Autoethnography as a Recent Methodology in Applied Linguistics: A Methodological Review

Ufuk Keles Dr
Bahcesehir University, Istanbul Turkey, ukeles@crimson.ua.edu

Autoethnography as a Recent Methodology in Applied Linguistics: A Methodological Review

Abstract

In this methodological review, I explore how recent autoethnographic studies in the field of applied linguistics have used autoethnography as a research methodology. I examine 40 autoethnographies published in peer-reviewed journals between 2010 and 2020. The findings show that a large number of the researchers employed autoethnography as "an umbrella term" without opting for a specific type of autoethnography. Second, a great majority of the autoethnographers diverted from traditional third-person academic prose, although most of them approached their stories with an analytic lens. Third, the absence or scarcity of (auto)biographical information decreased both the evocative and analytic qualities of autoethnographic studies. Lastly, the authors provided little or no justification of their methodological choices as to why they specifically opted for autoethnography rather than other qualitative methodologies. Likewise, most authors provided little or no explanation about their selection of data collection tools and procedures as well as their data analysis methods and strategies. In light of these findings, I suggest future autoethnographers familiarize themselves with the types, epistemological foundations, and methodological affordances of autoethnography so that they may find the most appropriate voice and affordances to tell their stories in their own way.

Keywords

autoethnography, first-person voice, qualitative research, applied linguistics, collaborative autoethnography, duoethnography, methodological review

Creative Commons License

Acknowledgements

Autoethnography as a Recent Methodology in Applied Linguistics: A Methodological Review

Ufuk Keleş
Bahçeşehir University, İstanbul Turkey

In this methodological review, I explore how recent autoethnographic studies in the field of applied linguistics have used autoethnography as a research methodology. I examine 40 autoethnographies published in peer-reviewed journals between 2010 and 2020. The findings show that a large number of the researchers employed autoethnography as "an umbrella term" without opting for a specific type of autoethnography. Second, a great majority of the autoethnographers diverted from traditional third-person academic prose, although most of them approached their stories with an analytic lens. Third, the absence or scarcity of (auto)biographical information decreased both the evocative and analytic qualities of autoethnographic studies. Lastly, the authors provided little or no justification of their methodological choices as to why they specifically opted for autoethnography rather than other qualitative methodologies. Likewise, most authors provided little or no explanation about their selection of data collection tools and procedures as well as their data analysis methods and strategies. In light of these findings, I suggest future autoethnographers familiarize themselves with the types, epistemological foundations, and methodological affordances of autoethnography so that they may find the most appropriate voice and affordances to tell their stories in their own way.

Keywords: autoethnography, first-person voice, qualitative research, applied linguistics, collaborative autoethnography, duoethnography, methodological review

Introduction

Today, scholars from various academic fields continue to write their own stories to understand a social phenomenon through reflecting on their own experiences in a personalized style (Wall, 2006). While doing so, as opposed to doing research "on" the topic to understand a given phenomenon, these scholars turn to their inner worlds and personal experiences to unveil, interpret, and critique the social structures and the underlying power dynamics. They try to uncover their emotions, thoughts, and beliefs by remembering, revisiting, and recreating their past experiences in order to understand and theorize the connections among the self, power, and culture (Holman Jones, 2005), and to voice their criticisms of, contribute to, and broaden the existing scholarship (Adams et al., 2015).

Against this backdrop, autoethnography has recently become a popular methodology in applied linguistics as a newly introduced method of research (Yazan, 2019a). The past decade has witnessed a tremendous increase in autoethnographic works written by researchers to explore their experiences as language learners, language teachers, teacher educators, educational scholars, language counselors, parents, immigrants, and so on (e.g., Ai, 2015, 2016; Brock-Utne, 2018; Canagarajah, 2012; Hayler & Williams, 2020; Kennedy & Romo, 2013;

Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020; Liu & Lin, 2018; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019; Shibata, 2012; Simon-Maeda, 2011; Solano-Campos, 2014; Vellanki & Prince, 2018; Yazan, 2019b). Despite its popularity, autoethnography remains to be a fairly new research methodology in applied linguistics, hence needs to be fully conceptualized (Mirhosseini, 2018). Therefore, I believe a methodological review of autoethnographic studies in applied linguistics is timely. In this vein, the aim of this study is to explore the methodological choices, affordances, and challenges in autoethnographic articles published in peer-reviewed applied linguistics journals between 2010 and 2020. I address this research question: How have recent autoethnographic studies used autoethnography as a method of qualitative inquiry in applied linguistics?

Autoethnography as a Methodological Choice

Compared to other qualitative research methods, autoethnography is relatively new in social sciences. Since it is a broad term which denotes a large variety of methodological practices (Ellingson & Ellis, 2008), defining autoethnography has proven difficult. A number of pioneering scholars have thus far provided multiple definitions for autoethnography in accordance with its purpose, data sources, data analysis, and writing style. In Table 1, I have gathered a list of multiple scholars' definitions of autoethnography.

Table 1

Multiple Scholars' Definitions of Autoethnography

In-text citation	Autoethnography is…
Boylorn & Orbe (2014, p. 16)	cultural analysis through personal narrative.
Chang (2008, p. 56)	a qualitative research method that uses ethnographic methods to bring cultural interpretation to the autobiographical data of researchers with the intent of understanding self and its connections to others.
Ellis (2004, p. 37)	writing about the personal and its relationship to culture.
Ellis & Bochner (2000, p. 739)	an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural.
Gannon, (2006, p. 475)	part of a corrective movement against colonizing ethnographic practices that erased the subjectivity of the researcher while granting him or her absolute authority for representing "the other" of the research.
Holman Jones (2005, p. 765)	a blurred genre . . . a response to the call . . . it is setting a scene, telling a story, weaving intricate connections between life and art . . . making a text present . . . refusing categorization . . . believing that words matter and writing toward the moment when the point of creating autoethnographic texts is to change the world.
Reed-Danahay (1997, p. 6)	a form of self-narrative that places the self within a social context. It is both a method and a text.
Spry (2001, p. 710)	a self-narrative that critiques the situatedness of self and others in social context.
Starr (2010, p. 1)	a process of self-exploration and interrogation [that] aids individuals in locating themselves within their own history and culture [,] allowing them to broaden their understanding of their own values in relation to others.

| Wall (2008, p. 38) | an intriguing and promising qualitative method that offers a way of giving voice to personal experience for the purpose of extending sociological understanding. |

I included these definitions in Table 1 because they belong to the most cited qualitative methodologists in the articles I reviewed. Despite the variety in emphasis, all of these definitions refer to one shared tenet of autoethnography; that is, the relationship between autoethnographers' goal to make meaning of their lived experiences with the culture(s) in which they are living, being, doing, and knowing. These scholars agree that autoethnography is a qualitative research method that situates "self" (auto) in the broader society (ethno) and enables researchers to write (graphy) their own stories. Also, some scholars view autoethnography as self-narrative that gives researchers the freedom to incorporate different literary genres such as poetry and storytelling to extend the limits of traditional qualitative inquiry. In most of these definitions, the goal of autoethnography is to better understand how cultural discourses operate and are experienced by individuals.

Types of Autoethnography

As a borderland genre, autoethnography blurs the dichotomous boundaries between emotion and reason, individual and social, body and mind, and theory and practice (Gannon, 2006), and accommodates an unlimited number of possibilities of creativity, flexibility, and conformity (Marx et al., 2017). As a result, many different forms of autoethnographies have recently flourished, such as poetic, performative, evocative, analytic, critical, community, and art-based, along with many others (e.g., Anderson, 2006; Bochner & Ellis, 2016, Boylorn & Orbe, 2014; Faulkner, 2017; Guyotte et al., 2018; Leavy, 2015; Pensoneau-Conway et al., 2014; Reed-Danahay, 2017; Spry, 2001, 2011). Also, along with those which are single-authored, many multi-authored autoethnographies have been published under different names. With so many different types, names, epistemological foundations, and styles, however, autoethnography literature is nebulous for educational researchers (Marx et al., 2017).

Chang et al. (2013) use the concepts of "interpretation" and "narration" that bring order to this seemingly chaotic mass/mess. Some autoethnographers construct their work through "interpretive narration," presented mostly as evocative autoethnographies, while others use "narrative interpretation" to produce analytic autoethnographies in more conventional ways (p. 19). While "narrative interpreters," who are at the *analytic* end, focus on analyzing their autobiographical data in relation to existing theories, "interpretive narrators" aim at finding an appropriate voice and style to emphasize their lived experiences at the *evocative* end of the spectrum.

Evocative autoethnographers combine tenets of autobiography and ethnography to analyze their personal experiences within their particular social milieu (Ellis et al., 2011), and divert from the traditional sociological analysis discourse (Ellis & Bochner, 2006), Like the work of novelists, evocative autoethnographers pay attention to character building through dialogues and descriptions in well-described settings (Ellis, 2004). On the other hand, advocating that autoethnography should not break away from its roots in ethnography, Anderson (2006), takes a more traditional ethnographic stance to avoid obscuring the compatibility of autoethnographic works within traditional ethnographic practices. In a nutshell, while evocative autoethnography denotes a post-modern approach to doing research, analytic autoethnography is embedded in traditional qualitative research (Denzin, 2006).

