COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY
https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2024.2383437

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The road from Teamsterville: Locating alternate approaches to the ethnography of communication

Mark Ward Sr. and Leland G. Spencer

ABSTRACT

In this essay, we offer three interrelated continua that together constitute a heuristic framework for locating metatheoretical approaches to the ethnography of communication (EC). The first continuum locates a range of epistemological approaches for EC research, from post-positive to interpretive to critical. Building on these epistemic commitments, the second continuum locates varying approaches to conceptualizing power relations in ethnographic contexts. The third continuum, also related to but not parallel with the other two, locates differing ethical approaches for ethnographers of communication. Taken together, these three continua reveal the values instantiated in a range of approaches to EC research. Given the diversity of approaches available in the field, we argue not for the primacy of one over another, but for mutual recognition of, and mutually productive cross-conversation on, the strengths and challenges of the respective views.

KEYWORDS

Ethnography of communication; speech codes theory; fieldwork; critique; epistemology; power; ethics

In a recent essay, Nimrod Shavit (2023) proposed to "transcend the debate on the critical voice in Ethnography of Communication" (p. 1) by "systematizing [its] interpretive dynamic into a replicable procedure whose results could be tested as hypotheses in experimental settings" (p. 4) and result in "constructing scientific predictions and explanations" (p. 7). His proposal was a response to Ward et al. (2022) who argued that contemporary social justice concerns within the field of communication studies impose on ethnographers an ethical obligation to critique harmful and oppressive speech, and that critical theory provides additional tools to enhance ethnographic description. This exchange is the latest in a debate that has been ongoing for more than 30 years – since Fiske (1990) took EC to task for "divorc[ing] analysis from criticism, the denial of structural differences" (p. 452), to which Philipsen (1991) rejoined that putting liberation before conservation "is to reduce [ethnography's] power and scope by theoretical fiat" (p. 329). More recently, Foley and Valenzuela (2005) observed that critical ethnography is part of qualitative researchers' larger "philosophical and methodological revolt against positivism" (p. 218). Researchers and informants each benefit, noted Haliliuc (2016) when the critical ethnographer "observes compassionately and reflects critically"

CONTACT Mark Ward Sr. wardm@uhv.edu College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences, University of Houston-Victoria, 3007 N. Ben Wilson, Victoria, TX 77901-5731, USA

(p. 134). Yet ethnographers also have an ethical responsibility, averred McKinnon et al. (2016) to refrain from "kowtow[ing] to the opinions and wishes of those studied, especially when the critic encounters objectionable discourse and practices" (p. 18).

As coauthors, we too have different views on the role of critique in EC. One of us (Spencer) argues that the ethnographer should enter the field with the a priori knowledge that power relations are always already present in any speech community. The other of us (Ward) holds that ethnographers of communication must first describe and understand a culture on its own terms, thus gaining the standing to critique – or as Philipsen (2010) reflected later in his career, "I changed my goal from changing a culture to working and living among people in a way that I might be useful to them, on their [communicative] terms, yet without sacrificing altogether my ideals" (p. 2). However, we have both observed the ongoing debate, agreeing it is salutary and necessary yet lament that real cross-conversation has stalled. Against, for example, Shavit's (2023) suggestion to transcend the debate by adopting a post-positive EC methodology, we side rather with Holstein and Gubrium's (2008) call for "ethnographic fieldwork [that] invites assumptions, an analytic vocabulary, and procedural guidelines that differ from those of naturalistic inquiry," yet without abandoning "naturalistic inquiry [that] draws attention to 'realities' of the social world that must be taken into account lest social reality be conveyed as a mere swirl of communicative moves" (p. 392). While infusing ethnography "with considerable naturalistic sentiments," they urge ethnographers not "to be satisfied with descriptions of local constitutive practices but also must describe how resources from beyond the interaction at hand mediate these practices" (p. 392).

To operationalize this vision, in this essay we propose a heuristic framework for locating alternate approaches to research in the ethnography of communication. Our heuristic enables researchers to place their own approaches along a continuum from post-positive to interpretive to critical, thereby facilitating evaluation and discussion of the merits and liabilities of each approach. We lay out continua in three areas: (1) epistemological approaches to EC ranging from post-positive prediction-and-control to interpretivism to critique, (2) approaches to power relations ranging from views that power is epiphenomenal to power is always already integral, and (3) approaches to EC ethics ranging from social-scientific detachment to denaturalization and emancipation. To aid ethnographers in making their own ontological, epistemological, and axiological decisions, we offer our tripartite framework as a readily comprehensible heuristic for making sense of differing metatheoretical perspectives on EC goals and values.

Later in the essay, we will for the sake of transparency state our own case that making space for critique enriches EC and extends its contributions. We admit that the impetus for our proposal is, as Ward et al. (2022) described, our

cultural moment in which discussions of social justice concerns have come to fore in communication studies. Nevertheless, while we do not argue that everyone must embrace a "best" set of perspectives and commitments, we do contend that the choice not to engage approaches to EC other than one's own is indeed a choice and one that needs explaining when a scholar elects it. For example, lest neutrality be inferred from a decision to defer critique of a problematic discourse, a scholar can explain that the decision owes to limitations in data collection. Regardless of what choices scholars make, they should recognize and reflect on the affordances and liabilities of those choices. Acknowledging such costs and benefits within the research itself, we contend, strengthens the credibility and persuasiveness of EC. To that end, we offer our heuristic in hopes of facilitating productive cross-conversation as ethnographers engage in scholarly debate over alternate approaches. That Shavit (2023) and Ward et al. (2022) both lay claim to EC bona fides can be a sign of healthy debate. But this also suggests the possibility of an incipient fracturing of the EC program into divergent and perhaps ultimately incommensurable strands that speak different languages. To counter such a prospect, we believe that our heuristic can provide a common basis for shared dialog.

Epistemology, power, and ethics: three frameworks

Shavit (2023) and Ward et al. (2022) each reference Philipsen's (1975) foundational study, "Speaking 'like a man' in Teamsterville: Culture patterns of role enactment in an urban neighborhood," as a springboard for their respective proposals. Yet half a century on, each imagines the road from Teamsterville as different paths – one bringing interpretive inquiry into the ambit of post-positive social science, the other adding to interpretivism the ethical obligations and theoretical tools of critique. As such, these two proposals usefully begin to sketch a range of approaches to EC epistemology, power, and ethics. Thus, we begin our exploration by introducing our proposed heuristic framework for locating the various approaches that the extant literature suggests are available to EC scholars. After explaining the layout of our framework, we will in succeeding sections elaborate implications for each of our three continua.

