


Autoethnography as a Qualitative Methodology: Conceptual Foundations, Techniques, Benefits and Limitations

Kudzayi Savious Tarisayi* 

Stellenbosch University (South Africa)

Submitted: August 16, 2023 – Revised version: October 9, 2023


Accepted: November 2, 2023 – Published: December 19, 2023

L'autoetnografia come metodologia qualitativa: fondamenti concettuali, tecniche, benefici e limiti

This paper provides an overview of autoethnography as a qualitative research methodology. It outlines the conceptual underpinnings, evolution, key features, data collection methods, and theoretical orientations that have shaped autoethnography. The unique affordances of autoethnography are discussed, including producing thick insider descriptions, illuminating hidden social worlds, disrupting problematic research power hierarchies, enhancing researcher reflexivity, and increasing accessibility through evocative storytelling. Critiques and limitations of the method are also examined, including issues of ethics, rigor, generalizability, and tendencies toward self-indulgence. The paper advocates for incorporating autoethnography into research contexts to harness its strengths for generating nuanced, embodied accounts of cultural experience, although careful implementation is required. Overall, the examination delineates how autoethnography offers profound subjective, yet systematic means for inquiry aimed at furthering human self-understanding and sociocultural critique.

Questo articolo fornisce una panoramica dell'autoetnografia come metodologia di ricerca qualitativa. Delinea le basi concettuali, l'evoluzione, le caratteristiche chiave, i metodi di raccolta dei dati e gli orientamenti teorici che hanno formato l'autoetnografia. Ne vengono discusse potenzialità uniche, tra cui la produzione di descrizioni dettagliate, la rivelazione di mondi sociali nascosti, l'interruzione di problematiche gerarchie di potere nella ricerca, la valorizzazione della riflessività del ricercatore e l'aumento dell'accessibilità attraverso la narrazione evocativa. Vengono inoltre esaminate le criticità e i limiti del metodo, comprese questioni di etica, rigore, generalizzabilità e tendenza all'autoindulgenza. L'articolo raccomanda l'integrazione dell'autoetnografia nei contesti di ricerca per sfruttarne i punti di forza al fine di generare testimonianze di esperienze culturali variegate ed embodied, sebbene sia necessaria un'attenta implementazione. Nel complesso, l'analisi illustra come l'autoetnografia offra strumenti soggettivi ma sistematici, utili per un'indagine approfondita mirata a promuovere l'autocomprensione umana e la critica socioculturale.

Keywords: Autoethnography; Teacher education; Reflexivity; Evocative writing; Vulnerable research.

*  kudzayit@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Teaching is an intensely personal, context-dependent endeavour. Yet much teacher research relies solely on external data like test scores, omitting the rich intricacies of teachers' lived experiences. Autoethnography offers a profoundly subjective yet rigorous qualitative method that could re-inject marginalized teacher voices into debates over education. This paper explicates what autoethnography is, its evolution and theoretical bases, core elements, and data collection approaches. Benefits like illuminating hidden social worlds are weighed against critiques around rigor and ethics. Ultimately, the paper advocates for incorporating autoethnography into teacher education to enhance practitioner reflexivity, convey classroom complexities empathetically through evocative storytelling, and stimulate broader public discourse. However, quality implementation requires moving beyond mere confessionals to grounded analysis. With conscientious application, autoethnography's humanizing, contextualizing potential warrants its inclusion in teacher research.

2. Embracing the Subjective Self: Autoethnography as Methodology

Autoethnography utilizes the researcher's own experiences, emotions, and critical reflections as primary data for inquiry into cultural beliefs and practices. Unlike traditional research methods that aim for detached objectivity, autoethnography foregrounds the researcher's subjectivity. It values the researcher's insider perspective gained through being immersed in a cultural context as a source of privileged understanding (Ellis, 2004).

Autoethnography has its origins in ethnography's immersive techniques like participant observation but shifts the lens inward to critically examine the researcher's thoughts, assumptions, and sociocultural identities that shape the research process. This emphasis on reflexivity acknowledges the researcher is never fully objective, and their positionality influences interpretations (Denshire, 2014). Rather than treating human experiences as sterile data, autoethnography embraces embodied, evocative storytelling techniques to convey nuanced personal perspectives. Through compelling first-person narratives, it aims to emotionally immerse readers within the intimate textures and ambiguities of a cultural experience (Adams, Jones & Ellis, 2015).

