Abstract:

Autoethnography is an ethnographic inquiry that utilizes the autobiographic materials of the researcher as the primary data. Differing from other self-narrative writings such as autobiography and memoir, autoethnography emphasizes cultural analysis and interpretation of the researcher’s behaviors, thoughts, and experiences in relation to others in society. Autoethnography should be ethnographical in its methodological orientation, cultural in its interpretive orientation, and autobiographical in its content orientation. In this chapter the author discusses the definition of this inquiry method, methodology, and benefits of autoethnography as well as pitfalls to avoid when doing autoethnography.
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AUTOETHNOGRAPHY AS METHOD:
Raising Cultural Consciousness of Self and Others

What Is Autoethnography?

Autoethnography is ethnographical and autobiographical at the same time. Here I intentionally place “ethnographical” before “autobiographical” to highlight the ethnographical character of this inquiry method. This character connotes that autoethnography utilizes the ethnographic research methods and is concerned about the cultural connection between self and others representing the society. This ethnographic aspect distinguishes autoethnography from other narrative-oriented writings such as autobiography, memoir, or journal.

Ellis & Bochner (2000) define autoethnography as “autobiographies that self-consciously explore the interplay of the introspective, personally engaged self with cultural descriptions mediated through language, history, and ethnographic explanation” (p. 742). Although their definition leans too far toward the autobiographical than the ethnographic end, their observation of “connecting the personal to the cultural” accurately points to the important mission of autoethnography (p. 739). This important linkage between “the self and the social” is also emphasized in Reed-Danahay’s (1997) oft-quoted book, Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social. In these works of Ellis, Bochner, and Reed-Danahay, the “self” refers to an ethnographer self.

However, when the term “auto-ethnography” was first introduced by anthropologist Heider (1975), “self” did not mean the ethnographer self, but rather the informant self. In his study of Dani people, he called their cultural accounts of themselves the Dani’s
autoethnography. The term was used in a similar way when Butz and Besio (2004) discussed the colonized people’s self-understanding. Hayano (1979) employed the term “autoethnography” differently when he studied his “own people.” Wolcott (2004) informs us that his “own people” were card players who spent “leisure hours playing cards in Southern California’s legitimate card rooms” (p. 98).

Since then, an extensive list of labels has been used to refer to autobiographical applications in social science research according to Ellis and Bochner (2000, pp. 739-740). For Reed-Danahay (1997), the label of autoethnography includes at least three varieties: (1) “native anthropology” produced by native anthropologists from the people group who were formerly studied by outsiders; (2) “ethnic autobiography” written by members of ethnic minority groups; and (3) “autobiographical ethnography” in which anthropologists interject personal experience into ethnographic writing (p. 2).

These varied autoethnographic studies do not place an equal emphasis on autobiography (content) and ethnography (inquiry process). Ellis and Bochner offer an insightful triadic model to illustrate the complexity of the autoethnography nomenclature. They state that “[a]utoethnographers vary in their emphasis on the research process (graphy), on culture (ethno), and on self (auto)” and that “[d]ifferent exemplars of autoethnography fall at different places along the continuum of each of these three axes” (p. 740). Some of them place more value on the ethnographic process; others on cultural interpretation and analysis; and yet a third kind on self-narratives. Keeping in mind the triadic balance, I argue that autoethnography should be ethnographical in its methodological orientation, cultural in its interpretive orientation, and autobiographical in
its content orientation. This implies that self-reflective writings deficient in any one of these ingredients would fall short of “auto-ethno-graphy.”

**Methodology of Autoethnography**

Various methodological strategies of autoethnography have been developed in a variety of qualitative research traditions and listed under different names (Ellis & Bochner 2000, p. 740). The list of the names is also extensive according to these authors. Regardless of different origins and representations, all the methodological strategies share the commonality of being the qualitative, “narrative inquiry” (Clandinin and Connelly 2000). Some are more ethnographic than others in terms of its ethnographic intent and research process. The autobiographic inquires with the ethnographic orientation are the ones I focus on in this chapter.

Like ethnography, autoethnography pursues the ultimate goal of cultural understanding underlying autobiographical experiences. To achieve this ethnographic intent, autoethnographers undergo the usual ethnographic research process of data collection, data analysis/interpretation, and report writing. They collect field data by means of participation, self-observation, interview, and document review; verify data by triangulating sources and contents; analyze and interpret data to decipher the cultural meanings of events, behaviors, and thoughts; and write autoethnography. Like ethnographers, autoethnographers are expected to treat their autobiographical data with critical, analytical, and interpretive eyes to detect cultural undertones of what is recalled, observed, and told of them. At the end of a thorough self-examination within its cultural
context, autoethnographers hope to gain a cultural understanding of self and others. Autobiographical narratives will add live details to this principled understanding, but narration should not dominate autoethnography. In the following subsections, I will break down the research process into two interconnected, not always sequential, steps: (1) composing autobiographical field texts and (2) turning autobiographical field texts into autoethnography.