The ethnography of communication is rooted in Hymes's (1962) early suggestion that interpersonal speaking is a powerful metaphor for social life. Ethnographic observation of speaking could thus, he proposed, elicit cultural assumptions on which the talk of a speech community is patterned and how shared rules for interpreting in-group talk construct a shared culture (Hymes, 1974). Since then, EC has emerged as a "living" and continually developing research program. Philipsen's fieldwork in Teamsterville (Philipsen, 1975, 1976; Philipsen & Carbaugh, 1986) and among suburbanites in the Pacific Northwest (Katriel & Philipsen, 1981) accumulated emic cases on which he later built his etic speech code theory.

As researchers continued to report more emic cases, the theory has gone through successive iterations from four propositions to 13 (Philipsen, 1992, 1997; Philipsen & Hart, 2024; Philipsen et al., 2005). Meanwhile, Carbaugh (1988b, 1988a, 1990, 1996, 2005) work on cultural communication has yielded another EC approach, cultural discourse analysis (Carbaugh, 2007), that is generating a growing literature. That EC today can encompass arguments spanning Shavit's (2023) post-positive approach to Ward et al.'s (2022) advocacy for the critical voice suggests that the scope for EC research continues to widen and that the need for mutually productive cross-conversation is growing.

Interpreting the social realities that speech communities construct through their communication is an inherently elastic project. Ethnographer Laura Ellingson (2009) argues that qualitative research in communication happens across a continuum from realism to artistry, with valuable research happening at each end and all throughout the continuum. By offering the metaphor of a continuum, Ellingson resists binary categorizations that force oppositional and independent choices, and instead invites ethnographers to blend methodological approaches. In a similar manner, we embrace continua as an organizing scheme for thinking through the priorities of EC and the respective contributions of post-positive, interpretive, and critical approaches. Each perspective along the continua that we propose offers valuable insights, and each has liabilities. Herein, we posit three continua related to viewpoints about the conduct of the ethnography of communication. First, we offer a continuum that locates epistemological approaches to EC. Next, we posit a continuum to locate ethnographers' approaches to accounting for power in their work. Third, we develop a continuum to locate ethnographers' ethical commitments.

The three continua each span three approaches to social realities, namely post-positive, interpretive, and critical. These three are adapted from Burrell and Morgan's (1979) influential categorization of sociological paradigms; approaches to studying a given group are driven by whether a scholar views social realities as having objective or subjective existence and as characterized by order or conflict. Each of the three approaches admits the existence of stable shared patterns constructed through group members' communication, whether these patterns are objectively measured as aggregate communicative behaviors (post-positive), inferred from observations of members' subjective mind-sets as seen by their communication (interpretive), or critiqued as objective social structures of power and discourse (critical). Post-positivists see social realities as orderly, having a larger objective existence beyond individual behaviors; interpretivists also see social realities as orderly, but sustained by individual members' subjective mind-sets; critical scholars see social realities as sites of conflict over objective, power-laden social structures. But in terms of Craig's (1999) metamodel, each ultimately undertakes EC from a sociocultural perspective that theorizes communication as the (re)production of social order.

We regard the continua as orthogonal to one another rather than parallel. For example, some scholars may find themselves more toward the critical end in their understanding of power, but not as far in that direction on how they choose to write about it. As noted earlier, one of us (Ward) chooses to first describe and understand a culture on its own terms to gain the standing for later critique. Moreover, we understand that scholars might move across the continua throughout an ethnographic project. One might start a project committed to emic observation only but later find in the analysis that etic theories grounded in feminism or Marxism help explain a phenomenon witnessed in the field. While we sometimes invoke the metaphor of points to discuss positions along the continua, we recognize that the boundaries between categories are permeable and may morph through the course of a given project so that location along a continuum is more dynamic than static throughout the research process. Post-positive, interpretive, and critical perspectives are discrete approaches to EC, grounded in different views of social reality. Yet we believe that, when a given project or ongoing research program can benefit from a mixed approach, our continua can provide ethnographers with a useful guide forward.

Continuum 1: epistemological approaches to EC

As Ellingson's (2009) continua emphasize, qualitative communication research methodologies capture a diverse range of epistemological commitments, with some scholars seeing qualitative research as primarily adjunct to more post-positive approaches (e.g., using a qualitative survey to discern or narrow items in a quantitative study) and others seeing artistic expression as a way of generating deeper understanding of complex human phenomena. As qualitative researchers, ethnographers of communication subscribe to a range of epistemologies as well. Continuum 1 of Table 1 illustrates our assessment of the extant literature on EC as inscribing a range of epistemological commitments.

At the most realist end of Continuum 1 lies the contention that the ethnography of communication should, in the parlance of post-positivist social science, seek to predict and control human communication behavior. Shavit (2023) argued that the most proper purpose of the ethnography of communication resides in the impulse to explain why people behave as they do, with the goal of projecting reasonable expectations about what. Shavit faulted EC as it historically has functioned for answering only "how" and "what" questions, but not "why" questions. In his view, "[E]thnographers can anticipate their objects of inquiry. To anticipate the object of a cultural discourse is to make a falsifiable claim about its teleological end on the assumption of complete rationality on the part of all the individuals concerned" (p. 8). In Shavit's view, the ethnography of communication as traditionally

Table 1. Framework for locating alternate approaches to EC research.

POST-POSITIVE	INTERPRETIVE				CRITICAL
Continuum 1: Epistemology					
Predict and control	**Describe and conserve**	**Understand and critique**	**Critique to understand**	**Critique the "understanding"**	
Develop replicable procedures to test hypotheses in experimental settings	Perform conserving function by describing culture on its own terms	First understand culture on its own terms to gain standing for critique of power relations	Critique yields truer description since power is always already present in every culture	Critique EC itself as denying structures and excluding theories of subjectivity	
Continuum 2: Power					
Power is epiphenomenal	**Describe if important**	**Describe if observed**	**Understand and critique**	**Integral to community**	**Integral to ethnography**
Power is epiphenomenal to relations of causality	Power discourses described only if important to community	Power discourses described only if explicitly observed	Understand community on its own terms before critiquing power	Power is always already integral to every community	Power is always already integral to ethnographic research
Continuum 3: Ethics					
Practice social-scientific detachment	**Don't ascribe power if not important to community**	**Conserve culture on own terms, don't tell how to live**	**Learn culture on own terms to be useful to community**	**Denaturalize power to emancipate marginalized**	**Denaturalize false consensus of ethnography**
Ethics is practicing scientific objectivity	Ethics is letting culture decide what is important	Ethics is describing culture on its own terms	Ethics is critiquing culture in its own speech	Ethics is creating space for marginalized voices	Ethics is recognizing ethnographic assumptions

conceptualized excels at explaining how human beings communicate but cannot project beyond those observations and predict how those same people might behave in the future, for instance, in novel situations or evolving circumstances.