Making the familiar strange is a hallmark of autoethnography. The researcher leverages insider knowledge of a cultural context, then deliberately applies analytical distance and theoretical frameworks to gain new critical insights into taken-for-granted aspects of social life (Delamont, 2009). Thus, autoethnography offers profound possibilities for qualitative research by embracing the subjective self as an asset rather than liability. It values insider knowledge, reflexivity, and evocative storytelling as means to provide uniquely transparent, empathetic and critical perspectives on human social realities.

3. History of Autoethnography

Autoethnography emerged as a distinct research method in the 1980s, but it has conceptual roots tracing back decades earlier (Adams *et al.*, 2015). In the 1950s and 1960s, ethnographers began questioning the supposed objectivity of immersive ethnographic research, recognizing that the researcher inherently influences the cultural interpretations they produce. Ethnography shifted from passive observation toward more reflexive examination of the researcher's role. Similarly, in sociology, there was a growing focus on researchers accounting for their personal experiences and biases when conducting qualitative studies of human social life (Anderson, 2006).

In the 1970s, autoethnography's emergence was tied to the rise of feminism and multiculturalism, which critiqued the dominance of white male perspectives in ethnographic research and representation. Marginalized voices argued that placing white men as authorities on diverse cultural experiences was problematically colonial. Feminist scholars highlighted how women's lives were being filtered through a male lens, limiting understandings. They advocated for women researching and representing women's experiences to gain more authentic insights (Denshire, 2014).

Relatedly, Black and Indigenous scholars emphasized the need for people of colour to research their own communities to counteract problematic representations by outsiders and foreground voices of colour (Adams *et al.*, 2015). The autoethnographic focus on the researcher's positionality, subjectivity, and sociocultural identities took shape as a response to urges that research needed to be conscious of power, privilege, and identity.

In the 1980s, landmark autoethnographic works emerged, including Humphreys' (1970) *Tearoom Trade*, in which he gave an insider account of impersonal sexual encounters between men in public restrooms. Feminist sociologist Carolyn Ellis published articles on sociological introspection, advocating for placing the personal in scholarship (Anderson, 2006). By the 1990s, autoethnography gained prominence as a distinct research methodology addressing critiques of how traditional methodologies limited understandings of human experience.

Key developments in autoethnography over the past three decades have included classifying different types, establishing criteria for evaluation, and ongoing debates about its status as legitimate empirical research. Anderson (2006) categorized autoethnography into evocative and analytic approaches. Evocative autoethnography focuses on crafting literary, engaging narratives that create emotional resonance with readers. Analytic autoethnography follows more traditional empirical conventions, with structured data analysis procedures.

Other developments include the delineation of evaluative criteria, as autoethnography's unconventional, personalized approach made many uneasy about how to assess its quality and rigor. Scholars like Ellis (2000) put forth criteria focused on things like authenticity, trustworthiness, and impact. Ongoing tensions around autoethnography center on balancing creative expression and academic conventions and navigating how much usefulness versus rigor should determine its merit (Adams *et al.*, 2015).

4. Theoretical Foundations of Autoethnography

Autoethnography is informed by various theoretical orientations that provide lenses for interpreting and analysing personal experiences in relation to sociocultural contexts. Key theoretical areas that have shaped autoethnography include phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, critical race theory, feminism, and queer theory.

4.1. Phenomenology

Phenomenology focuses on the subjective lived experiences of people and how individuals assign meaning to these experiences (Sloan & Bowe, 2014). It values first-person internal perspectives and concrete descriptions of specific events over abstract generalizations. Autoethnography's emphasis on examining personal experiences through internal reflection and sense-making aligns with a phenomenological approach (Allen-Collinson, 2013). Both phenomenology and autoethnography seek to capture the essence of phenomena as consciously perceived and embodied by individuals.

Specific phenomenological concepts utilized in autoethnographic analysis include lifeworld, intentionality, intersubjectivity, and bracketing. Lifeworld refers to individuals' everyday lived experiences and realities as meaningful to them (Dowling, 2007). Autoethnographers examine how their personal lifeworlds have been shaped by different sociocultural factors. Intentionality acknowledges that consciousness is always conscious of something — that people's perspectives of phenomena reveal what they find meaningful (Sloan & Bowe, 2014). Autoethnographers use personal perspectives to discern broader cultural values and meanings.