Nevertheless, they both emphasize the central role the researcher's personal experiences play in exploring the cultural practices that shape their experiences.[1]

Autoethnography as a "Promising" Methodology in Applied Linguistics

Because autoethnographers focus on a variety of personal experiences manifested in their emotionally laden relationships with(in) their communities, it has easily found an entry point in educational research. Educational spaces provide autoethnographers with the grounds where knowledge, identity, and culture are socially constructed (Starr, 2010), and where educational policies and ideologies (re)produce and are (re)produced by the dominant discourses through power, privilege, and normalization that Apple (1978) calls the "hidden curriculum" (p. 375). In this context, some educational researchers embraced autoethnography as a way of (self)criticism of and (self)reflection in their professional spaces (Hayler & Williams, 2020), while others noticed its potential to contribute to social justice (Starr, 2010).

As "stakeholders" in such spaces, many students, teachers, teacher educators, counselors, administrators, and parents have turned to autoethnography to write about their stories, which would have otherwise remained untold (Woodley, 2016). They have produced a number of autoethnographies to foreground their experiences of socialization, marginalization, membership, resistance, confusion, acceptance, and resistance in diverse educational institutions. As a result, autoethnographic writing has become a popular research methodology in the field of educational sciences (Gannon, 2017), with a plethora of dissertations, books, journal articles, and conference presentations in increasing numbers in the last two decades (Hughes et al., 2012).

Against this backdrop, educational journals with high impact factors started to publish a number of autoethnographies, legitimizing autoethnography's status as a credible qualitative research methodology in educational research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Halvorsen, 2018; Hughes & Noblit, 2016). Apparently, autoethnographic writing will maintain its popularity as educational researchers continue to frame learning as a situated, social, and multi-layered socio-political act.

In a similar vein, the past decade of applied linguistics has witnessed an abundance of autoethnographic works (Sardabi et al., 2020). Scholars have used autoethnography as a tool in their teaching to empower their students through self-reflexive practices (e.g., De Los Ríos & Seltzer, 2017; Price-Dennis et al., 2017; Yazan, 2018, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c; Yazan et al., 2020). Coming from different socio-linguistic and socio-cultural backgrounds, scholars have also used this methodology to scrutinize their experiences in different contexts on various language-related topics. These topics include multi- or bilingualism, transnational identities, experiences studying abroad, professional and/or academic development, second language socialization, multiculturalism and globalization, language policies and ideologies, and many more.

The proliferation of autoethnographic writing in applied linguistics has not come out of the blue. Multiple paradigm shifts in the field known as *the cognitive turn* in the 1980s (see Chomsky, 1959; Lakoff, 1990), *the sociocultural turn* (see Johnson, 2006; Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 2006), *the critical turn* in the 1990s (see Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Pennycook, 2001), *the social turn* in the late 1990s (see Block, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997), *the affective turn* in the 2000s (see Benesch, 2017; Pavlenko, 2013), *the narrative turn* (see Barkhuizen, 2011; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008, 2012), and *the multilingual turn* in the 2010s (see Conteh & Meier,

---

1 For a more detailed discussion of evocative and analytic autoethnography, readers may refer to *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 2006*; 35*(4), special issue.

2014; May, 2014, 2019; Ortega, 2019) have had a profound impact on what directions applied linguistics will take in the near future.

At this point, I must acknowledge that these turns do not follow a linear timeline. I am well aware that the beginning of a turn did not mark the end of a previous one as all these turns are ongoing and co-existent in the assemblage of applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2018). Yet, each turn has contributed to the breadth and depth of the field. Owing to these "turns," applied linguistics has widened its focus in time from (*discipline-specific*) behaviorist, and later, cognitive foundations, to (*transdisciplinary*) social, and later, multicultural directions (Perrin & Kramsch, 2018). In this context, educational linguists' approaches towards language learners and language teachers have significantly expanded. In the past, language learners were regarded as merely imitating users, and later as individuals with the mental capacities to learn a language in school spaces. They are now viewed as individuals who are social learners, critical thinkers, and multilingual speakers who hold personal beliefs, thoughts, and emotions that guide their active learning processes in their social environments, be they national or transnational spaces. Likewise, language teachers are now identified as orchestrators, providers, facilitators, sociocultural critics, caring professionals, and multicultural ambassadors, rather than being recognized only as knowledge-transmitting technicians (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Along with the reconceptualization of knowledge in the field of teacher education, from knowledge-*for*-practice to knowledge-*in*-practice and from there to knowledge-*of*-practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999), teachers who used to be seen as technicians started to be regarded as legitimate knowledge producers as well (Bulfin & Mathews, 2003). All these paradigmatic (re)conceptualizations have catered to the proliferation of a variety of autoethnographies in applied linguistics.

Self-of-the-Researcher

Coming from a lower working class in a small mining town in Turkey, I was the first person in my extended family to go to university, and the only family member who learned to speak English as an additional language. I studied English language and literature at one of the most prestigious English-medium-of-instruction universities in Turkey. There, I always felt like a misfit among my cohort, most of whom came from educated and affluent families. Also, when I finished university, I had already become alienated from my family, owing to my educational background and to the change in my class membership.

Upon receiving Fulbright scholarship to pursue a PhD at a US university, I moved to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and lived there for almost five years. During my doctoral studies there, I oftentimes felt marked by my ethnic, linguistic, and religious identities. After I was introduced to autoethnography during my coursework, I decided to write an autoethnographic dissertation so that I could critically explore my experiences of second language and transnational socialization, along with my feelings of (not) belonging as an English language learner, teacher, and user (Keleş, 2020). The more I learned about autoethnography, the more my academic interests leaned towards it. As my personal and educational life was imbued with the feeling of "in-betweenness" accompanied by social, cultural, and financial hardships, I was sure that it was the most appropriate research methodology to tell my own story in my own voice. This review is an "end product" of this autoethnographic journey of mine.

Methodology

In this study, I reviewed the methodological dimensions of 40 autoethnographies published in applied linguistics journals between 2010 and 2020. I aimed to understand and

describe how educational linguists used different types of autoethnographies and what methodological affordances of autoethnographic inquiry researchers applied in their studies. I conducted a literature search in two rounds. First, I targeted the articles on the EBSCOhost database and second, on Google Scholar using keywords including "auto ethnography" OR "auto/ethnography" OR "autoethnography" AND "second language teaching" AND "Applied Linguistics" AND "Educational Linguistics." I limited the search to between 2010 and 2020 since the field witnessed a fast proliferation of autoethnographic works in this decade.

On the EBSCOhost database, there were initially 632 hits. I removed the articles that were not directly related to applied linguistics from the list. This removal pulled the number down to 219. Given the large number, I went through the titles, subjects (keywords), abstracts and journal names. Opting for empirical studies, I eliminated conceptual pieces. Next, I excluded the empirical studies that briefly mentioned autoethnography comparing it with their main methodology. Also, I disregarded the studies in which autoethnography was used as an educational tool in classroom instruction. By doing so, I narrowed the list down to 29 articles. In the second round, I conducted a Google Scholar search. Using the same exclusion criteria I applied earlier to my EBSCOhost search results, I narrowed the number down to 11 in the Google search. In the end of the selection process, I compiled 40 articles published in 27 journals, as in Table 2.

Table 2
Applied Linguistics Journals Publishing the Reviewed Autoethnographies

Journal Name **(Reviewed Articles)**
Changing English (Ai, 2015, 2016; Bryan, 2010; Rickard, 2014; Su, 2019)
Cogent Education (Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016)
Critical Questions in Education (Schoorman, 2017)
English Teaching (Park, 2014)
Family Relations (Kennedy & Romo, 2013)
International Journal of Multilingualism (Catalano et al., 2018)
International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (Filipović, 2019)
International Journal of Research & Method in Education (Adamson & Muller, 2018)
International Review of Education (Halvorsen, 2018)
Journal of Language and Literacy Education (Anderson et al., 2015)
Journal of Language, Identity & Education (Choi, 2012, Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020, Rivers, 2019)
Journal of Research in International Education (Tsumagari, 2010)
Journal of Second Language Writing (Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019)
L2 Journal (Kim & Saenkhum, 2019; Park, 2013)
Language Policy (Liu & Lin, 2018)
Language, Culture & Curriculum (Szecsi & Szilagyi, 2012)
Modern Language Journal (McGregor & Fernández, 2019)
Pedagogy, Culture and Society (Frimberger, 2016)
RELC Journal (Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018)
Research in the Teaching of English (Johnson, 2018)
Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal (Osborne, 2013; Shibata, 2011)
SYSTEM (Kamiya, 2019)
Teacher Education Quarterly (Fall, 2019; Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019; Yazan, 2019b)
Teacher Educator (Vellanki & Prince, 2018)
TESOL Journal (Hancı-Azizoğlu, 2018; Solano-Campos, 2014; Zacharias, 2019)
TESOL Quarterly (Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Canagarajah, 2012)

The English Journal (Caraballo & Rahman, 2016)

Findings

In this review, I explored how recently published autoethnographic studies (#40) used autoethnography as a methodological choice in the field of applied linguistics. I based my review on multiple methodologists' discussions of autoethnography as a qualitative research methodology. To that end, I created a matrix to investigate each reviewed autoethnographic article's type, use of voice, provision of (auto)biographical information, data collection tools, and data analysis procedures.

