcher" (358). On the other hand, it is also about how people understand your message. Agar (1980) noted: "I tried to tell everyone who I was, but [. . .] the message does not always get across to everyone" (1980, 60).

How can these challenges of multiple loyalties and identities, sufficient analytical distance, and an unambiguous presentation of the self be overcome? First, a balance must be found between issues that require openness and those issues that require prudence. On the one hand, it is useful to reflect openly on one's role in the research, including the personal sympathies, intentions, loyalties, and complications that emerge with multiple roles in the field and becoming a participant observer. On the other hand – also from an ethical perspective – one must be aware of power differences and be prudent about sensitive information that could possibly harm research participants.

Second, there must be a combination of closeness and distance. Closeness is essential to be able to empathize with research participants in order to obtain in-depth information and even to "understand what goes without saying" (Ybema and Kamsteeg 2009, 101). However, in order to analyse and theorize research outcomes, a degree of distance must also be maintained, and the researcher must also avoid "staying native," by "breaking out" (Alvesson 2003, 176) or by becoming involved in a way that has been characterized as "detached involvement" (Nash 1963, in Agar 1980, 50–51).

Third, voluntary and prior informed consent must always be pursued, and it must not be assumed that one's role as a researcher is immediately clear to anyone in the field. Therefore, however frustrating it may be, repetition is necessary. One should constantly be clear and open about one's role as a researcher.

The challenges linked to having multiple roles in the field may have down sides, but they certainly also entail excellent opportunities for good ethnographic insight. Multiple roles imply that there are also multiple perspectives. Indeed, the research topic is then approached, in a relatively natural way, from different angles and through multiple, bottom-up, "insider" views.

Research Setting 3: Co-producing Data

Dual roles can be confusing not only for research participants but also for researchers themselves. When researchers switch smoothly between their roles in the field, boundaries may become blurred and more hybrid. A possible result is that researchers become co-producers of research data as a side effect of being active agents attempting to improve and their research and educational settings as they move towards the participant side of the participant-observer spectrum. This is almost inevitable in any research in which participant observation is used as a method (Spradley 1980, 58–62; Bernard 2006, 347).

This occurred in the Filipino research setting when a group of Dutch Waldorf consultants joined a trip to the Philippines. They were responsible for a series of Asian Waldorf Teacher Training sessions. This event turned out not only to be an opportunity to meet Filipino Waldorf teachers from all over the country, but it was also a way to discuss various aspects of Waldorf education with them and to think collectively about improvements in teaching practices and the curricula in their schools. In such a situation, a researcher could easily act as a consultant, even if one is not officially assigned to that role. Or one may even be asked to substitute for a trainer who suffered from sunstroke in the tropical heat at the end of the Philippines dry season.

> Diary excerpt:
> *Trainer Henk invited me to his workshop in order to facilitate a discussion on the history curriculum in grade 7 and 8. Teachers from different Filipino Waldorf schools joined the discussion. All participants considered the discussion relevant, and it became clear that most of them were not fully satisfied with the current history curriculum, which was evaluated as being too general, too unspecific, and too Eurocentric in relation to the national and local contexts of the schools. Various options for change became part of the conversation.*
>
> *Gradually, I joined the discussion by making suggestions and coming up with alternative ideas. I did so partly because my opinion was asked for by the participants, but also partly due to my own enthusiasm for the topic. After all, I am a teacher myself and I know the Waldorf history curriculum of grade 7 and 8 quite well.*

This third and last example deals with the dilemma of forging a research partnership with research participants. Could one cooperate with them to make things better? Why would one do this? "Increasingly, anthropologists today involve the people whom they study in their fieldwork" (Gmelch and Gmelch 2018, 240). Such questions relate to the increase of anthropological studies in familiar settings, in which close proximity between researchers and research participants makes cooperation easier.

Usually, ethnography is more focused on describing social realities rather than on changing them. But the researcher's influence on the research setting is considered implicit to the research process, not something to be avoided per se, but something to be open about and reflect upon. Anthropological knowledge is always "inseparable from their relationship with those they study" (Mosse 2006, 935) and "socially negotiated" (Ibid, 946). Furthermore, research plans are usually open to change during the research, since the data are collected inductively and there is a certain openness to serendipitous (unintentional) findings.

In the example above, the possibility to co-produce a newly adjusted history curriculum can be considered serendipitous because it had not been anticipated. Like the Three Princes of Serendip, ethnographers find all kinds of things they weren't looking for. So, even though an action-oriented method is less conventional in ethnographic research, it leaves the option open, often in cooperation with research participants (Down and Hughes

2009). The challenge in such research is not necessarily to minimize one's influence as a researcher, but to ensure that all participants recognize their contributions.

Ultimately, all social researchers strive for validation of their research outcomes. This usually happens by giving critical accounts of underlying structures, that is, ethnography of education, or by action-oriented cooperation from the inside, that is, ethnography in education. Teachers who study schools are able to be ethnographers in education, since they are familiar with teaching and research practices. This gives them the tools to rapidly convert research outcomes into practical change. This is illustrated by the third vignette, which shows how the researcher is readily drawn into potential curricular change.

A Rationale for Ethnographic Research by Teachers in Schools

What opportunities are provided by ethnographic research conducted by teachers in schools? This question must be asked taking into account that teachers-ethnographers partly study themselves, play multiple roles in the field, and often co-produce data with research participants.