Intersubjectivity recognizes that individual experiences and meanings are shaped through relationships and shared cultural systems (Allen-Collinson, 2013). Autoethnographers consider how shared sociocultural meanings emerge through interaction. Bracketing involves suspending preconceived notions about a phenomenon to focus on how it appears in consciousness (Dowling, 2007). Autoethnographers utilize bracketing to become aware of ingrained assumptions that may distort understandings of personal experiences.

4.2. Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism examines how individuals actively shape and make sense of the sociocultural worlds they inhabit (Jeon, 2004). It recognizes that people construct meanings based on interactions and interpretive processes rather than directly internalizing societal norms. Autoethnography similarly aims to illuminate the reciprocal links between self and society. The researcher's personal experiences become vehicles for discerning broader cultural meanings, norms, discourses, and power dynamics as subjectively interpreted based on identity standpoints (Adams *et al.*, 2015).

Relevant concepts from symbolic interactionism appearing in autoethnographic analysis include self-concept, social constructionism, emotions as social, and the "generalized other." Self-concept refers to individuals' views of themselves formed through social interactions and interpretations (Jeon, 2004). Autoethnographers examine how experiences have shaped their self-concepts and identities. Social constructionism asserts that common understandings of reality are constructed through shared language and meaning making rather than being objectively determined (Best, 2008). Autoethnographers consider how sociocultural forces like gender, race, and class norms shape constructions of reality.

Emotions as social recognizes emotions as originating in social processes rather than only psychological states (Best, 2008). Autoethnography explores how emotional responses are influenced by cultural factors. The "generalized other" describes how individuals imagine societal perspectives of themselves and modify their self-concepts accordingly (Jeon, 2004). Autoethnographers use this concept to reflect on how social discourses impacted their identities and self-perceptions.

4.3. Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory centres the voices and experiences of people of colour while critiquing systemic racism (Charbeneau, 2015). It recognizes racial oppression as endemic and problematizes cultural narratives that marginalize non-white perspectives. Critical race autoethnographies utilize storytelling about racism to reveal ingrained oppression. Personal narratives of racial trauma, marginalization, or resistance highlight broader themes of injustice at both societal and institutional levels (Clandinin & Huber, 2010). The researcher articulates the emotional and material impacts of racism on themselves and communities.

Key tenets of critical race theory important to autoethnography include intersectionality, counternarratives, interest convergence, critique of liberalism, and social justice aims (Charbeneau, 2015). Intersectionality recognizes interconnected forms of oppression across race, class, gender, and other identities. Counternarratives elevate marginalized voices to contest dominant cultural storylines. Interest convergence describes how racial equality is only advanced when it also benefits elite white interests. Critiques of incremental legal reform reveal the limits of liberal approaches to equity. Social justice aims frame autoethnography as a means to expose oppression and empower action against structural inequalities.

4.4. Feminist Theory

Feminist standpoint theory contends that knowledge emerges from lived experiences shaped by gender and power relations (Hesse-Biber, 2014). It recognizes women's everyday lives as sources of insights about sociocultural conditions. Feminist autoethnographies frequently chronicle experiences of patriarchal silencing, sexual violence, and oppression in male-dominated institutions from an insider perspective. The use of personal narrative contests cultural metanarratives that have excluded and distorted women's realities (Butz & Besio, 2009).

Key feminist concepts intersecting with autoethnography include the personal as political, intersectionality, temerity, positionality, and self-reflexivity (Pillow & Mayo, 2012). The personal as political views sharing personal experiences of gender subordination as a political act that raises consciousness. Intersectionality considers how gender identity interacts with race, class, and other differences. Temerity represents courage and commitment in exposing uncomfortable truths. Positionality stresses situated knowledge based on the autoethnographer's specific social identities and standpoint. Reflexivity aims to foster conscious self-awareness of assumptions behind knowledge claims.

4.5. Queer Theory

Queer theory confronts heteronormativity and provides conceptual tools to deconstruct essentialist notions of gender and sexuality (Adams & Jones, 2011). It recognizes identity categories as social constructions rather than intrinsic qualities. Queer autoethnography utilizes personal narratives to explore experiences of those marginalized due to dominant cultural norms around gender and sexuality, such as LGBTQ individuals (Adams & Jones, 2011). Stories aim to challenge conventional assumptions by illuminating the complexity and fluidity of gender and sexual identities.