Types of Autoethnography

Existing scholarship offers a number of different types of autoethnographies, such as poetic, performative, evocative, analytic, and critical. However, the findings show that a great majority of the authors describe their study simply as autoethnography, refraining from choosing a specific type of this methodology. Among the 40 reviewed articles, only seven are framed as a specific type of autoethnography, which are either critical (Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019) or analytic (i.e., Canagarajah, 2012; Johnson, 2018; Kim & Saenkhum, 2019; Park, 2014; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018; Zacharias, 2019). All these studies discuss the various underlying reasons for choosing critical or analytic autoethnographies in their methodology.

Although many other autoethnographers use various "critical" theories (e.g., critical literacy, critical pedagogy, and critical race theory) aligned with critical paradigms, only Rodriguez-Mojica et al. (2019) call their study a critical autoethnography. Problematizing the qualities of Spanish language teachers in the US, they term their study as "critical" in accordance with their theoretical framework (i.e., Critical Race Theory) to challenge the existing power dynamics shaping and being shaped by dominant discourses.

Those who opted for analytic autoethnography justified their choice through various reasonings. Canagarajah (2012) pointed to the publication policies of the journal and readers' familiarity with "analytic" compared to "evocative" autoethnography. In a similar vein, Rose and Montakantiwong (2018) stated that they found analytic autoethnography more conventional. Park (2014) justified her selection of analytic autoethnography through the purpose of her study. That is, she aimed at focusing on analyzing reflexive relationships between her and her students rather than dwelling on her personal emotions. Kim & Saenkhum (2019) and Johnson (2018) related their preference for analytic autoethnography with their adherence to their theoretical framework to understand their lived experience. Zacharias' (2019) choice of analytic autoethnography derived from the fact that she found using only memory work insufficient. In brief, these six studies viewed analytic autoethnography as a more suitable approach, as they preferred not to move further away from traditional qualitative methodologies.

Interestingly, none of the scholars framed their study as "evocative autoethnography," although some of them employed various literary genres to evoke emotions. For instance, Park (2013) incorporated poetry into her article to highlight her emotions in four distinct but interconnected domains regarding her socio-linguistic and socio-cultural background. Although she called her work an autobiography rather than autoethnography, I included her study in the review since she went beyond the conventions of autobiography by linking her experiences with the broader social structures. Rickard's (2014) study is another example of an autoethnography with evocative features. In her reflection on her experience as a teacher and a lesbian in a secondary Catholic school in Ireland, Rickard used two versions of one story of her past: one based on her lived experiences and the other based on imagination. Although

both Park (2013) and Rickard (2014) used significant evocative elements, neither of them called their studies evocative autoethnography.

Types of Multi-Authored Autoethnographies.

Of the 40 articles, 16 are multi-authored; three being duoethnographies (Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020; Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018), while six are collaborative (or joint) autoethnographies (Adamson & Muller, 2018; Catalano et al., 2018; McGregor & Fernández, 2019; Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019; Vellanki & Prince, 2018). However, the remaining seven multi-authored studies are framed merely as autoethnographies despite the intensive collaboration between the authors.

Existing scholarship frequently defines multi-authored autoethnographies in two terms: collaborative (or joint) autoethnographies or duoethnographies. While most collaborative studies refer to Chang et al.'s (2013) *Collaborative Autoethnography* book, duoethnographic ones frequently cite Norris et al.'s *Duoethnography: Dialogic Methods for Social, Health, and Educational Research* (2012) to frame their studies. Chang et al. (2013) define collaborative autoethnography as a method "in which researchers work in community to collect their autobiographical materials and to analyze and interpret their data collectively" (p. 23). While collaborative autoethnography emphasizes collectivity, duoethnography highlights the dialogical aspect of collaboration in autoethnographic data collection and analysis (Norris et al., 2012). In both, autoethnographers engage actively in the narration and analysis of each other's lived experiences as a joint venture.

The findings show that all three reviewed duoethnographies had a similar design, drawing on Norris & Sawyer (2012), who highlighted that duoethnographers should collect data through personal conversations and present their findings via juxtaposition of their lived experiences. To illustrate, Lawrence & Nagashima (2020) conversed about their professional lives with regard to their gender, sexuality, race, and "native-speakerness." Then, they restructured and refined three dialogues to clarify the findings and make them accessible to readers (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). In another duoethnography, Rose and Montakantiwong (2018) discussed their incorporation of English as an International language in their classroom. Upon dialogically reflecting on each other's written narratives, they presented their findings thematically in two distinct tales. In the third duoethnography, Lowe and Kiczkowiak (2016) brought together a "native" and a "non-native" English teacher's stories of classroom practice. Collecting data from online conversations with each other, the authors presented their experiences via a co-constructed dialog. In all of these duoethnographies, the authors maintained their close dialogical engagement with each other's experiences from the data collection to the presentation of the findings.

Unlike the three duoethnographic studies, collaborative autoethnographies' designs are varied, particularly in the construction and presentation of the findings. For instance, Adamson & Muller (2018) co-constructed autoethnographic narratives regarding their experiences working in two Japanese universities. The authors wrote their autoethnographic narratives individually after deciding on the narrative frames through a Skype meeting. When their narratives were ready, they co-authored a unified manuscript to present their findings. In their study, Rodríguez-Mojica et al. (2019) individually constructed and presented personal narratives to collaboratively investigate what linguistic qualifications are required to teach Spanish in US education system.

In Catalano et al.'s (2018) study, the researchers explored their additional language learning experiences: the authors first wrote journal entries individually, then conversed about them all together in discussion sessions to come up with themes. They analyzed these themes together and presented the findings collectively. Likewise, Vellanki & Prince (2018) explored

how their transnational identities influenced their instruction in a global multicultural teacher education course in a US university. They conversed about their previously crafted individual reflections Upon recording these conversations, they presented their findings thematically in a collective fashion.

In McGregor & Fernandez's (2019) article, the authors brought two autoethnographies together regarding their individual interviewing experiences with language learners in different settings. Focusing on the common elements in their interactions with interviewees, they presented their findings as a synthesis of common and distinct elements. In Sánchez-Martín & Seloni's (2019) study, the researchers examined their interaction during dissertation mentoring between two transnational women. Collecting data through journals, memos, and an interview, the authors collaboratively identified themes and presented them through thematic analysis.

Reviewing all these multi-authored autoethnographic studies, I noticed that, compared to duoethnography, collaborative autoethnography has more flexibility in data generation and offers more options to collect and analyze data, and to present findings. Collaborative autoethnographers used data collected together and/or separately before or after they started their project. They also presented their data multiple ways in separate, collaged, or unified sections. On the other hand, duoethnographers tended to construct data dialogically only after they initiated the project and presented their findings through critical dialogs or thematic stories.

The Use of Voice: A Broad Picture

Autoethnography allows researchers the freedom to tell their story in their own voice. That is, unlike traditional researchers, autoethnographers have the liberty to choose the first-person voice to deliberately avoid assuming a "God's eye" omniscient view (Bochner & Ellis, 2016). Those who opt for first-person voice argue that following the conventions of third-person academic voice, traditional social scientists distance the text from readers and make the readers accept authorial analysis as systematic and factual (Adams et al., 2015). On the contrary, many researchers acknowledge the decolonizing effect of autoethnography (Bhattacharya, 2018) in that it gives voice to silenced and marginalized individuals and groups (Boylorn & Orbe, 2014; Fall, 2019; Holman Jones et al., 2016). By using first-person voice in their writing style, these scholars aim to "disrupt taboos, break silences, and reclaim [their] lost and disregarded voices" (Adams et al., 2015, p. 36).

On the other hand, autoethnographers who prefer conventional, third-person voice believe that first-person point of view is decidedly subjective because it foregrounds the researcher's own interpretation of lived experiences (Caulley, 2008). They contend that third-person narrative offers them an objective and analytical voice. They use third-person voice to create a balance between personal experiences and the narrator's cultural analysis (Adams et al., 2015), which is a desired feature for analytic autoethnography (Anderson, 2006).
Overall, despite different views on the use of voice, autoethnography enables flexibility to choose among different voices. Nonetheless, whether to use first, third, or a mixed voice is an epistemological choice that begs for justification. However, only a few of the reviewed studies' authors provided such information as why they chose a specific voice in their autoethnographies.

The Use of Voice in Single-Authored Autoethnographies.

The findings indicated that a great majority of the single authors (i.e., 22 out of 24) used first-person voice in their studies. The only two solo-authored studies written in third voice belonged to Kamiya (2019) and Tsumagari (2010). These two authors designed their studies

as case studies and focused on analyzing data that existed before deciding to write an autoethnography. Noting that they approached subjectivity as a flaw, I believe their deliberate use of the third person stemmed from their adherence to (post)positivist epistemology and its related terminology. Both authors viewed researching themselves as limitations although existing autoethnographic scholarship is built on the fact that autoethnographers are entitled and even encouraged to reflect and draw on their own experiences, thoughts, and emotions. Interestingly, although Tsumagari said, "An autoethnographic approach for this study was considered best, as it is usually written *in first-person voice*" in the methodology section (*italics* added, p. 294), she preferred to write her paper in third-person voice without providing any justification for doing so. Such contradiction further shows that she disregarded the epistemological affordances of autoethnography in her study.