There are clearly a number of challenges related to ethnographic research conducted by teachers in schools, but there also some good reasons to make a case for it. First, an insider perspective is founded on an organic closeness to research participants and offers a considerable chance to yield in-depth information. Second, the research is approached from multiple grounded insider perspectives. Lastly, it implies the potential for practical empirical impact.

References

Agar, Michael H. 1980. *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*. New York: Academic Press.

Alvesson, Mats. 2003. "Methodology for Close Up Studies: Struggling with Closeness and Closure." *Higher Education* 46, no. 2, 167–193.

Bakbie, Andrea M. and Mary C. Provost. 2004. "Teachers as Researchers." *Intervention in School & Clinic* 39, no. 5, 260–268.

Bernard, Harvey Russell. 2006. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*, 4th edition. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira

Boland, Neil. 2015. "The Globalisation of Steiner Education: Some Considerations." *Research on Steiner Education Journal* 6, 192–202.

Brannan, Matthew, Geoff Pearson, and Frank Worthington. 2007. "Ethnographies of Work and the Work of Ethnography." *Ethnography* 8, no. 4, 395–402.

Delamont, Sara. 2016. *Fieldwork in Educational Settings: Methods, Pitfalls and Perspectives*, 3rd edition. Oxford: Routledge.

Dhondt, Pieter, Nele van de Vijver, Pieter Verstraete, Moritz Föllmer, Moritz, and Mark B. Smith. 2015. "The Possibility of an Unbiased History of Steiner/Waldorf Education?," *Contemporary European History* 24, no 4, 639–649.

Forsey, Martin. 2004. "'He's not a Spy; He's One of Us': Ethnographic Positioning in a Middle-Class Setting." In *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation* edited by Lynne Hume and Jane Mulcock, pp. 59–70. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gmelch, George and Sharon Bohn Gmelch. 2018. *In the Field: Life and Work in Cultural Anthropology.* Oakland, CA: University of California Press*.*

Hoffmann, Vera. 2016. "Creating Place-based Waldorf Festivals; An Ethnographic Study of Festivals in Two Non-European Waldorf Schools." *Research on Steiner Education Journal* 7, no. 2, 88–104.

Inda, Jonathan X. and Rosaldo, Renato (eds). 2008. *The Anthropology of Globalization*, 2nd edition. Malden: Blackwell.

Klippel, Friederike. 2017. "Teachers as Researchers," *Language Teaching* 50 (2): 297-98.

Kluckhohn, Clyde. 1949. *Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Mosse, David. 2006. "Anti-social Anthropology? Objectivity, Objection, and the Ethnography of Public Policy and Professional Communities." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12, no. 4, 935–956.

Myers, Robert. 2011. "The Familiar Strange and the Strange Familiar in Anthropology and Beyond," *General Anthropology* 18, no. 2, 1–9.

Robben, Antonius C.G.M. 2007. "Fieldwork Identity". In *Ethnographic Fieldwork. An Anthropological Reader*, edited by Antonius C.G.M. Robben and Jeffrey A. Sluka, pp. 59–63. Malden: Blackwell.

Shore, Cris. 2012. "Anthropology and Public Policy." In *The Sage Handbook of Social Anthropology*, pp. 89–104. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2929 14436

Shuttleworth, Russell. 2004. "Multiple Roles, Satuses, and Allegiances: Exploring the Ethnographic Process in Disability Culture." In *Anthropologists in the Field; Cases in Participant Observation* edited by Lynne Hume and Jane Mulcock, pp. 46–58. New York: Columbia University Press.

Spradley, James P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ybema, Sierk and Frans Kamsteeg. 2009. "Making the Familiar Strange: A Case for Disengaged Organizational Ethnography." In *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life*, edited by Sierk Ybema, Dvora Yanow, Harry Wels, and Frans Kamsteeg, pp. 101–119. London: Sage.

Visual impressions
from Gamot Cogon Waldorf School

Figure 1 | Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, 14 February 2017. The school's reception building. Every Monday morning, the flag ceremony takes place here – at other schools in the Philippines, this is done daily – with the flag raised and the national anthem sung before the children go to their classrooms. The reception building is elevated due to flood risk. Underneath the reception area, the teachers gather to start the day with a verse and to wish one another a good day.

Figure 2 | Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, 11 January 2017. Main building of the Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, built in an organic anthroposophical architectural style with heptagonal forms but adapted to the Filipino context with organic architecture, *nipa*-hut-style structures, and local natural building materials. The kindergarten and classes 1 and 2 are located in separate structures. The buildings are surrounded by greenery. There is ample space to play, a large schoolyard, school gardens, and a basketball court. The school is located on a five-hectare site with forest and agricultural land.

Figure 3 | Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, 27 January 2020. Outdoor lessons. There are many art classes (like drawing, painting, music, and theatre), movement classes (like physical education), and nature classes (like gardening) in the curriculum, and lessons often take place outdoors.

Figure 4 | Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, 14 February 2017.
Olympic Games in class 5, the sports activity parallels the main
lesson topic of Ancient Greek culture.

Figure 5 | Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, 23 January 2020. In the classroom during a main lesson in class 6. Each class begins the day with a main lesson. During these lessons, students work thematically in three-week blocks. The themes correspond to the age of the class, thereby serving not only cognitive goals but also social and personal development objectives.

Figure 6 | Gamot Cogon Waldorf School, 4 June 2018. The Rose Ceremony, a tradition at the beginning of the school year in which class 12 students receive class 1 students with a rose. The ceremony takes place on the outdoor school stage. Many gatherings take place here, including seasonal festivals, plays, or regular *kamustahans*, thematic meetings with parents.