The next point on Continuum 1, description and conservation, represents the founding commitments of Gerry Philipsen as he took Hymes's original "ethnography of speaking" proposal and operationalized the ethnography of communication as a research method. Instead of "show[ing] the people we study how to change their lives," ethnographers "owe it to the people we study to try to appreciate and understand their discursive practices" by being "as accurate, careful, and sensitive as we can be" (Philipsen, 1989, pp. 259–260). EC thus properly performs a "conserving" function as ethnographers "document and describe . . . with as much principled care as possible" (Philipsen, 1991, p. 329). Such emic research can lead to etic "theory development using ethnographic data, and empirically-grounded interpretations" (Philipsen, 1989, p. 259). Molina-Markham's (2012) ethnography of Quaker worship services illustrates this approach. Molina-Markham asked herself what she needed to understand about the culture to make sense of its communication practices and concluded that having a background in Quaker beliefs and

vocabulary helped her make an argument about the use of narrative in spiritual journey accounts delivered during adult education meetings of the Quaker Church. To give another example, Wilkins's (2005) research about the behaviors of students in Finnish schools argued that the ethnographer's role is to observe and report; at the same time, Wilkins explained his use of convenience sampling and member checking and his status as an instructor of English language learners in Finland and a student at a Finnish university. As ethnographers of communication describe the communicative practices they observe, they put those findings in conversation with communication theory to generate new knowledge. In this view, the goal of ethnography resides in interpretation, not criticism. The ethnographer of communication should endeavor to understand the community studied on its own terms without imposing the researcher's own theoretical or political commitments.

Moving further across Continuum 1, another approach begins with Philipsen's commitment to understanding a culture on its own terms – but then moves on to critique when necessary and appropriate. For instance, Carbaugh and Rudnick (2006) offered an ethnographic study of Native and non-Native guides' approaches to giving tours at Glacier National Park. The non-Native tour guides Carbaugh and Rudnick studied frequently dismiss Native spirituality as superstitious, but the authors withhold judgment about those attitudes until the end of the article. In the conclusion, the authors finally acknowledge the colonial violence inherent in the different versions of the tour, where Native guides explain the Native names of geographic features and the spiritual significance of the land to Native peoples while the non-Native guides privilege the names of colonizers and discount Native religious practices. The authors' critical judgment appears but is decidedly polite: "The tale, then, is at least implicitly of an invaded homeland, and perhaps even a colonized people" (p. 180). To give another example, Mark Ward Sr. conducts ethnographic research in evangelical Christian churches, a culture in which he identifies as an insider after converting to evangelical faith as a teenager (Ward et al., 2022). During the first decade of his data collection, he held to Philipsen's view and resisted critique. Yet as he developed a tripartite picture of interwoven micro (interpersonal), meso (congregational), and macro (institutional) evangelical discourses, "This drew my gaze to the evangelical culture as a larger social structure where its discourses of power, especially those of gendering, were unavoidable" (p. 89). With that, Ward asked himself, "How long must I describe a culture on its own terms before I gained the standing to critique its power relations? Isn't a decade enough?" (p. 89). In his recent work, he has included alongside his field observations critiques of evangelical patriarchy and anti-intellectualism (see Ward, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022), but only after gaining a deep understanding of evangelical speaking, theology, and worldview on their own terms.

Advancing further toward the critical end of Continuum 1, another epistemological perspective argues that starting with a critical stance allows scholars to understand what they observe with greater richness and, importantly, a crucial accounting for power dynamics. Foley and Valenzuela (2005), for instance, called for more participatory action research from ethnographers. They lamented that much of the research, even when it calls itself critical, only speaks in the language of the academy and does not focus enough on making tangible changes in the locations observed. In a dialog with Ward about Philipsen's reluctance to name the homophobia of his participants in his classic "Speaking 'like a man' in Teamsterville," both Leland G. Spencer and Craig O. Stewart (in Ward et al., 2022) argued that bringing critical theory to bear on analyses adds to the explanatory power of the research as well as its potential academic and cultural impacts. Stewart maintained that naming unequal power relations when they appear in observational data qualifies as empirical and does not require inserting any a priori commitments into the data. For his part, Spencer argued that including critiques makes the analysis more useful to readers – a claim that he and colleague Theresa Kulbaga recently expanded on in calling for "outrage epistemology" or recognition that one's felt sense of wrong at an injustice has epistemic value (Kulbaga & Spencer, 2022). Moreover, Spencer argued that neutrality does not and cannot exist, and that even if it could, we should not desire it (see also Patterson, 2016; Spencer, 2020).

At the far end of Continuum 1 lies the claim that ethnography itself must be critiqued. By taking observations at face value, Fiske (1990) argued, EC amounts to an "acceptance of a common sense relationship of the individual to society that denies the socio-political construction of the individual and therefore excludes theories of subjectivity" (p. 452), thus implicitly reifying dominant ideologies. Further, any attempt to write about an ethnographic context necessarily changes what the ethnographer observed. Non-discursive reality may exist but to write about it, to try to understand it, means putting it into language – principally the language of the ethnographer: "The act of putting into discourse does not *describe* a non-discursive reality, it *produces* an apprehensible reality; discursivity is not descriptive but generative" (Fiske, 1991, p. 330, emphasis original). In Fiske's view, the role of critique in ethnography must apply not only to the context studied and the behavior observed, but to the very practice EC itself.

Like any methodology, the ethnography of communication has an epistemic goal: it sets out to add to the sum of our collective knowledge and understanding of human communication. The continuum of epistemological commitments located here reveals that different approaches to the ethnography of communication arrive at that goal variously. Such variety, we aver, stands out as a strength rather than a liability for EC. Other epistemological positions may certainly exist now or come later, whether beyond the respective

endpoints in Continuum 1 or between the points explored herein. We might even imagine other arrangements besides the linearity presumed in a continuum, where epistemologies interrelate spatially in three dimensions. In any event, we learn best when we practice openness to other epistemological commitments, even when we do not change our own as a result.

Continuum 2: approaches to power in EC

Just as epistemologies of ethnographers differ, so do their conceptualizations of power, its importance in human communication, and the role power should (or should not) play in ethnographic analyses. The power continuum in the ethnography of communication locates perspectives, illustrated in Continuum 2 of Table 1, that reflect the classic agon between interpretive and critical methods about the relative importance of power and the question of the degree to which researchers should look for it, report on it, and use it in their analysis.

Starting at the end of Continuum 2 that accords the lowest importance to power, Shavit (2023), who argued for an ethnography of communication focused on prediction and control, understands power as epiphenomenal to relations of causality. That is, power relations are byproducts rather than causes. To Ward et al.'s (2022) observation that Philipsen did not critique Teamstervillers' homophobia and racism, Shavit (2023) rejoined that "the limitation of SCT [speech codes theory] is not a lack of orientation toward social justice but a more fundamental inability to analyze relations of causality" (p. 1). Implicitly we believe in Shavit's call to reinvent EC along lines of systematically replicable procedures and experimentally testable hypotheses "for constructing scientific predictions and explanations" (p. 7) is privileging the power of the researcher, who thereby seeks predictive ability toward the presumable end of yielding "better" results within the observed speech community.