**Composing Autobiographical Field Texts**

The initial step of research involves collecting data, which continues throughout the research process with different intensity at different points. Here I cautiously introduce a new term “field texts” by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) to refer to “data.” I will sometimes use “field texts” in lieu of “data” when “composing field texts” describes more accurately what autoethnographers do. Since the term “data” has been traditionally associated with quantitative research inquiries and autoethnographers accumulate voluminous texts as multiple data collection activities progress, the term “field texts” is justifiably adopted as an alternative to “data.” At the same time, I am cautious of replacing “data” with “field texts” completely because autoethnographical “fieldwork” is different from other qualitative inquiries. Whereas qualitative/ethnographic fieldwork is likely to take place in an environment where the researcher comes in direct contact with others, autoethnographic fieldwork often involves others in the researchers’ recollection and reflection.

Memory is both a friend and foe of autoethnographers. Whereas it allows researchers to tap into the wealth of data to which no one else has access, memory selects, shapes, limits, and distorts. Memory fades as time goes, blurring the vitality of details. Dillard
(cited Clandinin and Connelly 2000) recognizes “blurring” as “smooth[ing] out details, leaving a kind of schematic landscape outline” (p. 83). Memory also triggers aversion when it attempts to dig deeper into unpleasant past experiences. Foster testifies to the excruciating pain she experienced in recalling her childhood tainted with her mother’s schizophrenia and the obliterating effect of the pain on her memory until her autoethnographic study helped her heal (Foster, McAllister, and O’Brien 2005). Memory can also select and embellish pleasant moments. Omission and addition are natural occurrences in our recalling. In the same way as subjectivity, they are detrimental to our autobiographic research endeavor unless they are properly recognized and disciplined.

Composing field texts helps researchers become aware of the limiting nature of memory and bring details to the “schematic landscape outline.” Clandinin and Connelly (2000) concur that field texts “help fill in the richness, nuance, and complexity of the landscape, returning the reflecting researcher to a richer, more complex, and puzzling landscape than memory alone is likely to construct” (p. 83).

Autoethnographers can use various techniques to facilitate their recalling, organize memories, and compose field texts as data. The techniques of data collection include, but are not limited to, (1) using visual tools such as free drawings of significant places, “kinsgrams,”1 and “culturegrams”2; (2) inventorying people, artifacts, familial and societal values and proverbs, mentors, cross-cultural experiences, and favorite/disliked activities; (3) chronicling the autoethnographer’s educational history, typical day and week, and annual life cycle; (4) reading and responding to other autoethnographies and self-narratives; and (5) collecting other field texts such as stories of others, “storied poems,” personal journals, field notes, letters, conversation, interviews with significant
others, family stories, documents, photographs, memory boxes, personal-family-social artifacts, and life experiences (Clandinin and Connelly 2000, p. 101). These techniques are elaborated in my book, *Autoethnography*, to be published by Left Coast Press in 2007. Autoethnographers are commended to develop their own techniques of data collection to meet their research goals.

One of the commonly used data collection techniques for ethnography is participant-observation, in which researchers participate in the lives of their informants while observing their behaviors. In a similar fashion to this, autoethnographers can observe their own behaviors and document their thoughts while living them. Rodriguez and Ryave (2002) argue that self-observation as a data collection technique is useful because it gives access to “covert, elusive, and/or personal experiences like cognitive processes, emotions, motives, concealed actions, omitted actions, and socially restricted activities” (p. 3) and brings to the surface what is “taken-for-granted, habituated, and/or unconscious manner that [they]…are unavailable for recall” (p. 4). Self-observation may be used in the form of self-introspection when autoethnographers are alone or in the form of “interactive introspection” while the researchers interact with others. In the interactive introspection, the researchers and the others can interview each other “as equals who try to help one another relive and describe their recollection of emotional experiences” (Ellis 1991 cited Rodriguez and Ryave, p. 7). Although Rodriguez and Ryave’s technique of “systematic self-observation” is originally suggested for studies that utilize multiple informants who are instructed to conduct their own self-observation, this technique can be applied to autoethnography that focuses on one informant, none other than self. Field
journals or a self-developed recording form may be used to document unstructured or structured self-observation.

Interviewing is another vital data collection technique employed in ethnographic fieldwork (Ellis 2004; Fontana & Frey 2000; Schensul, Schensul, & LeCompte 1999). Through interviewing with myriad informants, ethnographers gather information unavailable from participant observation. When applied to autoethnography, interviews with others fulfill a different goal. The interviews provide not only outsider perspectives, but also external data to confirm, complement, or dispute internal data generated from recollection and reflection. One caveat, however, is that face-to-face interview can hamper honest exchanges between interviewers—autoethnographers themselves—and interviewees. To obtain more candid perspectives on autoethnographers from interviewees, external interviewers or other creative alternatives such as email survey or questionnaire compiled by a third party may be adopted.