Relevant queer theories include performativity, deconstructionism, and queer temporalities (Adams & Jones, 2011). Performativity sees gender/sexual identities as continually reconstituted through repetitive speech and bodily acts rather than innate qualities. Deconstructionism unpacks binaries like male/female and heterosexual/homosexual to reveal their unstable meanings. Queer temporalities highlight how LGBTQ individuals experience time in nonlinear ways within mainstream cultural timelines. Autoethnographers may draw on these concepts to critically analyse their gendered and sexual experiences through alternative frameworks.

Autoethnography's subjective approach resonates with phenomenological and symbolic interactionist emphasis on individual meaning-making and perspectives. Critical race, feminist, queer and other critical theories further shape autoethnographic goals of exposing power inequalities, raising marginalized voices, and spurring personal and social change. These various lenses provide autoethnographers theoretical grounding to rigorously connect personal experiences to broader cultural contexts and critiques. The next section discusses the key elements of autoethnography.

5. Key Elements of Autoethnography

Autoethnography involves several core components that distinguish it as a qualitative methodology. These key elements include a focus on personal experience, the researcher as subject, reflexivity, evocative narrative presentation, and linking the personal to broader cultural contexts (Jones, Adams & Ellis, 2013).

First, autoethnography utilizes the researcher's own life experiences as primary data. Rather than collecting data externally from other participants, the autoethnographer uses their lived experiences, embodied sensations, emotional reactions, and critical reflections as the basis for inquiry and sense-making (Adams *et al.*, 2015). The researcher selectively examines epiphanies from their life that illuminate deeper cultural meanings.

Relatedly, in autoethnography the researcher simultaneously takes on the dual role of subject and object of study (Duncan, 2004). This collapse of the distinction between self and other provides the researcher privileged access to their thoughts, feelings, and experiences as an "insider." The vulnerability and honesty involved in exposing one's struggles, biases and shortcomings acts as a conduit to cultural insight (Adams & Jones, 2011).

Furthermore, rigorous reflexivity is a defining requirement of autoethnography. The researcher must critically analyse how their experiences have been shaped by social structures, cultural discourses, power relations, and their own sociocultural identities (Sparkes, 2020). This reflexive examination moves beyond descriptive self-focus to situated analysis of personal experiences using theoretical constructs and extant research. It illuminates often taken-for-granted aspects of social life.

Additionally, autoethnography embraces evocative, literary forms of narrative presentation. The lived experiences are conveyed through storytelling, vignettes, character development, dialogue and other creative techniques that depart from conventional academic writing (Ellis & Bochner, 2006). This evocative storytelling aims to emotionally immerse readers within the nuances and textures of the cultural context. The narrative form also reflects autoethnography's epistemological valuing of subjectivity.

Finally, autoethnographers explicitly link the personal to the wider cultural context (Adams *et al.*, 2015). The researcher situates their experiences within the broader social world to gain insider insights about cultural values, norms, practices, and systems of power and inequality. The juxtaposition of zooming into intimate personal perspectives while zooming out to make sense of them culturally is signature to autoethnography.

Thus, the uniqueness of autoethnography stems from its use of the researcher's life as data, foregrounding of subjectivity, necessity of reflexivity, adoption of literary narrative techniques, and connection of personal experiences to cultural analysis. These interrelated components distinguish autoethnography from other methodologies and offer profound possibilities to generate evocative, embodied, and critically conscious accounts of lived sociocultural realities.

6. Data Collection Methods in Autoethnography

Autoethnography relies on personal memory and subjective experience as data, so the researcher themselves is the data source. Common data collection methods include self-observation, reflexive journaling, memory work, artifact analysis, and external data collection to contextualize personal experiences (Adams *et al.*, 2015).

Self-observation involves conscious attentiveness to one's thoughts, emotions, and sensations in relation to a particular event or phenomenon. Similar to participant observation in ethnography, the researcher observes as an insider. However, the lens turns inward to observe the self rather than outward on others. The researcher takes metaphorical field notes of their internal processes and felt experiences as they occur.