The next points along Continuum 2 call for attending to power when it appears contextually relevant. Carbaugh (1989) advocated listening to the voices of the population studied and reflecting on power when the research informants make power a central theme of their talk or communicative behavior. He contended that an overdetermined view of power on the part of the researcher makes a "presumption [that] risks muddling the cultural voice, obscuring another voice in terms of our own, thus rendering the cultural as something unworthy of study for its own sake" (p. 278). More recently, Carbaugh (2007) in his method of cultural discourse analysis allows for a "critical mode" of analysis that "responds to the question: does this practice advantage some more than others? What is the relative worth of this practice among participants?" At the same time, he adds, "There is the commitment in cultural discourse analysis to describe and interpret a communication practice

from the view of participants, prior to its critical appraisal. In this way, the analyst establishes a deep understanding of the phenomenon of concern, from the view of those engaged in it, prior to evaluating it" (p. 173).

Somewhat similarly, Philipsen et al. (2005) argued that ethnographers should write about power only when they directly observe it. As an example, they pointed to Philipsen's (1986) earlier study of a public speech in which Chicago mayor Richard Daley employed Teamsterville discourse to political effect. Such a method "give[s] voice to the people being studied, rather than to the voice of the author," so that power is reported "on the basis of the evidence of the case itself, not on the basis of an a priori commitment to find that power is a dominant motive in all discourse" (Philipsen et al., 2005, p. 65). In this view, a truly emic approach relies on exactly what participants said and did and what the ethnographer observed. Carbaugh and Rudnick's (2006) study of Native and non-Native tour guides represents this approach. There, the authors only briefly commented on the power dynamics they observed, though the distance between Native and non-Native perspectives on Glacier National Park both rests on and reproduces centuries of violent colonialism that persists into the present.

Moving closer to the critical end of Continuum 2, Ward's position on power, following his view on EC as a method, asks researchers to understand a community on its own terms before critiquing power. Ward's (2019) work on gender in evangelical churches, for instance, does engage in feminist critique of theologies of gender complementarity. But before Ward offers such critique, he demonstrates a thorough understanding of that community's sacralization of gender roles. A feminist critique of gender complementarity that thoroughly understands why such gender roles matter to a given community is both more complete, more intellectually generous, and has greater explanatory potential than one that merely dismisses evangelical gender ideology as retrograde. Moreover, a scholar who demonstrates a clear understanding may have more space to offer a critique that the community will heed. Gender complementarity causes great harm, so that critiquing it from a place of epistemic familiarity has more potential than out-of-hand rejection. Laterin his career, Philipsen (2010) expressed a similar view as he reflected on his own repugnance at the racism of his Teamsterville informants. Rather than walk away, he was determined to learn the Teamsterville speech code and "changed my goal from trying to change a culture to working and living among people in a way that I might be useful to them, on their terms, yet without sacrificing altogether my ideals" (p. 2). Similarly, Kvam (2017) conducted an ethnography among immigration activists working to support Mexican migrants. Kvam argued that ethnography can yield applied conclusions that assist the everyday work of activists and leveraged the results of her research to suggest practical communication strategies for such aid organizations. At the same time, while Kvam used the racist rhetoric of Donald Trump as a justificatory rationale for

the value of her study in the introduction of her article, she largely abandoned a critical race analysis for the remainder of the article. Her recommendations for practice considered power tertiarily, with practical considerations and everyday behaviors in the foreground.

The next point of Continuum 2 insists that power already inheres in human organizing and socializing. In this view, power operates subtly or overtly in all social interactions. An ethnographer who attends to power only when participants ascribe importance to it or when the ethnographer observes power relations in fieldwork may miss the hegemonic operation of power below the surface of interactions. In dialog with Ward et al. (2022), Spencer took this position in critiquing the homophobic speech and attitudes of Teamsterville men and Philipsen's decision to leave such speech unremarked upon (except to the degree that homophobic attitudes mistakenly directed at Philipsen slowed down the work he set out to accomplish). As Spencer pointed out, Philipsen's argument did nothing to help the gay residents of Teamsterville, not to mention the variety of readers who have encountered Philipsen's work in the years since. Put another way, the choice to leave power unmentioned – indeed, a choice – also leaves power unchallenged. Such a perspective always assists the powerful. Rather than neutrality, this view reinscribes existing power relations, and in some cases offers them the additional imprimatur of peer-reviewed scholarly research.

To put Spencer's and Ward's viewpoints in conversation, we return to the latter's research sites: evangelical churches. Ward's view of deferring a critique of power until first understanding it might seem like a surplus of caution when anyone in the United States, regardless of religious tradition, lives in a country whose politics and laws have for decades been consciously shaped by the evangelical Religious Right (e.g., Williams, 2012). Scholars working on American public discourse will inevitably encounter the movement's powerful impacts. As such, they may feel empowered to critique those impacts even without the level of ingroup understanding for linguistic and cultural particularities that Ward calls for (e.g., Crowley, 2006). The exercise of power, in overt and arguably harmful ways, opens this group to more critique as the price of influence in major public debates (e.g., Fetner, 2008).

On the other hand, dispensing with any ingroup understanding may run a risk that Kenneth Burke (1939) ascribed to some critics of fascism: "If the reviewer but knocks off a few adverse attitudinizings and calls it a day, with a guaranty, in advance, that his article will have a favorable reception among the decent members of our population, he is contributing more to our gratification than to our enlightenment" (p. 1). Powerful critiques of the Religious Right have come from evangelical-identifying scholars (e.g., Balmer, 2006; Du Mez, 2020; Labberton, 2018). For his part, Ward (2013) argues that the best hope for dialog between opposing sides in the culture wars is to see such dialog as intercultural communication so that, following

Gudykunst's (2005) theory, at least one side can defer its own cultural scripts and assuage anxiety and uncertainty by mastering scripts that the other side deems moral and intelligible.

At the far end of Continuum 2 lies the recognition that the ethnography of communication itself participates in the discursive construction of power and emerges from those same discursive machinations. As Fiske (1991) explained, "[E]very speech act is between socially situated people, and ... speaking relations are always, at one level of analysis, an engagement in social relations as well as social relationships" (p. 333). As such, everything the ethnographer of communication does, from choosing a topic to participating in fieldwork to selecting a publication outlet represents a power-inflected choice. "The production of the 'reality' that is the object of study is theoretically driven, the identification and rejection of data and their ranking in a hierarchy of significance [are] all instances of theory in practice" (p. 334). The idea that any part of ethnography might reflect objectivity or pure description belies, for Fiske, the role of power that pervades the whole process: "Investigation, description, putting-into-discourse, and interpretation are inseparable for they are all interlinked stages in the discursive process. There is no non-interpretive stage of investigation, for the choice of the object of investigation is an interpretive act" (p. 334).