The Use of Voice in Multi-Authored Autoethnographies.

The review of the use of voice in multi-authored autoethnographies yielded differing results. Overall, the authors' voice preferences seemed to stem from convenience rather than epistemological concerns. That is, most studies focused on finding the most effective writing style to make clear of who is doing the talking in different sections. Of the 16 multi-authored autoethnographies, one study was thoroughly written in first-person plural (Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016), and one in third-person voice (Caraballo & Rahman, 2016). The remaining 14 studies utilized multiple strategies throughout the manuscripts, distinguishing the mutually written parts from the parts centering on individual stories.

To refer to all authors, 13 studies used first-person plural (we), while only one used third-person plural (they) in mutually written parts. In parts where the spotlight was on one particular researcher, 12 studies used third-person singular, whereas only two studies utilized first-person singular (Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019). Also, two studies were written in both first- and third-person voice (Anderson et al., 2015; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018). In brief, this wide array of using voice may be explained more so by the practical reasoning than epistemological understanding.

The Use of First-Person Voice in Multi-Authored Autoethnographies.

Ironically, the use of first-person in multi-authored autoethnographies either contributed to giving voice to each researcher individually or resulted in the dominance of the first author's voice over the other(s)'. To illustrate, Anderson et al. (2015), Rodríguez-Mojica et al. (2019), Rose and Montakantiwong (2018), and Sánchez-Martín and Seloni (2019) presented their stories harmoniously while at the same time allowing for individual stories to be told in first-person singular. In Anderson et al.'s (2015) study, which discussed how negative labeling influenced academic trajectories, the authors combined three consecutive stories presented in subheadings under each author's names. As a result, the reader was informed clearly about who the "I" referred to while reading each story. Similarly, to explore the linguistic qualifications of Spanish teachers, Rodríguez-Mojica et al. (2019) presented their individual experiences in consecutive autoethnographic stories of learning and teaching Spanish in the US. Using separate subheadings with their first names allowed them to use first-person voice to talk about their lived experiences regarding privilege and marginalization.

Rose and Montakantiwong (2018), when presenting their experiences of adapting an "English as an international language" approach in their classrooms, narrated their individual stories in first-person singular first, and next compared their experiences in "we" language. Sánchez-Martín and Seloni (2019) utilized a different strategy to scrutinize their interpersonal relationships during dissertation mentoring: while one author made a statement, she used "I,"

accompanied by her name in brackets. This way, each author maintained her personal voice, while making it clear for the reader to whom "I" referred. In all of these autoethnographies, the purposeful use of "I" allowed the authors to speak about their individual stories while the use of "we" created a harmony between them while engaging in each other's experiences.

Conversely, the use of first-person language has also served as a means to suppress the voice of the second author. For instance, although framed as a collaborative project, Kennedy and Romo (2013) used Kennedy's first-person singular voice only. For Kennedy, Romo served as her assistant, who helped collect data and who mitigated Kennedy's subjectivity as an outsider to achieve reliability. This way, Romo's presence was deemed to be a contributor, rather than a co-author, with a muted voice.

In another study, Liu and Lin (2018), as a married couple, discussed their family language policies and practices while raising their children as bilingual English and Chinese speakers. Throughout the manuscript, Liu (the husband and the first author) foregrounded his own voice, while Lin's voice was never heard. To illustrate, he said: "My wife and I joked that, since we were neither rich nor powerful, we could turn our children into 'the second generation of the bilinguals' by making sure to pass on our linguistic advantage in their childhood at home" (p. 12). This utterance showed that Liu used first-person voice in an idiocentric way, implying that the second author's story was not independent from his own.

(Auto)biographical Information

An effective way for autoethnographers to engage readers as companions rather than a passive audience is the provision of autobiographical information. Considering that most autoethnographers come from historically marginalized communities (Chavez, 2012), their (auto)biographies are likely to have unique characteristics that need unpacking. Such information may help readers understand how autoethnographers accepted, negotiated with, and resisted the particular practices and discourses in their social worlds. In my view, without sufficient (auto)biographical information, it is difficult to discern an autoethnography from other ethnographic research.

Autobiographical Information in Single-Authored Autoethnographies.

Among the reviewed, single-authored autoethnographies, those who discussed their lifetime experiences tended to incorporate substantial autobiographical information throughout the manuscript (e.g. Ai, 2016; Canagarajah, 2012; Choi 2012, Hancı-Azizoğlu, 2018; Park, 2013, Rivers, 2019; Schoorman, 2017; Solano-Campos, 2014; Su, 2019; Zacharias, 2019). With extensive autobiographical information provided at the beginning of an autoethnography, engaging in a dialog with the author(s) was rather easy for me as a reader via this imaginary dialog:

Author:	Hi!
Me:	Hi! Sorry, do I know you?
Author:	No, but let me introduce myself to you. Well, I am not from around here-
Me:	Wait a minute! That makes two of us 😊
Author:	I am an L2 English speaker-
Me:	What a coincidence! Me, too! Tell me more! (…)

The earlier I learned about the author(s), the more comfortable I felt while keeping the conversation, and the more willing I was to read their stories dialogically. To illustrate, Su (2019) started her paper presenting her EFL/ESL learner and teacher identity by saying:

> I was born in the south of China, the capital city of XX Province. My parents are both ordinary workers who know very little of English as a foreign language and had never learnt anything about English as they were born in the 1950s. (p. 1)

Reading this statement, I immediately told myself that Su and I shared almost identical backgrounds except that I was from Turkey. Like her, I come from a working-class background. My parents too knew almost nothing about how important learning English would be in my future. Furthermore, my parents were born in the 1950s as well. From the very onset, I felt the connection, and started wondering what other similarities Su and I shared, how we differed from each other, and for what reasons.

Unlike Su (2019), who presented her lifetime experiences, other autoethnographers, who focused on particular experiences on a specific topic in a given period of time, had a different section for their autobiographical data (e.g., Kamiya, 2019; Osborne, 2013; Park, 2014). Osborne (2013), for instance, provided autobiographical information only in the "context of the study" part, and in no more than 60 words. This plain and brief section, however, did not suffice for me to strike a dialog with him, since my questions about him were left unanswered. Consequently, I read the rest of the manuscript as though I was not reading an autoethnography. Likewise, in her analytic autoethnography, in which she explored her two-year long experience as a teacher educator at an MA TESOL program in Korea, Park (2014) provided limited autobiographical data in the "method" section separately under the "research context and participants" part, in which she discussed the program more than her own language learning and teaching experiences. As a reader, I would like to have learned more about how her life in the US as a bilingual child growing into an ELT professor impacted her professional practice in Korea.

Filipović's (2019) autoethnographic case study is another example. She provided very little information about herself in her discussion of an international project regarding teaching and learning Romani in multiple European countries. Throughout the manuscript, I looked for pieces of information regarding what personal reasons she had in joining the project, why she was interested in the Romani language, and how her participation in the project affected her personal, professional, and academic life. Without such information, I read a case study rather than an autoethnography.

Autobiographical Information in Multi-Authored Autoethnographies.

Chang et al. (2013) liken autoethnography to a "solo performance" and collaborative autoethnography to an "ensemble" (p. 24). For single-authored autoethnographies, having autobiographical data to know "who the author is" may be sufficient to understand and appreciate the "solo performance" of an artist. However, to accompany an "ensemble," readers may require more information while reading collaborative autoethnographies, including what (inter)personal relationships the authors had before and during the project and to what degree the power dynamics in their (inter)personal relationships affected their collaboration.

(Auto)biographies of Co-Authors in Collaborative Autoethnographies.

Among the reviewed collaborative autoethnographies, McGregor and Fernández (2019) and Caraballo and Rahman's (2016) studies had no or very little (auto)biographical information regarding the three questions above. In their study, McGregor and Fernández (2019) scrutinized how their identities affected their interviewing process. Although this overarching question of their study was related to their identities, having little (auto)biographical data about the authors prevented me from understanding how their identities

came into being, and in turn, influenced their qualitative work. Therefore, it was difficult to critically engage with them and understand their findings. In their study, Caraballo and Rahman (2016) scrutinized how the second author, as an English Language Arts teacher, struggled with the social norms in the US as a result of her Muslim identity. The authors criticized school administrators' lack of multicultural perspective towards teachers' backgrounds, which contributed to teachers' (in)visibility in educational settings. However, the study provided no (auto)biographical data regarding the participant teacher's (the second author) life before her university years. The absence of such information in the autoethnography added to the (in)visibility of the Muslim teacher's multicultural background, although visibility was the main discussion point in the article.

Relationships and Power Dynamics Between Co-Authors in Multi-Authored Autoethnographies.