Reflexive journaling extends self-observation into a regular written practice. Journals provide a space for unstructured reflection on meaningful experiences as they happen. Following autoethnography's blend of process and product (Adams *et al.*, 2015), journals become both a data collection tool as events occur as well as a source of narrative data to be analysed later.

Memory work entails mining one's past experiences through deliberate, structured recall. This retrospection seeks to evoke and reconstruct significant personal events. Memory-work prompts like free-writing or guided visualization can stimulate recall of buried memories. Reconstructing the context, sensations, and emotions of past experiences makes them available for contemporary sense-making.

Gathering relevant personal and public artifacts can also invoke memories and meaning. Personal artifacts like childhood mementos, photographs, letters, clothing, etc. contain traces of experiences that can spark recollection when re-engaged. Public artifacts such as advertisements, music, films, and news reports can situate memories culturally. Artifact analysis helps connect inner worlds to outward cultural contexts.

While autoethnographers focus inward, incorporating external data can enrich analysis. Interviews with others who shared similar experiences can provide alternate perspectives. Textual artifacts like diaries, medical records, letters can supply corroborating details to jog and fill out memories. Extant texts on relevant cultural phenomena, theoretical works, and related autoethnographies provide analytical frameworks to interpret personal data.

Ultimately all of these approaches aim to generate personal data that can provide cultural insight. The methods direct attention both inward to excavate intimate experiences and outward to situate experiences socioculturally. Memories, artifacts, and external data become lenses to refract and illuminate different aspects of the phenomenon under investigation. The researcher synthesizes these disparate puzzle pieces of the past to construct new meanings in the present.

7. The Unique Affordances of Autoethnography as a Qualitative Methodology

Autoethnography offers several key advantages as a qualitative methodology that address critical gaps in traditional research approaches. These strengths include producing abundantly thick insider descriptions; enabling access to obscured social worlds; disrupting colonial research power hierarchies; fostering researcher reflexivity; and enhancing research accessibility through evocative storytelling (Adams *et al.*, 2015; Wall, 2008).

First, autoethnography results in remarkably nuanced, dense accounts of a cultural experience from an insider perspective. Mainstream research methods often extract thin data devoid of the vivid ambiguities and complexities of lived realities (Vryan, 2006). In contrast, autoethnographers leverage privileged

access to intimate memories, details, emotions, and embodied knowledge to reconstruct multilayered, sensorially immersive descriptions of a cultural phenomenon (Adams, 2006). This insider lens illuminates subtle dimensions overlooked by cultural outsiders.

Furthermore, autoethnographers can illuminate stigmatized, concealed experiences muted in dominant cultural narratives and representations (Hughes & Pennington, 2017). Through candid first-person storytelling, autoethnographies provide windows into marginalized subcultures and perspectives (e.g. LGBTQ, people of colour) in more authentic, transparent ways than permitted by traditional research approaches. These insider accounts grant “outsiders” unprecedented access to hidden social worlds (Adams, 2006).

Additionally, the immense focus on the researcher’s identity, privilege, and positionality reflexively disrupts exploitative power hierarchies endemic to colonial research traditions (Pathak, 2013). Autoethnographers situate themselves transparently within the research process versus feigning neutrality or objectivity. This vulnerable, transparent self-exposure coupled with foregrounding of minoritized voices works to counteract dehumanizing, othering research practices (Hughes & Pennington, 2017).

Moreover, the method fosters profound researcher reflexivity regarding how personal experiences are shaped by sociocultural forces (Wall, 2008). Deep reflection on the impacts of researcher privileges, biases, and theoretical paradigms strengthens the integrity of interpretations. This critical self-interrogation also uncovers blind spots that can undermine research validity (Pathak, 2013). Overall, the reflexive emphasis enhances qualitative research ethics.

Additionally, evocative autoethnographic storytelling increases research accessibility to wider publics beyond academia (Adams, 2006; Hughes & Pennington, 2017). Compelling, readable personal narratives resonate emotionally and cognitively for diverse audiences. Broader dissemination can augment application of cultural insights and spur social change. Autoethnography’s storytelling shifts research impact from esoteric to public good.

Autoethnography offers qualitative inquiry profound affordances including elucidating insider experiences of cultural worlds, amplifying marginalized voices, disrupting colonialist research tropes, strengthening researcher reflexivity, and enhancing accessibility of findings. These strengths address critical needs for more authentic, socially just, transparent research practices. The unique benefits of autoethnography warrant its increasing prominence within qualitative methodology canons.