As Continuum 2 reveals, debates about the role of power in the ethnography of communication include a wide range of approaches. The most fiercely defended tenets of some directly clash with the fervent convictions of others. We again see value across the diversity of viewpoints, though, with each approach offering benefits. Some main benefits at the more descriptive end of the continuum include more fully embracing the emic approach to interpretive research and the insistence on respecting the lives and experiences of one's participants. At the same time, ethnographers who describe power relations only when observed may, from the critical end of the continuum, learn what they have missed in choosing not to account for power. By the same token, researchers who would take a critical stance from the start might heed an invitation to look more closely, and even withhold judgment temporarily, to gain a fuller understanding even of something they might ultimately reject as oppressive and harmful. In any case, these choices *are* choices and provide a frame that cuts off some possibilities even as it enables others. Avowing those frames, with their respective strengths and offsetting liabilities, makes a piece of scholarship more intellectually honest and, ultimately, more ethical – which is the central concern of the next continuum.

Continuum 3: approaches to ethics in EC

While Continua 1 and 2 focus on epistemology or "how" we know, Continuum 3 of Table 1 shifts to the interrelated category of axiology or

"what" we believe is worth knowing. Differing perspectives about what the ethnography of communication should offer to an overall understanding of human communication correspond with viewpoints about how ethnographers *ethically* engage with the informants and communities they study and the telos of their resulting articles, chapters, books, and applied research outcomes.

On the least critical end of Continuum 3 resides Shavit's (2023) approach calling for prediction and control. For Shavit, ethical research requires objectivity. In this view, practicing social-scientific detachment stops researchers from putting a thumb on the scale of their results and conclusions. In seeking generalizable results, researchers would, to the degree possible, avoid influencing informants or inserting their own perspectives into their observations or interpretations.

Next on Continuum 3 lie the views of Carbaugh and Philipsen whose ethics of radical listening impel them to stick with, respectively, what the culture they observe says about itself or exhibits in their own communicative behavior. For Carbaugh (1989), the culture studied always knows itself and its values better than any outside researcher could. The most ethical stance for the scholar, then, is practicing enough humility to privilege that culture's own values and priorities – even without necessarily adopting them. Again, to do otherwise "risks muddling the cultural voice, obscuring another voice in terms of our own, thus rendering the cultural as something unworthy of study for its own sake, in its own terms" (p. 278). For his part, Philipsen argued, as noted above, that ethnographers of communication must "be as accurate, careful, and sensitive as we can be" (Philipsen, 1989, p. 260) in "conserving" a culture, doing so "with as much principled care as possible" (Philipsen, 1991, p. 329). The emic ethics of these two positions prioritize a culture's own understanding of itself, a view at once respectful of cultures and their agency.

On the next point in Continuum 3 lies the contention that if one critiques a culture, one should do so from an understanding of that culture and preferably an ability to deploy its speech code. As noted earlier, Philipsen (2010) later in his career related how he at first thought to walk away from the hypermasculinity and racism he encountered at Teamsterville during his fieldwork. But instead, "I set myself to learn its terms and tropes, its premises and rules, for locally appropriate and efficacious communication" with the hope of "working and living among people in a way that I might be useful to them, on their terms, yet without sacrificing altogether my ideals" (p. 2). Philipsen (1997) presaged this development by adding to his speech codes theory the proposition that "The artful use of a shared speech code is a sufficient condition for predicting, explaining, and controlling the form of discourse about the intelligibility, prudence, and morality of communicative conduct" (p. 167). Similarly, in a published dialogue with colleagues, Ward noted the sexism of evangelical culture but explained, "Indeed, if I exposed taken-for-granted gender norms, was I not doing a service to my informants? By denaturalizing a blind spot,

marginalized voices could be heard, and dominant voices might even reexamine their discourse in light of the hidden impacts that I reported" (Ward et al., 2022, pp. 89–90). And Elisa M. Varela agreed that "there are different ways to resist sexism, homophobia, and racism. We need not all take up critical theories of discourse to catalyze critical reflection. For example, by denaturalizing speaking practices' interconnections with notions of gender, 'Teamsterville' furnishes a more robust basis for critical reflection" (Ward et al., 2022, p. 97).

Moving toward the more critical end of Continuum 3, the next point argues that the ethical goal of communication research is emancipation from all forms of oppression. Such a liberatory ethic in the ethnography of communication would ask, for instance, how speaking can construct a more just world. In this view, the researcher has an ethical imperative to critique oppressive language patterns or communicative behaviors in the interpretations of their observations. Even when researchers cannot intervene in the oppressive conditions they observe in situ, they can put the thick description of their fieldwork in conversation with critical theory, explain why harmful behaviors constitute homophobia or racism or other social ills and, crucially, offer alternatives. In publication outlets like academic journal articles or books, the ethnographer's main audience comprises students and scholars of communication who may well consider what an ethnographer reports on and authorizes in their accounts of their research contexts. Foley and Valenzuela (2005) called for more activist ethnographies aimed more at actual intervention in local contexts than at academic audiences. They advocated for "more politically useful critical ethnographies" than ones addressed just to other scholars (p. 224; see also, Van Maanen, 2000).

Rhetoricians working on field methods or other in situ projects often embody the kind of political representation of this point on the continuum. As Middleton et al. (2015) explained,

> Ethnography's interpretive aim can be augmented by a rhetorical sensibility, especially one that attends to the contests over meaning that lie at the heart of the rhetorical enterprise. As constellations of meaning are articulated, challenged, and rearticulated, those engaging in participatory critical rhetoric carry with them the fundamental appreciation for language and its power in forming the discourses of hegemony and resistance. Moreover, participatory critical rhetoric enables ethnographers to participate in the advocacy of these endeavors, linking discursive possibility with embodied action. (pp. 22–23)

Pezzullo (2016), in a perspective largely concordant with Middleton et al., called for ethnographic rhetorical methods as a distinctly emancipatory approach to research precisely because ethnography allows for the unearthing and centering of rhetorics and perspectives not often considered.

Reflecting on the homophobia of Teamstervillers, Spencer (in Ward et al., 2022) asked how queer readers would make sense of Philipsen's work: of his frustration at being perceived as gay for wearing colored socks and refusing to

use corporal punishment, and of his relief upon finally convincing his informants they could trust him (presumably because he was not, in fact, gay). Ethnographers may observe conditions that facilitate or stifle worldmaking possibilities for people – whether their readers, their participants, or both. How they report on those realities and the communicative options for fomenting or resisting them matters deeply.