Collaborative autoethnography requires close relationships between authors and sharing power between/among researchers (Chang et al., 2013). However, few collaborative studies addressed the relationships between/among the authors as *colleagues* (i.e., Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Kennedy & Romo, 2013; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018; Vellanki & Prince, 2018), *advisor and advisee* (i.e., Caraballo & Rahman, 2016; Catalano et al., 2018; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019), or *spouses* (i.e., Liu & Lin, 2018). Among these collaborative autoethnographies, Atkinson and Sohn (2013), Caraballo and Rahman (2016), Liu and Lin (2018), and Rose and Montakantiwong's (2018) studies showed power imbalances between the authors. While the first author's expertise and interpretation dominated the study, the second author was positioned as a "participant" (i.e., Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Caraballo & Rahman, 2016), the first author's wife (i.e., Liu & Lin, 2018), or an unsuccessful teacher figure in the implementation of a new syllabus (i.e., Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018). Furthermore, none of these studies mentioned the interpersonal power relations between the authors.

The only study that addressed the question of power dynamics between the authors was Lawrence and Nagashima's (2020) duoethnography. In their study, the authors explored their intersecting identities with regard to their teaching principles and classroom interactions in Japan. Their awareness of the power dynamics in the workplace and academia was visible throughout the paper. Instead of keeping it private, they even explained their decision as to who the first author would be, noting that "this decision was arrived at based solely on [the first author's] role as the initiator of the project at the beginning and does not suggest a greater contribution or higher status" (p. 6). After reading this study, I asked what power relations might have affected the choice of the first author and the content of the study in the other multi-authored autoethnographies I reviewed. For instance, how did Dwight's (first author) status as a white, male, L1 English speaker, as opposed to Jija's (second author) non-white, female, L2 English speaker identity affect the content and the order of authorship in Atkinson and Sohn's (2013) study? To what extent, did (or should) "professorship" influence this order in Caraballo and Rahman (2016) and Catalano et al.'s (2018) studies? Why is the first author "the husband" in Liu and Lin's (2018) study? What underlying social dynamics and power relations may have led to such decisions? I believe these questions beg for answers by the authors, since their answers are crucial for their readership to understand the "synergy and harmony" of the multivocal "ensemble" (Chang et al., 2013, p. 24) of the collaboration. Considering that the "self" (auto) component distinguishes autoethnography from other ethnographic works, I believe all of the authors' selves need to be present in the manuscript. However, I heard neither Elma's nor Liu's wife's voices in Caraballo and Rahman (2016) and Liu and Lin's (2018) respective studies. Rather than "co-authors," they seemed more like "participants," who contributed to the study through "extensive member check."

Data Collection Tools

In order to emphasize the empirical dimension of their qualitative study, and to contextualize its "ethno" (cultural) aspect, autoethnographers employ a wide range of data collection tools. Chang (2008) describes three sets of data collection strategies for autoethnographic research: personal memories, self-observation, and external data. Accordingly, in the reviewed autoethnographies, the authors mainly used personal memories, which were followed by textual data, interview data, documents and artifacts, and observations (see Table 3 for details).

Table 3
Data Collection Tools Utilized in the Reviewed Studies

Tool	Type	In-text citation
Personal Narratives	The only data	Ai, 2016; Brock-Utne, 2018; Bryan, 2010; Schoorman, 2017; Su, 2019
	Primary data	Ai, 2015; Canagarajah, 2012; Frimberger, 2016; Hancı-Azizoğlu, 2018; Johnson, 2018; Park, 2014; Rickard, 2014; Rivers, 2019; Tsumagari, 2010; Yazan, 2019b; Zacharias, 2019
Textual Data	*Journal entries* (supplementary data)	Caraballo & Rahman, 2016; Catalano et al., 2018; Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020; Solano-Campos, 2014; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019; Tsumagari, 2010; Yazan, 2019b, Zacharias, 2019
	Diaries (the only data)	Choi, 2012; Kamiya, 2019; Osborne, 2013
	written reflections / memos	Adamson & Muller, 2018; Catalano et al., 2018; McGregor & Fernández, 2019; Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019, Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019; Vellanki & Prince, 2018; Yazan, 2019b
	field notes	Halvorsen, 2018; Park, 2014; Shibata, 2012; Solano-Campos, 2014
	own published works	Canagarajah, 2012; Kim & Saenkhum, 2019; Rivers, 2019
	creative writing, stories and poems	Fall, 2019; Hancı-Azizoğlu, 2018; Park, 2013; Rickard, 2014
	email correspondence	Filipović, 2019; Yazan, 2019b
	social media posts	Solano-Campos, 2014; Johnson, 2018
Interpersonal communication	*Interviews with each other*	Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Sánchez-Martín & Seloni, 2019
	Interviews with others	Ai, 2015; Halvorsen, 2018; Kennedy & Romo, 2013; Park, 2014; Szecsi & Szilagyi, 2012
	online conversations	Adamson & Muller, 2018; Atkinson & Sohn, 2013; Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016

	face-to-face-conversations	Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020; Vellanki & Prince, 2018
	group discussions	Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019
Documents and Artifacts	*Visual*	Anderson et al., 2015; Fall, 2019; Johnson, 2018; Rivers, 2019; Solano-Campos, 2014
	textual	Caraballo & Rahman, 2016; Canagarajah, 2012; Filipović, 2019; Halvorsen, 2018; Kennedy & Romo, 2013; Tsumagari, 2010; Yazan, 2019b
Observations		Catalano et al., 2018; Filipović, 2019; Halvorsen, 2018; Johnson, 2018; Kennedy & Romo, 2013

Personal Narratives.

A closer examination of the studies showed that personal narratives based on memory work constituted the primary, if not the only data source in multiple single-authored autoethnographies (see Table 3). Most of these studies shared one feature in common: they encompassed long periods of time, measured in years. In these studies, the authors reflected upon their prolonged language learning, language teaching, and language teacher education experiences in different contexts. To illustrate, revisiting her memories in her autoethnography, Su (2019) made connections between her unique language learning and teaching experiences in China, and the particularities of the Chinese educational system utilizing a "personal experience narration" approach. In his study, Rivers (2019) shared narrative snapshots of his twenty years of English teaching in Japan, taking an "autoethnographic storytelling approach" to critically explore his lifetime story as a white, male, native English teacher. In his autoethnography, after going carefully through secondary resources to re-remember episodes of his life's history as a language teacher educator, Yazan (2019b) benefited mainly from memory work to construct his personal self-reflection. Zacharias (2019) described how her non-nativeness affected her classroom introduction practices in different contexts over the years. While doing so, she told her story through a "personal experience lens."

All in all, the analysis of these studies showed that personal narratives based on memory work played a central role in autoethnographic works, especially the ones encompassing years of experiences. In such cases, other data collection tools were helpful in revisiting, re-remembering, and re-constructing the past, and analyzing personal narratives with an analytical approach.

Textual Data.

Authors used multiple forms of textual data including personal diaries or journal entries, written reflections or memos, field notes, their own published works, samples of creative writing, such as stories and poems, email correspondence, blog entries, and social media posts (see Table 3). Although multiple authors used varied textual data in their autoethnographies, the review showed that only three authors used textual data as the only data source, (all were personal diaries; e.g., Choi, 2012; Kamiya, 2019; Osborne, 2013).

In her exploration of her "multivocal post-diasporic selves" through her habit of watching Korean dramas, Choi (2012) analyzed the personal diaries she kept while living in New York, Beijing, Tokyo, and Sydney over the years as a second generation Korean American. In his autoethnographic case study, Kamiya (2019) explored his L2 English vocabulary development using the diary he wrote as a Japanese senior high school student while he was studying abroad in the US for a year. In his study, Osborne (2013) analyzed the

diary that he wrote for two weeks to describe his Italian language vocabulary learning experience of using a mobile application.

Among these three studies, Kamiya (2019) and Osborne (2013) did not provide any examples form their actual diaries. Instead, they approached their diaries as empirical data and presented their findings in a traditional academic writing format. On the other hand, Choi (2012) presented multiple examples from her diary, which she used as an opportunity to enter into a conversation with the readers in the exploration of her past experiences.

Interviews.

The review showed that the use of interview data differed according to the number of authors. While only three single-authored autoethnographies used interviews as data sources, multiple collaborative autoethnographies benefited from recorded interview data in various forms, such as online conversations, face-to-face-conversations, group discussions, semi-structured interviews with each other, and interviews with others (see Table 3). On the whole, interviews served as supplementary to personal narratives and textual data in single-authored autoethnographies. Their function was limited to comparing and contrasting others' stories with the autoethnographer's own experiences. In collaborative autoethnographies, however, interview data played a more central role as one of the main data sources. Through partnership, most co-authors co-constructed personal data through deep conversations, critical reflexivity, and analytic explorations. Given that dialogism distinguishes duoethnographies from other collaborative autoethnographies (Chang, 2008; Norris et al., 2012), interviews played a central role in the reviewed duoethnographic works (e.g., Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020; Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018). In these studies, the authors not only produced data interviewing each other through deep, long conversations; they also presented their data in dialogs or sequential speech.

Documents and Artifacts, and Observational Data.

The documents and artifacts included photographs, images from different media such as newspaper clippings, comic strips, school yearbooks, coursework assignments and lesson plans, questionnaires, homework samples and test scores, course syllabi, and institutional reports (see Table 3). Observations were the least-utilized data collection tools: only five studies used observation (among other tools) to collect data (see Table 3). The underlying rationale for using documents and artifacts as well as observational data was similar in that they were in secondary roles. They served to multiply the data sources to help the authors revisit their past memories or to enhance the authors' interpretations of their lived experiences and the social dimensions at play. Also, they acted as "proof" of narratives during the data analysis procedure.