8. Key Criticisms and Limitations of Autoethnographic Methodology

While autoethnography offers many strengths as a qualitative approach, criticisms have emerged regarding ethical issues, rigor, generalizability, and tendencies toward self-indulgence or solipsism. Sceptics argue autoethnography’s highly subjective approach and lack of conventional analytical procedures undermine standards of sound, ethical research (Delamont, 2009; Holt, 2003). A primary concern involves ethical practices, particularly around representation of others and confidentiality given the exposure of intimate personal details (Tolich, 2010). Autoethnographers frequently incorporate experiences involving family, friends, partners, and students. The inability to gain consent from or member-check depictions of all individuals within narratives raises possibilities of inaccurate portrayals or breaches of privacy, even if pseudonyms are utilized (Sparkes, 2020). Critics contend guidelines around consent, anonymity, and protecting vulnerable groups require greater delineation.

Additionally, questions persist regarding rigor and verification procedures (Holt, 2003). Autoethnography’s creative analytic approach rejects hypothesis testing and grounded theory-style coding common in other qualitative methods. With no established conventions for data analysis, interpretations rely heavily on the researcher’s subjective judgments. Evocative vignettes seem to lack explicit verification mechanisms to substantiate their analytic logic and truth claims, unlike more structured methods. Moreover, the profoundly personalized focus of autoethnography limits generalizability of any insights (Holt, 2003). Single-subject explorations cannot yield findings readily transferable to broader populations like quantitative or multi-sited qualitative research. Highly contextualized narratives centred on a sole individual’s idiosyncratic experiences fail to sufficiently

connect to existing theoretical and empirical knowledge in ways that meaningfully advance wider understandings (Delamont, 2009).

Additionally, some critics contend autoethnography privileges artistic expression, fragmented ambiguity, and eliciting emotion rather than producing coherent, rigorous analysis (Anderson, 2006). Extremely aesthetic, performative texts can slip into self-indulgent displays of lyrical narration that actually obscure development of substantive research insights. A few argue evocative autoethnography undermines scholarly rigor through literary navel-gazing. While proponents view the centrality of subjective perspectives as an asset, critics argue it reinforces unproductive relativism in qualitative research (Delamont, 2009). Valuing personal vantage points fails to sufficiently distinguish informal anecdotes from rigorous inquiry yielding insights beyond the individual. A key challenge remains establishing shared conventions to judge analytic merit amid highly variable, personalized approaches.

Common concerns surrounding autoethnography include ethical grey areas regarding representations of others, scepticism about rigor of subjective interpretations, limited generalizability of single cases, tendencies toward artistic self-absorption rather than analysis, and overvaluing personal experience as evidence. While tensions persist, proponents maintain that attending to evaluation criteria while harnessing the unique affordances of evocative storytelling outweighs these limitations.

9. The Transformative Potential of Autoethnography for Teacher Education

Autoethnography holds profound potential for teacher educators to develop critical reflexivity in themselves and their students, convey classroom intricacies empathetically, and stimulate broader public discourse through accessible storytelling. The method aligns with reflection-in-action pedagogies and offers new pathways to capture and share insider perspectives on the contextual complexities of teaching (Sparkes, 2020).

Teaching is an intensely relational, embodied endeavour contingent on the unpredictable dynamics between specific teachers and students (Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). However, much teacher research relies solely on external data like student surveys and test scores, omitting the lived realities of practitioners. Autoethnography enables teacher educators to draw on their own affective experiences — feelings, reactions, intuitions, sensory details — as rich data illuminating the human dimensions of classrooms. Autoethnographic teacher narratives can evocatively convey the invisible affective labour involved in building relationships and navigating difference.

Furthermore, the deliberate vulnerability of exposing one's mistakes, biases, and pedagogical struggles inherent in autoethnography powerfully models critical reflexivity for both pre-service and in-service teachers (Sparkes, 2020). Through rigorous self-analysis, autoethnography illuminates blind spots and tacit prejudices shaping teaching practices. Teacher autoethnographies could spark deeper reflection in students regarding how their sociocultural identities and positionalities impact their teaching and relationships with youth. Explicit autoethnographic examination of privilege and marginalization within teacher-student dynamics furthers reflexivity's de-centring aims (Bloom, Peters, Margolin, & Fragnoli, 2008).