The final point of Continuum 3 shares much with the preceding point in its melioristic goal for ethnography. This approach, however, adds that ethical research requires an active awareness of ethnography's dynamics. Fiske (1991) argued that ethnography should try to address social ills: "The point of producing knowledge is not just to understand our social conditions but to improve them. I wish to live in a society in which social differences are respected and validated and in which power differences are minimized" (p. 334). Because Fiske sees every part of the ethnographic process as a discursive construction, ethical responsibility inheres in every step. "An uncritical analysis," Fiske (1990) lamented, "ends up by being supportive of its object" (p. 451).

Discussion

Our three continua together offer a heuristic framework for locating different epistemological approaches to ethnography of communication research, approaches to power in ethnographic analysis and ethical approaches to guide ethnographic practice. Schemata of this sort have proven generative in the field of communication for describing communication theory (Craig, 1999; Graves, 2019; Graves & Spencer, 2023) and qualitative research (Ellingson, 2009), to name two examples. Each perspective along our continua, and others not yet imagined or articulated, offers contributions to knowledge and understanding of human communication behavior. While readers may prefer one point of each continuum over the others, we aver that rejecting the insights of any point on the continua threatens to impoverish what we may come to know from the ethnography of communication. Each point along our continua and each theoretical commitment they represent reveal *and* conceal. Rather than denying the realities of one's choices, we encourage scholars to embrace the uncertainties as epistemically pregnant with possibility. What do one's choices allow one to see, and what do these choices background or obscure? How might different theoretical lenses reshape strategies for crafting a literature review, observations in the field, the final write up of the manuscript, and all the stages in between?

Not every work must engage with critical theory, and those that choose not to do so should acknowledge what they may miss. At the same time, those that do should account for the applicability of theory to the lived realities of their participants, including what perspectives or understandings of the world the

researchers might miss due to their own ideologies. Honesty about such biases and the liabilities thereof matters more than trying to eliminate biases. On the other hand, interpretive and critical ethnographers who dismiss empirical rigor as solely a post-positivistic concern may fall into traps such as Milburn (2021) described, when she analyzed

> twenty years of peer-reviewed journal articles and books (2000–2019) that specifically use the concept of speech community within research about speech codes. Although speech community is incorporated into one of the six main tenets of speech codes theory, the concept has not been consistently used . . . [when researchers often claim] the a priori assertion of a speech community. I conclude by arguing that one must understand the particular social relations among speakers before asserting the existence of a speech community. (p. 221)

A further example of acknowledging one's biases is the inclusion of reflexivity statements in one's research. At least ostensibly, such statements promise to enact the kind of avowal of researchers' perspectives that we call for. Done well, a reflexivity statement acknowledges the researcher's positionality and accounts for its potential effects in and on the research. Although reflexivity statements can become pro forma or boilerplate, especially when they appear as if checking off a box and then vanish without an impact on the research, good reflexivity statements offer an epistemic enhancement to a work's contribution. In the ethnography of communication, appropriate procedures for data collection "depend on the relationship of the ethnographer and the speech community" in that "[t]he essential defining characteristics of ethnographic field procedures are that they are designed to get around the recorder's biased perceptions and that they are grounded in the investigation of communication in natural contexts" (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 95). Carbaugh et al. (2011) helpfully call for various forms of reflexivity, referring to self-reflexivity as necessary but insufficient. To self-reflexivity, they add theoretical reflexivity, descriptive reflexivity, interpretive reflexivity, comparative reflexivity, and critical reflexivity. By going beyond self-reflexivity, scholars acknowledge that not only their personal positionalities but also their academic and interpersonal acculturation practices have shaped their epistemologies (and much more).

In the dialog (Ward et al., 2022) whose conversation we seek to advance, each of the four scholars identified their standpoints. The two colleagues whose research is grounded in EC illustrate two possibilities. On the one hand, Ward described how his standpoint as a self-identified evangelical impacts fieldwork and analysis within his own community. On the other hand, Varela identified as nonwhite, queer, working-class, cis woman of immigrant descent. She found in EC a methodology that enables "the intellectual stance of humility . . . [whereby] I could listen to, on *their* terms, people who are socially marginalized due to their intersecting identities. Rather than engage in colonial interventionist practices,

I could be useful to marginalized communities – again, on their terms" (Ward et al., 2022, p. 95, emphasis in original). This suggests and affirms how ethnographers' self-reflexivity can extend to larger critical interrogation of their standpoint as immersed in "Western, modernistic epistemologies focused on mind-body dualism at the expense of other ways of knowing and understanding human beings" (Taylor, 2023, p. 40) and in an academic tradition where "[k]nowledge production and whose knowledge counts as legitimate is a historical process deeply intertwined with colonialism" (Schnabel, 2023, p. 55).

By integrating critically inflected self-reflexivity, the ethnography of communication follows allied disciplines that have found value in the practice. To give one example, sociologist Barbara Trepagnier (2001) conducted a series of focus groups about race and racism and crucially revealed that even well-intentioned people hold racial biases and stereotypes. Given her positionality as a white woman, she conducted focus groups with other white women to facilitate the most productive conversations possible. At the same time, Trepagnier explained that including other genders and races in her focus groups might inhibit the white women's freedom of conversation that she hoped to achieve. Likewise, authoethnographers regularly integrate their own positionalities meaningfully into their analyses. Adams and Jones (2011), for example, argued for "intersections of reflexivity as both an orientation to research and a writing practice that brings together the method of autoethnography and the paradigm of queer theory." Whatever their own positions, autoethnographers should "question our desire to name and claim stories and to embrace the gifts and challenges of open texts and the importance of reflexivity as we test the limits of knowledge and certainty" (p. 108).

For ourselves, while we support the inclusion of identity-based reflexivity statements when scholars choose to use them (especially when they operate usefully in the article in an integrative way rather than making a guest appearance with no impact on the rest of the article), we call here for reflexivity about the ethnographic values, epistemological and axiological that shape any given piece of EC research. Openly identifying on each of the three continua and writing thoughtfully about what those positions enable and constrain throughout the research process adds to what readers will learn from the research. For example, we recognize that Shavit's (2023) approach to EC supposes a scientific objectivity in which the researcher's standing should not bear on findings. Interpretive and critical ethnographers, on the other hand, affirm the importance of reflexivity and question whether true objectivity is attainable. Yet in his call for a more post-positivist approach to EC, Shavit makes an argument for the benefits, from his perspective, of aiming for prediction and control in ethnography. In so doing, he also details what he sees as the limitations of traditional interpretive EC. Such explicitness about his perspective, its affordances and its limitations also align with our call for EC scholars to put their studies into active conversation with alternate approaches.