Data Analysis

The findings of the review showed that the authors employed three distinct strategies in their data analysis. The first group used autoethnography as their only data analysis method. The second group analyzed their data using an additional method. The third group used a specific data analysis method independent from autoethnography, as seen in Table 4.

Table 4

Data Analysis Methods Utilized in the Reviewed Studies

Data Analysis Strategy	Data Analysis Method	In-Text citation
Autoethnography only		Ai, 2016; Anderson et al., 2015; Bryan, 2010; Canagarajah, 2012; Choi, 2012; Hancı-Azizoğlu, 2018; Johnson, 2018; Kim & Saenkhum, 2019; Rodríguez-Mojica et al., 2019; Shibata, 2012; Su, 2019; Yazan, 2019b, Vellanki & Prince, 2018
Autoethnography and another method combined	Layered Account Method	Fall, 2019
	Narrative Inquiry	Adamson & Muller, 2018
	Life Story Research	Atkinson & Sohn, 2013
	Life History Narratives	Park, 2013
	Progressive/Regressive Method	Park, 2014
	Storying	Rickard, 2014
	Data Analysis Spiral	Szecsi & Szilagyi, 2012
Another method apart from autoethnography	Statistical Analysis	Kamiya, 2019
	Thematic Analysis	Catalano et al., 2018; Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016; Osborne, 2013; Rose & Montakantiwong, 2018; Sanchez-Martin & Seloni, 2019; Solano-Campos, 2014; Zacharias, 2019
	Grounded Theory	Kennedy & Romo, 2013; Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020; McGregor and Fernández, 2019

Those who utilized autoethnographic data analysis followed Ellis et al. (2011) and/or Chang's (2008) conceptualization of autoethnography as a broad, qualitative inquiry that encompasses both data collection and data analysis. For Ellis et al. (2011), "autoethnography is both process and product," (p. 273) leaving much flexibility for the researchers who explore their own experiences in a systematic way to understand the broader cultural practices. Similarly, Chang (2008) notes that autoethnographic data collection and analysis take place concurrently and inform one another in a "web-like fashion" (p. 4). On the whole, the authors focusing on many years of their language learning, language teaching, and teacher education experiences did not rely on any additional data analysis method other than autoethnography.

The findings of the review revealed that thematic analysis was the most frequent method used specifically for data analysis. It was used in seven autoethnographies (see Table 4). However, only two studies provided a rich and step-by-step description of how they used thematic analysis and explained their data analysis procedure in detail (i.e., Catalano et al., 2018; Osborne, 2013). The remaining five studies' authors briefly mentioned that they used thematic analysis in their autoethnographies without touching upon why they chose this specific data analysis method. Conversely, there was a discrepancy between the selected data analysis method in Zacharias' (2019) study, in that she presented her findings according to a chronological ordering method rather than thematic organization.

Overall, the review of data analysis methods showed that the reliance on autoethnography overshadowed multiple authors' discussions of data analysis methods they used in addition to or separately from autoethnography. They mentioned only that they used a specific data analysis method, without providing further information about how they employed

this method. Also, there was little or no explanation in the reviewed articles as to why they chose to analyze their data using such methods and how their preference for using such analysis methods contributed to their study.

Discussion

Before initiating this project, I first investigated whether there were any similar reviews in other fields. I located Doloriert and Sambrook's (2012) review in organization and management in higher education, Hughes et al. (2012) and Hughes and Noblit's (2016) reviews in qualitative educational research, Stahlke Wall's (2016) review of the manuscripts she reviewed over the years as a qualitative methodologist, Adams and Manning's (2016) review in family research, and Méndez's (2013) literature review of autoethnographic research. I saw that only Doloriert and Sambrook (2012) and Adams and Manning's (2016) studies were discipline-specific, yet, these two studies reviewed a limited number of autoethnographic studies and focused on their topics of interest in a brief manner. The other reviews also had a small sample size considering the reviewed manuscripts. Additionally, these studies did not aim for a review of autoethnographic works per se.; their inclusion of such studies was to give examples to provide a rather prescriptive criteria for writing "good" and "impactful" autoethnographies.

Unlike these reviews, I took a more systematic and descriptive stance to explore how autoethnography as a research method contributes to the depth and breadth of applied linguistics. More specifically, I sought to answer how recent autoethnographic studies (#40), published in peer-reviewed applied linguistics journals between 2010 and 2020, have used autoethnography as a method of qualitative inquiry in applied linguistics. To that end, I particularly focused on the types and scopes of these studies' methodologies in accordance with the use of voice, the provision of (auto)biographical information, data collection tools, and data analysis methods. I believe this methodological review will contribute to the ongoing discussions of qualitative research methodologies and will serve well in the process of legitimization and conceptualization of autoethnography as "an emerging genre" (Mahboob et al., 2016, p. 52), "less-threaded path" (Mirhosseini, 2018, p. 76), and "a newly introduced method of research" (Yazan, 2019a, p. 6) in the field of applied linguistics.

Overall, I reached four major findings. First, a great majority of the researchers conceptualized autoethnography as "an umbrella term" with little or no further explanation as to how taking an autoethnographic approach defined, informed, or enriched their studies. Existing scholarship has offered several different types of autoethnographies so far (Marx et al., 2017). In the broader social and educational science literature, evocative and analytic are the two most extensively employed types of autoethnography. However, none of the applied linguistics studies I reviewed in this paper were termed evocative autoethnographies, although its forerunning proponents, Carolyn Ellis and Arthur Bochner, were among the most cited scholars in the methodology sections of these articles.

Arguing that language learning is an emotional act (Benesch, 2017; Motha & Lin, 2014; Richards, 2020), and teaching a language requires substantial emotional labor (Schutz & Zembylas, 2009). I believe the field may benefit from more examples of evocative autoethnographies that rely on emotions (Bochner & Ellis, 2016). Aligning with the affective turn (Benesch, 2017; Pavlenko, 2013), such studies may inform the field by focusing on language learners, language teachers, and teacher educators' emotionally laden experiences.

Second, a great majority of the reviewed single-authored as well as a number of multi-authored autoethnographies diverted from traditional third-person academic prose, although most of them approached their stories with an analytic lens. These authors approached their stories as "an enlarged conversation" with their readers (Goodall, 2000, p. 11) by using first-

person voice in their manuscript. Referring to applied linguistics, Kanno (2003) writes, "in a field that still largely favors a "scientific" mode of inquiry, first-person narratives are automatically suspect as anecdotal, soft, or just "story telling" (p. 11). I believe that by publishing more autoethnographies in first-person voice, applied linguists will help transform applied linguistics into a more humanized and decolonialized field.

On the other hand, the first author's use of first-person voice may lead to the silencing of the second author in collaborative autoethnographies, as the review of Kennedy and Romo (2013) and Liu and Lin's (2018) studies revealed. In these studies, the voice of one author (usually the first) suppressed the second author's, resulting in an unanticipated (and most probably unwanted) silencing effect. Given that one tenet of autoethnography is decolonizing qualitative research (Adams et al., 2015; Bhattacharya, 2018), future autoethnographers should ensure equal voice in their multi-authored works to avoid such undesired complications/implications.

Third, the review showed that the absence or scarcity of (auto)biographical information diminished both the evocative and analytic qualities of autoethnographic studies. Since the "auto" (self) component distinguishes autoethnographic studies from other qualitative research methodologies, it is crucial to provide (auto)biographical information. Without it, readers may not understand the contextual elements in the author(s) narratives, which in turn may inhibit the readers' comprehension of the author(s)' personal experiences. Given that, as a research methodology, autoethnography brings to the fore marginalized voices which would otherwise remain unheard (Sparkes, 2000), and offers "narrow, but solid, pathways for stories of the socially marginalized to enter the discourse of academics" (Marx et al., 2017, p. 2). Researchers should incorporate substantial personal information in their future autoethnographies in order for readers to grasp their lived experiences.

Lastly, the findings showed that the authors of the reviewed studies used autoethnography mostly based on their data sources produced by the researchers either before or after (or a combination of both) deciding to conduct an autoethnographic study. However, they provided little or no justification of their methodological choices as to why they specifically opted for autoethnography rather than other methodologies. Only a few of them explained the particular affordances that autoethnography offered them as opposed to other methodologies that did not. I believe future researchers will contribute to the recognition of autoethnography as an established methodology in applied linguistics, provided that they craft the methodology section in more detailed and profound ways.

Considering the findings outlined above, I suggest to those who would like to write an autoethnography that they should deeply and critically explore the types, epistemological foundations, and methodological affordances of autoethnography so that they may find the most appropriate voice and affordances to tell their stories in their own way. As an alternative research method, autoethnography offers ample opportunities, especially to researchers who position themselves on the margins, in-between spaces, or against mainstream ideologies. As language learners, users, teachers, and teacher educators, these scholars may also incorporate literary devices and artistic tools in their "academic" work to bring their emotions to the fore, voice their ethico-onto-epistemological concerns, and narrate their unique stories which would otherwise remain in the periphery and unheard.