Additionally, evocative autoethnographic vignettes add nuance, humanity and empathy to traditional teacher education texts (Coia & Taylor, 2013). Autoethnographic stories communicate the emotional labour, uncertainties, joys and tribulations of classroom teaching in ways seldom found in academic literature. Exposure to these compelling first-person insider accounts fosters greater understanding in pre-service teachers of the humanness, contextual specificity, and heart involved in the work. Such vulnerable sharing builds solidarity.

Moreover, teacher educator autoethnographies can illuminate the inherent limits of generalized research and decontextualized techniques. By highlighting the immediacy and contextual specificity of classrooms, personal narratives underscore the need for professional practical wisdom that transcends pre-defined strategies (Sparkes, 2020). Teacher education centred solely on theory and best practices gains balance through context-rich stories speaking to the contingent, interactive essence of pedagogical work (Coia & Taylor, 2013).

Furthermore, the accessibility of evocative autoethnographic writing benefits public discourse on education. Teacher autoethnographies published online or as creative nonfiction could reach broad audiences beyond academia. More public sharing of teachers' lived experiences, emotions, and tribulations humanizes the profession and fosters empathy. Autoethnographies offer policymakers and families alternate humanizing narratives to counteract education debates dominated by abstract statistics.

Finally, quality autoethnography requires rigorous analysis alongside vulnerable storytelling. Teacher educators must model reflexivity and establish that subjective experience creates meaning only through examination within cultural, theoretical contexts (Sparkes, 2020). But properly implemented, autoethnography's evocative capacities offer teacher education profound means for humanizing insight, reflexive growth, empathetic connection and spurring social change through marginalized voices.

10. Conclusion

Autoethnography provides a profoundly subjective yet rigorous qualitative methodology that foregrounds the researcher's lived experiences as primary data for cultural analysis and critique. It rejects notions of detached objectivity common in other research methods. Instead, autoethnography necessitates deep critical examination of the researcher's sociocultural identities, privileges, biases, and theoretical lenses that inevitably shape the sense-making process. Through evocative, literary storytelling techniques, autoethnography aims to provide vivid first-person accounts that emotionally immerse readers within nuanced cultural worlds, thereby expanding understandings of lived social realities.

Ongoing epistemological tensions centre on navigating autoethnography's scholarly conventions alongside its creative, performative elements. Questions remain regarding how to evaluate the quality and rigor of highly personalized, reflective narratives that breach traditional academic writing styles. However, proponents argue that autoethnography's capacities for generating thick insider descriptions, illuminating marginalized perspectives, fostering researcher reflexivity, and making research accessible outweigh these concerns.

This examination of autoethnography reveals profound potential for teacher education. Autoethnography offers means for teacher educators to capture affective, relational dimensions of teaching often overlooked in external data sources. First-person narratives eliciting vulnerability, uncertainty, and emotive reactions provide balance to tendencies toward technical rationality in teacher training. Autoethnography also fosters reflexivity regarding positionality among both pre-service and in-service teachers. Hearing colleagues' stories illuminates that competent teaching exceeds mastering skills to involve contextual wisdom. For public audiences, autoethnographies communicate classroom experiences in humanizing ways drowned out by bureaucratic discourse.

However, implementing autoethnography in teacher education contexts warrants careful attention to ethical practices. Consent must be obtained before incorporating others' experiences. Confidentiality should be ensured through de-identification and judicious story selection. Member-checking provides means to validate interpretations and prevent misrepresentation. Collaborative approaches that diffuse sole authorship mitigate concerns over biases and limited perspectives. Importantly, quality autoethnography requires moving beyond simple narration to rigorous analysis grounded in theory, research, and self-critique. The aim is transformed understandings, not simply confessionals.

In conclusion, this exploration of autoethnography suggests rich potential for teacher educators seeking to diversify methodological approaches to offer evocative, embodied accounts of teaching and learning. Autoethnography provides educators means to draw on practice-based wisdom and contextual insights toward reflective growth for themselves and future practitioners. The unusual vulnerability and literary elements of the method should not eclipse its capacity for producing critical knowledge counterbalancing tendencies toward dehumanization and standardization in contemporary schooling. Teacher education programs integrating autoethnography may encounter initial discomfort, yet the rewards of humanized, contextualized teacher knowledge warrant pushing methodological boundaries. Carefully cultivated, autoethnography offers profound opportunities to re-inject marginalized teacher voices into debates over education's future directions.