Conclusion

One value in the continuum is that its two ends, by inscribing the limits of possibility, enable us to chart several intermediate possibilities as well. In contrast, a pyramid implies a hierarchy of lesser and greater possibilities, while a scale implies a relative ranking. Arguably, a continuum suggests that its ends are "extremes" and implies these are negative outliers to be avoided. However, for our three continua we would push back against this presumption.

If our approving stance toward critical reflection would suggest a less approving view of post-positivism, we admit in the interests of self-reflexivity that this is true. Our reading of the literature suggests that the ethnography of communication is not meant to be a Popperian science in the manner proposed by Shavit (2023). As we noted earlier, Foley and Valenzuela (2005) observed that "qualitative research has become *the* site of philosophical and methodological revolt against positivism" (p. 218, emphasis in the original). Nevertheless, Shavit's proposal usefully reminds EC researchers that one goal of emic research is etic theory development. And Shavit's argument for greater rigor can be a corrective to EC researchers who struggle even to identify what constitutes a true speech community (Milburn, 2021). Philipsen's early collaborator, Tamar Katriel (2015), has moreover called for "expanding ethnography of communication research" to incorporate more attention to coding, given "the rapidly shifting contemporary techno-social environments communicators face today" (p. 454). Ethnography of *mediated* communication may require new and more social-scientific data collection methods. We see these proposals as salutary and, further, they suggest the value of our continua. Our continua bring different approaches into productive conversation (our purpose in the first place) rather than creating binaries that discourage conversation.

The old adage asserts that if your only tool is a hammer, every problem will become a nail. Contrariwise, we assert that ethnographers of communication have many tools at their disposal. They need not treat each problem as a nail nor each ethnographic context as an equivalent background for precisely applying their own understanding of EC without regard for what the other tools might offer. For ourselves, we believe a post-positivism that allows only for prediction and control would limit the ethnography of communication by rendering some tools off limits. Yet as noted earlier, post-positivist approaches can remind ethnographers of the need for empirical rigor and that the goal of emic research is etic theory development. At the other end of our continua, however, are critical approaches that call into question, and indeed would invalidate, the entire EC project. This, too, would limit what EC can discover about human communication. Yet the call to interrogate EC itself usefully

sensitizes ethnographers to the perils of an "uncritical analysis [that] ends up by being supportive of its object" (Fiske, 1990, p. 451) and supportive of the dominant and unjust social structures that the object may reify. In sum, then, we believe that all approaches are valid and useful in their own ways, such that practitioners of a given EC methodology, whether post-positive, interpretive, or critical, can benefit from cross-conversation with EC colleagues who take different approaches to their work.

And so we offer our three continua as a heuristic framework to locate – and put into conversation – alternate approaches in the ethnography of communication to epistemology, power, and ethics. We offer this framework not just as a heuristic for organizing disparate views. We invite readers to consider and discuss how integrating insights from across the three continua can enrich the ethnography of communication. Our framework can provide an easy reference for scholars to locate their own approaches to epistemology, power, and ethics, as well as to consider if a mixed approach could benefit a given EC project or ongoing research program. The heuristic likewise provides a tool for analyzing, and learning from, the approaches and decisions taken by other ethnographers – and putting these into productive cross-conversation. And in teaching the ethnography of communication, our continua can provide a readily grasped heuristic to sharpen students' awareness of foundational questions – the nature of social reality, the role of the ethnographer, their relationship to and ethical responsibilities toward informants – and appreciation for the broad possibilities for EC research afforded by alternate approaches.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Mark Ward Sr. (Ph.D., Clemson University) is a professor of communication at the University of Houston–Victoria.

Leland G. Spencer (Ph.D., University of Georgia) is a professor and chair of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at the University of South Carolina.

ORCID

Mark Ward Sr. http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8701-1834
Leland G. Spencer http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7719-3221

References

Adams, T. E., & Jones, S. H. (2011). Telling stories: Reflexivity, queer theory, and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*, *11*(2), 108–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708611401329

Balmer, R. (2006). *Thy kingdom come: How the Religious Right distorts faith and threatens America*. Basic Books.

Burke, K. (1939). The rhetoric of Hitler's battle. *The Southern Review*, *5*, 1–21. https://thesouthernreview.org/issues/detail/Summer-1939/204/

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Heinemann.

Carbaugh, D. (1988a). Comments on "culture" in communication inquiry. *Communication Reports*, *1*(1), 38–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/08934218809367460

Carbaugh, D. (1988b). *Talking American: Cultural discourses on DONAHUE*. Ablex.

Carbaugh, D. (1989). The critical voice in ethnography of communication research. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *23*(1–4), 261–281. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818909389324

Carbaugh, D. (1990). Toward a perspective on cultural communication and intercultural contact. *Semiotica*, *80*(1–2), 15–35. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1990.80.1-2.15

Carbaugh, D. (1996). *Situating selves: The communication of social identities in American scenes*. State University of New York Press.

Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation*. Erlbaum.

Carbaugh, D. (2007). Cultural discourse analysis: The investigation of communication practices with special attention to intercultural encounters. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *36*(3), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475750701737090

Carbaugh D., Nuciforo E. V., Molina-Markham E. and Van Over B. (2011). Discursive reflexivity in the ethnography of communication: Cultural discourse analysis. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, *11*(2), 153–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708611401334

Carbaugh, D., & Rudnick, L. (2006). Which place, what story? Cultural discourses at the border of the Blackfeet reservation and Glacier National Park. *Great Plains Quarterly*, *26*(3), 167–184. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23533732

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, *9*(2), 119–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x

Crowley, S. (2006). *Toward a civil discourse: Rhetoric and fundamentalism*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Du Mez, K. K. (2020). *Jesus and John Wayne: How white evangelicals corrupted a faith and fractured a nation*. Liveright.

Ellingson, L. L. (2009). *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research: An introduction*. Sage.

Fetner, T. (2008). *How the Religious Right shaped lesbian and gay activism*. University of Minnesota Press.

Fiske, J. (1990). Review of *Talking American* by Donal Carbaugh. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *76*(4), 450–451. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639009383936

Fiske, J. (1991). Writing ethnographies: Contribution to a dialogue. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *77*(3), 330–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639109383964

Foley, D., & Valenzuela, A. (2005). Critical ethnography: The politics of collaboration. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed. pp. 217–234). Sage Publications.

Graves, C. G. (2019). Dialogic inquiry as a mechanism of the constitutive metamodel. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *43*(3), 240–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2019.1647444

Graves, C. G., & Spencer, L. G. (2023). What communication brings to the study of gaslighting: Metatheory toward interdisciplinarity. *Review of Communication*, *23*(2), 136–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2022.2144426

Gudykunst, W. B. (2005). An anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory of effective communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 281–322). Sage.