Conclusion

I conducted this methodological review as the first paper of my three-paper dissertation (Keleş, 2020). I could not have completed this study, were it not for my advisor, Dr. Bedrettin Yazan, who is also an autoethnographer in the field of applied linguistics. Given that a great majority of methodological, systematic, and state-of-the-art reviews are a product of

collaborative efforts by multiple authors (unlike this one), I believe that in working on this study under Dr. Yazan's supervision, his mentorship helped greatly in the process of corroborating my findings to a great extent. Throughout, he provided me with extensive and insightful feedback, showed me alternative routes when I felt lost, and motivated me when I needed intellectual, emotional, and personal support.

As a final remark, I must note that I intended this methodological review neither to be a "harsh" criticism of the reviewed autoethnographies nor to offer any criteria for "good" autoethnographies with a prescriptive approach. In contrast, my initial purpose was to learn from them so that I could design my own autoethnographic studies – and I did (Keleş, in press). I have seen that autoethnography contributes greatly to the sociocultural, narrative, affective, and multilingual aspects of language learning, teaching, and using. It offers a "voice" to the individuals, whose voice would otherwise be difficult to hear.

References

Adams, T. E., Holman Jones, S., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography*. Oxford University Press.

Adams, T. E., & Manning, J. (2015). Autoethnography and family research. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 7*(4), 350-366. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12116

Adamson, J., & Muller, T. (2018). Joint autoethnography of teacher experience in the academy: Exploring methods for collaborative inquiry. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *41*(2), 207-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2017.1279139

Ai, B. (2015). A study of the EFL writing of Chinese learners: A critical narrative. *Changing English*, *22*(3), 294-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2015.1056091

Ai, B. (2016). Experiencing different identity prototypes in learning and teaching English: A Chinese learner's autoethnography, *Changing English, 23*(3), 280-291, https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2016.1162090

Anderson, A. W., Branscombe, M., & Nkrumah, T. (2015). Crossing blocked thresholds: Three stories of identity, embodied literacy, and participatory education. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *11*(2), 170-184.

Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*(4)*, 373-395. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449

Apple, M. W. (1978). Ideology, reproduction, and educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, *22*(3), 367-387. https://doi.org/10.1086/445993

Atkinson, D., & Sohn, J. (2013). Culture from the bottom up. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(4), 669-693. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.104

Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative knowledging in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(3), 391-414. https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.261888

Benesch, S. (2017). *Emotions and English language teaching: Exploring teachers' emotion labor*. Routledge.

Bhattacharya, K. (2018). Coloring memories and imaginations of "home": Crafting a de/colonizing autoethnography. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, *18*(1), 9-15. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708617734010

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Edinburgh University Press.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (2016). *Evocative autoethnography: Writing stories and telling lives*. Routledge.

Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. P. (Eds.) (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. Routledge.

Brock-Utne, B. (2018). Researching language and culture in Africa using an autoethnographic approach. *International Review of Education*, *64*(6), 713-735.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-018-9746-6

Bryan, B. (2010). From Boston to Brixton: An autoethnographic account of schooling from Jamaica to the UK. *Changing English*, *17*(2), 141-152. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684003787258

Bulfin, S., & Mathews, K. (2003). Reframing beginning English teachers as knowledge producers: Learning to teach and transgress. *English Teaching*, *2*(3), 47-58.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). Teacher development in a global profession: An autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(2), 258-279. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.18

Caraballo, L., & Rahman, E. (2016). Visible teaching, (In)visible teacher: An educator's journey as a Muslim woman. *English Journal*, *106*(2), 47-53.

Catalano, T., Shende, M., & Suh, E. K. (2018). Developing multilingual pedagogies and research through language study and reflection. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *15*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1181633

Caulley, D. N. (2008). Making qualitative research reports less boring: The techniques of writing creative nonfiction. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *14*(3), 424-449. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800407311961

Chang, E. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Left Coast Press.

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. -A. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.

Chavez, M. S. (2012). Autoethnography, a Chicana's methodological research tool: The role of storytelling for those who have no choice but to do critical race theory. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *45*(2), 334-348. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2012.669196

Choi, J. (2012). Multivocal post-diasporic selves: Entangled in Korean dramas. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *11*(2), 109-123. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2012.667305

Chomsky, N. (1959). A review of BF Skinner's Verbal Behavior. *Language*, *35*(1), 26-58. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674594623.c6

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning community. *Review of Research in Education*, *24*, 249-305. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X024001249

Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (Eds.). (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges* (Vol. 40). Multilingual Matters.

De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Analysing narratives as practices. *Qualitative Research*, *8*(3), 379-387. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106093634

De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2012). *Analyzing narratives. Discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

De Los Ríos, C. V., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, coloniality, and English classrooms: An exploration of two bicoastal urban classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *52*(1), 55-76.

Denzin, N. K. (2006). Analytic autoethnography, or déjà vu all over again. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *35*(4), 419-428. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241606286985

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. SAGE.

Doloriert, C., & Sambrook, S. (2012). Organisational autoethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, *1*(1), 83-95. https://doi.org/10.1108/20466741211220688

Ellingson, L. L., & Ellis, C. (2008). Autoethnography as constructionist project. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 445-456).

Guildford.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. AltaMira Press.

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research. 12*(1), 273-290.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). SAGE.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2006). Analyzing analytic autoethnography: An autopsy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *35*(4), 429-449. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241606286979

Fall, M. S. B. (2019). A layered account of translingual invisible tongues: Sensory and multimodal narratives from the English 101 to the Ph.D. classroom. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *46*(3), 10-33.

Faulkner, S. L. (2017). Poetry is politics: An autoethnographic poetry manifesto. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, *10*(1), 89-96. https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2017.10.1.89

Filipović, J. (2019). Transdisciplinary qualitative paradigm in applied linguistics: autoethnography, participatory action research and minority language teaching and learning. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *32*(5), 493-509. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1597209

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(3), 397-417. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114

Frimberger, K. (2016). Towards a well-being focussed language pedagogy: Enabling arts-based, multilingual learning spaces for young people with refugee backgrounds. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *24*(2), 285-299. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2016.1155639

Gannon, S. (2006). The (im)possibilities of writing the self-writing: French poststructural theory and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, *6*(4), 474-495. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708605285734

Gannon, S. (2017). Autoethnography. *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/978019 0264093.013.71

Goodall, H. L. (2000). *Writing the new ethnography*. AltaMira Press.

Guyotte, K. W., Hofsess, B. A., Wilson, G. J., & Shields, S. S. (2018). Tumbling from embodiment to enfleshment: Art as intervention in collective autoethnography. *Art Research International: A Transdisciplinary Journal*, *3*(2), 101-32. https://doi.org/10.18432/ari29334

Halvorsen, T.A. (2018). My face is more than me. A Nordic researcher in the South: An autoethnographic retrospective perspective. *International Review of Education*, *64*(6), 845-864. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-018-9744-8

Hancı-Azizoğlu, B. E. (2018). Creative writing as a second language: What is creativity for second language writers. *TESOL Journal, 9*(4), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.424

Hayler, M., & Williams, J. (2020). *Being a teacher educator in challenging times: Negotiating the rapids of professional learning* (Vol. 22). Springer Nature.

Holman Jones, S. (2005). Autoethnography: Making the personal political. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 763-791). SAGE.

Holman Jones, S., Adams, T. E., & Ellis, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of autoethnography*.

Routledge.

Hughes, S., & Noblit, G. (2016). Meta-ethnography of autoethnographies: A worked example of the method using educational studies. *Ethnography and Education*, *12*(2), 211-227. https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2016.1216322

Hughes, S., Pennington, J. L., & Makris, S. (2012). Translating autoethnography across the AERA standards: Toward understanding autoethnographic scholarship as empirical research. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(6), 209-219. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12442983

Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 235-257. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264518

Johnson, L. L. (2018). Where do we go from here? Toward a critical race English education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *53*(2), 102-124.

Kamiya, N. (2019). Predicting the emergence of content words in L2 diary entries during study abroad over a year. *System*, *85*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102113

Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities: Japanese returnees betwixt two worlds.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Keleş, U. (in press). Exploring my in-betweenness as a growing transnational scholar through poetic autoethnography. In L. J. Pentón Herrera, E. Trinh, & B. Yazan (Eds.), *Autoethnographies of doctoral students in applied linguistics*. (Revised and resubmitted on October 4, 2021)

Keleş, U. (2020). *My language learning, using, and researching stories: Critical autoethnography of socialization* (Publication No. 28154180) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama - Tuscaloosa]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Kennedy, K. D., & Romo, H. D. (2013). "All colors and hues": An Autoethnography of a multiethnic family's strategies for bilingualism and multiculturalism. *Family Relations*, *62*(1), 109-124. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00742.x

Kim, S. H., & Saenkhum, T. (2019). Professional identity (re)construction of L2 writing scholars. *L2 Journal*, *11*(2), 18-34. https://doi.org/10.5070/L211242088

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59-81. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264511

Lakoff, G. (1990). The invariance hypothesis: Is abstract reason based on image-schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics, 1*(1), 39-74. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1990.1.1.39

Lantolf, J. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Lawrence, L., & Nagashima, Y. (2020). The intersectionality of gender, sexuality, race, and Native-speakerness: Investigating ELT teacher identity through duoethnography. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *19*(1), 42-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1672173

Leavy, P. (2015). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.