References

- Adams, T. E. (2006). Seeking father: Relationally reframing a troubled love story. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(4), 704–723. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406288607>
- 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>
- Adams, T. E., Jones, S. H., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding Qualitative Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Allen-Collinson, J. (2013). Autoethnography as the engagement of self/other, self/culture, self/politics, selves/futures. In S. Holman Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of Autoethnography* (pp. 281–299). Walnut Creek (CA): Left Coast Press.
- Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449>
- Best, A. (2008). Symbolic interactionism. In L. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (pp. 848–853). Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications.
- Bloom, C. M., Peters, T., Margolin, M., & Fragnoli, K. (2008). Are my students like me? The path to colour-blindness and white racial identity development. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(6), 643–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124513499929>
- Butz, D., & Besio, K. (2009). Autoethnography. *Geography Compass*, 3(5), 1660–1674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00279.x>
- Charbeneau, J. (2015). White faculty transforming whiteness in the classroom through pedagogical practice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 18(5), 655–674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2013.831823>
- Clandinin, D. J., & Huber, J. (2010). Narrative inquiry. In B. McGaw, E. Baker, & P. P. Peterson (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed.). New York: Elsevier.
- Coia, L., & Taylor, M. (2013). Uncovering our feminist pedagogy: A co/autoethnography. *Studying Teacher Education*, 9(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2013.771394>
- Delamont, S. (2009). The only honest thing: Autoethnography, reflexivity and small crises in fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education*, 4(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457820802703507>
- Denshire, S. (2014). On auto-ethnography. *Current Sociology Review*, 62(6), 831–850. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114533339>
- Douglas, K., & Carless, D. (2013). A History of Autoethnographic Inquiry. In S. H. Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis, *Handbook of Autoethnography Routledge* (pp. 84–108). London: Routledge.
- Dowling, M. (2007). From Husserl to van Manen. A review of different phenomenological approaches. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44(1), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2005.11.026>
- Duncan, M. (2004). Autoethnography: Critical appreciation of an emerging art. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(4), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690400300403>
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel About Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek (CA): Altamira Press.

- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2010). Autoethnography: An Overview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-12.1.1589>
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research*, 36(4), 273–290. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.36.2011.4.273-290>
- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (Ed.). (2014). *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications.
- Holt, N. L. (2003). Representation, legitimation, and autoethnography: An autoethnographic writing story. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(1), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690300200102>
- Hughes, S. A., & Pennington, J. L. (2017). *Autoethnography: Process, Product, and Possibility for Critical Social Research*. Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483398594>
- Jeon, Y. (2004). The application of grounded theory and symbolic interactionism. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 18(3), 249–256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2004.00287.x>
- Pathak, A. A. (2013). Musings on postcolonial autoethnography. In S. H. Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis, *Handbook of Autoethnography* (pp. 595–608). London: Routledge.
- Pillow, W. S., & Mayo, C. (2012). Feminist ethnography: Histories, challenges, and possibilities. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *The Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis* (pp. 187–205). Thousand Oaks (CA): SAGE Publications.
- Sloan, A., & Bowe, B. (2014). Phenomenology and hermeneutic phenomenology: The philosophy, the methodologies, and using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate lecturers' experiences of curriculum design. *Quality & Quantity*, 48(3), 1291–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9835-3>
- Sparkes, A. (2020). Autoethnography: Accept, revise, reject? Reflections of an evaluative self. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 12(2), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2020.1732453>
- Tolich, M. (2010). A critique of current practice: Ten foundational guidelines for autoethnographers. *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(12), 1599–1610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732310376076>
- Vryan, K. D. (2006). Expanding analytic autoethnography and enhancing its potential. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 405–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241606286977>
- Wall, S. (2008). Easier said than done: Writing an autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 7(1), 38–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690800700103>

Kudzayi Savious Tarisayi – Stellenbosch University (South Africa)

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0086-2420>

✉ kudzayit@gmail.com

Senior Lecturer at Stellenbosch University, where he is affiliated with the Department of Curriculum Studies. He specializes in teaching Geography Education and has conducted research on a variety of topics, including teacher migration, integration of ICTs in Geography Education, and contemporary issues in education.