Haliliuc, A. (2016). Being, evoking, and reflecting from the field: A case for critical ethnography in audience-centered rhetorical criticism. In S. L. McKinnon, R. Asen, K. R. Chávez, & R. G. Howard (Eds.), *Text + field: Innovations in rhetorical method* (pp. 133–147). Pennsylvania State University Press.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2008). Constructionist impulses in ethnographic fieldwork. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 373–395). Guilford Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. C. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13–53). Anthropological Society of Washington.

Hymes, D. H. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Katriel, T. (2015). Expanding ethnography of communication research: Toward ethnographies of encoding. *Communication Theory*, *25*(4), 454–459. https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12072

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communication Monographs*, *48*(4), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758109376064

Kulbaga, T. A., & Spencer, L. G. (2022). Outrage epistemology: Affective excess as a way of knowing in feminist scholarship. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *45*(2), 273–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2021.1926032

Kvam, D. S. (2017). Supporting Mexican immigrants' resettlement in the United States: An ethnography of communication approach to building allies' communication competence. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *45*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2016.1248469

Labberton, M. (Ed.). (2018). *Still evangelical? Insiders reconsider political, social, and theological meaning*. IVP Books.

McKinnon, S. L., Asen, R., Chávez, K., & Howard, R. G. (2016). Introduction: Articulating text and field in the nodes of rhetorical scholarship. In S. L. McKinnon, R. Asen, K. R. Chávez, & R. G. Howard (Eds.), *Text + field: Innovations in rhetorical method* (pp. 1–21). Pennsylvania State University Press.

Middleton, M., Hess, A., Endres, D., & Senda-Cook, S. (2015). *Participatory critical rhetoric: Theoretical and methodological foundations for studying rhetoric in situ*. Lexington.

Milburn, T. A. (2021). Coded communities: Organizing boundless diversity. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *45*(4), 221–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2021.2002173

Molina-Markham, E. (2012). Lives that preach: The cultural dimensions of telling one's "spiritual journey" among Quakers. *Narrative Inquiry*, *22*(1), 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.22.1.02mol

Patterson, G. (2016). The unbearable weight of pedagogical neutrality: Religion and LGBTQ issues in the English studies classroom. In J. Alexander & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Sexual rhetorics: Methods, identities, publics* (pp. 134–146). Routledge.

Pezzullo, P. C. (2016). Afterword: Decentralizing and regenerating the field. In S. L. McKinnon, R. Asen, K. R. Chávez, & R. G. Howard (Eds.), *Text + field: Innovations in rhetorical method* (pp. 177–188). Pennsylvania State University Press.

Philipsen, G. (1975). Speaking "like a man" in Teamsterville: Culture patterns of role enactment in an urban neighborhood. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *61*(1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637509383264

Philipsen, G. (1976). Places for speaking in Teamsterville. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *62*(1), 15–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637609383314

Philipsen, G. (1986). Mayor Daley's Council speech: A cultural analysis. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *72*(3), 247–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335638609383772

Philipsen, G. (1989). Some initial thoughts on the perils of 'critique' in the ethnographic study of communicative practices. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *23*(1–4), 251–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818909389323

Philipsen, G. (1991). Two issues in the evaluation of ethnographic studies of communicative practices. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *77*(3), 327–329. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639109383963

Philipsen, G. (1992). *Speaking culturally: Explorations in social communication*. State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In G. Philipsen & T. L. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing communication theories* (pp. 119–156). State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G. (2010). *Coming to terms with cultures. The Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture presented to the 94th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association*. November 21, 2008. https://www.natcom.org/sites/default/files/annual-convention/NCA_Convention_Video_Archive_2008_Arnold_Lecture.pdf

Philipsen, G., & Carbaugh, D. (1986). A bibliography of fieldwork in the ethnography of communication. *Language in Society*, *15*(3), 387–397. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500011829

Philipsen, G., Coutu, L., & Covarrubias, P. (2005). Speech codes theory: Restatement, revision, and response to criticism. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 55–68). Sage.

Philipsen, G., & Hart, T. (Eds.). (2024). *Contending with codes in a world of difference: Transforming a theory of human communication*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Blackwell.

Schnabel, E. (2023). The politics of knowledge production: Situating the "God Problem" in the context of decolonization. In M. Ward Sr. (Ed.), *God talk: The problem of divine-human communication* (pp. 53–68). Peter Lang.

Shavit, N. (2023). A rational solution to the debate on the critical voice in ethnography of communication research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *22*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231166899

Spencer, L. G. (2020). Performative neutrality and rape culture in Naomi Iizuka's *Good Kids*. *Text & Performance Quarterly*, *40*(3), 211–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/10462937.2020.1807044

Taylor, L. E. (2023). Let them take the lead: A holistic, culture-centered approach to divine-human communication. In M. Ward Sr. (Ed.), *God talk: The problem of divine-human communication* (pp. 37–52). Peter Lang.

Trepagnier, B. (2001). Deconstructing categories: The exposure of silent racism. *Symbolic Interaction*, *24*(2), 141–163. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2001.24.2.141

Van Maanen, J. (2000). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. University of Chicago Press.

Ward, M., Sr. (2013). Managing the anxiety and uncertainty of religious otherness: Interfaith dialogue as a problem of intercultural communication. In D. S. Brown Jr. (Ed.), *A communication perspective on interfaith dialogue: Living within the Abrahamic traditions* (pp. 23–43). Lexington.

Ward, M., Sr. (2019). Sermons as social interaction: Pulpit speech, power, and gender. *Women & Language*, *42*(2), 285–316. https://doi.org/10.34036/WL.2019.027

Ward, M., Sr. (2020). "Knowledge puffs up": The evangelical culture of anti-intellectualism as a local strategy. *Sermon Studies*, *4*(1), 1–21. https://mds.marshall.edu/sermonstudies/vol4/iss1/1

Ward, M., Sr. (2021). Gendering by design: The visual language of essentialism in evangelical material culture. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion*, *17*(3), 1–29. https://www.proquest.com/openview/bca39f02a6d179dd70850b689f38efd8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1646347

Ward, M., Sr. (2022). "All scripture is inspired by God": The culture of biblical literalism in an evangelical church. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, *45*(1), 86–110. https://doi.org/10.5840/jcr202245124

Ward, M., Sr., Spencer, L. G., Stewart, C. O., & Varela, E. M. (2022). Return to Teamsterville: A reconsideration and dialogue on ethnography and critique. *Communication Quarterly*, *70*(1), 84–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2021.2021261

Wilkins, R. (2005). The optimal form: Inadequacies and excessiveness within the *asiallinen* [matter of fact] nonverbal style in public and civic settings in Finland. *Journal of Communication*, *55*(2), 383–401. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02678.x

Williams, D. K. (2012). *God's own party: The making of the Christian Right*. Oxford University Press.