Liu, W., & Lin, X. (2018). Family language policy in English as a foreign language: A case study from China to Canada. *Language Policy*, *18*(2), 191-207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9475-5

Lowe, R. J., & Kiczkowiak, M. (2016). Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: A duoethnographic study. *Cogent Education*, *3*(1), 1264171. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1264171

Mahboob, A., Paltridge, B., Phakiti, A., Wagner, E., Starfield, S., Burns, A., Jones, R. H., & De Costa, P. I. (2016). TESOL Quarterly research guidelines. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(1), 42-65. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.288

Marx, S., Pennington, J. L., & Chang, H. (2017). Critical autoethnography in pursuit of educational equity: Introduction to the IJME special issue. *International Journal of*

Multicultural Education, *19*(1), 1-6. http://sci-hub.tw/10.18251/ijme.v19i1.1393

May. S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

May, S. (2019). Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(1), 122-129. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12531

McGregor, J., & Fernández, J. (2019). Theorizing qualitative interviews: Two autoethnographic reconstructions. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(1), 227-247. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12541

Méndez, M. (2013). Autoethnography as a research method: Advantages, limitations and criticisms. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 15*(2), 279-287. https://doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2013.2.a09

Mirhosseini, S. A. (2018). An invitation to the less-treaded path of autoethnography in TESOL research. TESOL Journal, 9(1), 76-92. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.305

Motha, S., & Lin, A. (2014). "Non-coercive rearrangements": Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(2), 331-359. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.126

Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. D. (2012). Towards a dialogic methodology. In J. Norris, R. D. Sawyer, & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health and educational research* (pp. 9-40). Left Coast Press Inc.

Norris, J., Sawyer, R. D., & Lund, D. (2012). *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (Vol. 7). Left Coast Press.

Ortega, L. (2019). SLA and the study of equitable multilingualism. *Modern Language Journal, 103*, Supplement, 23-38. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12525

Osborne, M. (2013). An autoethnographic study of the use of mobile devices to support foreign language vocabulary learning. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, *4*(4), 295-307.

Park, G. (2013). My autobiographical-poetic rendition: An inquiry into humanizing our teacher scholarship. *L2 Journal*, *5*(1), 6-18. https://doi.org/10.5070/L25115768

Park, L. E. (2014). Shifting from reflective practices to reflexivity: An autoethnography of an L2 teacher educator. *English Teaching, 69*(1), 173-198. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.69.1.201403.173

Pavlenko, A. (2013). The affective turn in SLA: From 'affective factors' to 'language desire' and 'commodification of affect.' In D. Gabrys-Barker & J. Bielska (Eds.), *The affective dimension in second language acquisition* (pp. 3-28). Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pennycook, A. (2018) Applied linguistics as epistemic assemblage. *AILA Review, 31*(1), 113-134. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.00015.pen

Perrin, D., & Kramsch, C. (2018). Introduction: Transdisciplinarity in applied linguistics. *AILA Review*, *31*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.00010.int

Pensoneau-Conway, S. L., Bolen, D. M., Toyosaki, S., Rudick, C. K., & Bolen, E. K. (2014). Self, relationship, positionality, and politics: A community autoethnographic inquiry into collaborative writing. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, *14*(4), 312-323. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708614530302

Price-Dennis, D., Muhammad, G. E., Womack, E., McArthur, S. A., & Haddix, M. (2017). The multiple identities and literacies of black girlhood: A conversation about creating spaces for Black girl voices. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *13*(3), 1-18.

Reed-Danahay, D. (1997). *Auto/ethnography*. Berg.

Reed-Danahay, D. (2017). Bourdieu and critical autoethnography: Implications for research, writing, and teaching. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *19*(1), 144-154. http://sci-hub.tw/10.18251/ijme.v19i1.1368

Richards, J. C. (2020). Exploring emotions in language teaching. *RELC Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220927531

Rickard, A. (2014). 'A not-so-simple story from my life': Using auto-ethnography and creative writing to re-frame the heteronormative narratives of school life. *Changing English*, *21*(4), 348-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2014.969021

Rivers, D.J. (2019). Walking on glass: Reconciling experience and expectation within Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *18*(6), 377-388. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1674149

Rodríguez-Mojica, C., Briceño, A., & Muñoz-Muñoz, E. R. (2019). Combating linguistic hegemony: Preparing and sustaining bilingual teacher educators in the United States. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *46*(3), 57-78.

Rose, H., & Montakantiwong, A. (2018). A tale of two teachers: A duoethnography of the realistic and idealistic successes and failures of teaching English as an international language. *RELC Journal*, *49*(1), 88-101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217746206

Sánchez-Martín, C., & Seloni, L. (2019). Transdisciplinary becoming as a gendered activity: A reflexive study of dissertation mentoring. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *43*, 24-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.06.006

Sardabi, N., Mansouri, B., & Behzadpoor, F. (2018). Autoethnography in TESOL. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0995

Schoorman, D. (2017). Reconceptualizing the role of an educational researcher: A critical multicultural educator's perspective. *Critical Questions in Education*, *8*(2), 116-137.

Schutz, P. A., & M. Zembylas (Eds.). (2009). *Advances in teacher emotion research: The impact on teachers' lives*. Springer Publishing.

Shibata, S. (2012). The macro-and micro-language learning counseling: An autoethnographic account. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 3*(1), 108-121. https://doi.org/10.37237/030108

Simon-Maeda, A. (2011). *Being and becoming a speaker of Japanese: An autoethnographic account*. Multilingual Matters.

Solano-Campos, A. (2014). The making of an international educator: Transnationalism and nonnativeness in English teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal, 5*(3), 412-443. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.156

Sparkes, A.C. (2000). Autoethnography and narratives of self: Reflections on criteria in action. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17*(1), 21-43. https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.17.1.21

Spry, T. (2001). Performing autoethnography: An embodied methodological praxis. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*, 706-732. https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700605

Spry, T. (2011). *Body/paper/stage: Writing and performing autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.

Stahlke Wall, S. (2016). Toward a moderate autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 15*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1609406916674966

Starr, L. J. (2010). The use of autoethnography in educational research: Locating who we are in what we do. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, *1*(3), 1-9.

Su, C. (2019). Characteristics and limitations of English language teaching in China: Autoethnography of a mainland-born English learner and teacher. *Changing English*, *26*(2), 188-197. https://doi.org.libdata.lib.ua.edu/10.1080/1358684X.2019.1584524

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contributions of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). Continuum.

Szecsi, T., & Szilagyi, J. (2012). Immigrant Hungarian families' perceptions of new media technologies in the transmission of heritage language and culture. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *25*(3), 265-281. https://doi.org.libdata.lib.ua.edu/10.1080/07

Tsumagari, M. I. (2010). The enduring effects of a united world college education as seen

through a graduate's eyes. *Journal of Research in International Educ*ation, *9*(3), 289-305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240910388916

Vellanki, V., & Prince, S. P. (2018). Where are the "people like me"?: A collaborative autoethnography of transnational lives and teacher education in the US. *The Teacher Educator*, *53*(3), 313-327. https://doi.org.libdata.lib.ua.edu/10.1080/08878730.2018.1462873

Wall, S. (2006). An autoethnography on learning about autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *5*(2), 146-160. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500205

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

Woodley, H. (2016). The use of autoethnography in classroom based practitioner research. *ARECLS, 13*, 44-56.

Yazan, B. (2018). TESL teacher educators' professional self-development, identity, and agency. *TESL Canada Journal*, *35*(2), 140-155. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v35i2.1294

Yazan, B. (2019a). Towards identity-oriented teacher education: Critical autoethnographic narrative. *TESOL Journal, 10*(1), 1-15. http://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.388

Yazan, B. (2019b). An autoethnography of a language teacher educator: Wrestling with ideologies and identity positions. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 46*(3), 34-56.

Yazan, B. (2019c). Identities and ideologies in a language teacher candidate's autoethnography: Making meaning of storied experience. *TESOL Journal, 10*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.500

Yazan, B., Jain, R., & Canagarajah, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Autoethnographies in ELT: Transnational identities, pedagogies, and practices*. Routledge.

Zacharias, N. T. (2019). The ghost of nativespeakerism: The case of teacher classroom introductions in transnational contexts. *TESOL Journal, 10*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.499

Author Note

Ufuk Keleş is a visiting professor at Bahçeşehir University. As a Fulbright grantee, he completed his PhD studies in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Alabama, USA. Before this, he was an English teacher for fifteen years at a university in Turkey. His research interests include language planning and policies, social justice in ELT, multicultural education, and qualitative research in education. He has presented his research in multiple national and international conferences and published his work in several international peer-reviewed journals. He is married with a son. Please direct correspondence to ufuk.keles@ou.bau.edu.tr.

Article Citation

Keleş, U. (2022). Autoethnography as a recent methodology in applied linguistics: A methodological review. *The Qualitative Report, 27*(2), 448-474. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5131