**Turning Autobiographical Field Texts into Autoethnography**

In qualitative research, the step of data collection is not always sequential to or separate from that of data analysis/interpretation. Rather, the data collection process is often intertwined and interactive with data analysis and interpretation. In other words, these activities often take place concurrently or inform each other in a web-like fashion. For example, when autoethnographers recall past experiences, they do not randomly harvest bits of fragmented memories. Rather, they select some according to their research focus and data collection criteria. Evaluating certain experiences against the criteria is an analytical and interpretive activity that is already at work during data
collection. During this data collection process, the researchers are also able to refine their criteria, which will in turn shape the analysis and interpretation process.

When analyzing and interpreting autoethnographic field texts, autoethnographers need to keep in mind that what makes autoethnography ethnographical is its ethnographic intent of gaining a cultural understanding of self that is intimately connected to others in the society. The cultural meanings of self’s thoughts and behaviors—verbal and non-verbal—need to be interpreted in their cultural context. Interpretation begs a question of "why" to be answered: “Why does a self perceive, think, behave, and evaluate the way it does and how does the self relate to others in thoughts and actions?” Autoethnographic data analysis and interpretation involves moving back and forth between self and others, zooming in and out of the personal and social realm, and submerging in and emerging out of data. Like other ethnographic inquiries, this step of research process is methodologically nebulous to describe and instruct because analysis and interpretation require ethnographers’ holistic insight, creative mixing of multiple approaches, and patience with uncertainty. Yet some simple strategies—searching for recurring patterns, applying existing theoretical frameworks, and compare-contrasting with other autoethnographies—can be adopted as a starter in the process of analysis and interpretation.

The interweaving of data collection, analysis, and interpretation ultimately leads to the production of autoethnography. This means that autobiographical writing cannot come without a methodical process of ethnography and its focus on cultural understanding. However, it does not mean that writing can begin only when analysis/interpretation is completed. Wolcott (2001) suggests that ethnographers begin
writing earlier in the ethnographic process, even during the early stage of fieldwork, because writing stimulates, helps organize, and facilitates the subsequent data collection/analysis/interpretation process. This suggestion is useful for autoethnographers.

The writing style of autoethnography can vary, falling somewhere in the continuums between “realist” description and “impressionist” caricature and analytical description and “confessional” self-exposure. Van Maanen’s (1988) classification of ethnographic writings may help autoethnographers experiment with different styles such as “realistic tales,” “confessional tales,” and “impressionist tales.” Realistic tales refer to matter-of-fact accounts and representations that ethnographers give about people whom they have studied first hand. Realist tales are characterized by “minute, sometimes precious, but thoroughly mundane details of everyday life among the people studied” (p. 48) and include “accounts and explanations by members of the culture of the events in their lives” (p. 49). Ethnographers who employ realist tales tend to speak of the people they have studied with the authority of an expert. In reaction to realist ethnographers’ unabashed claim of authority over other people’s culture, those who practice confessional ethnography expose “how particular works [really] came into being” (p. 74) in confessional tales. “Personal biases, character flaws, or bad habits,” which Van Maanen dubs as “embarrassing,” are candidly displayed to demystify the ethnographic process and to augment a “reasonably uncontaminated and pure [ethnography] despite all the bothersome problems exposed in the confession” (p. 78). Impressionist tales highlight “rare” and “memorable” fieldwork experiences (p. 102). If realist tales focus on “the done” and confessional tales on “the doer,” “impressionist tales present the doing of
fieldwork” (p. 102). If autoethnographers keep in mind that these tales are originally identified with ethnography and thus need to be modified when applied to autoethnography, the different tales may provide alternatives in autoethnographic writing. Whichever style autoethnographers decide to employ, autoethnographers are advised not to lose the sight of the quintessential identity of autoethnography as a cultural study of self and others.

Benefits of Autoethnography

Autoethnography is becoming a useful and powerful tool for researchers and practitioners who deal with human relations in multicultural settings: e.g., educators, social workers, medical professionals, clergy, and counselors. Benefits of autoethnography lie in three areas: (1) it offers a research method friendly to researchers and readers; (2) it enhances cultural understanding of self and others; and (3) it has a potential to transform self and others toward the cross-cultural coalition building.

Methodologically speaking, autoethnography is researcher-friendly. This inquiry method allows researchers to access easily the primary data source from the beginning because the source is themselves. In addition, autoethnographers are privileged with a holistic and intimate perspective on their “familiar data.” This initial familiarity gives researchers an advantageous edge in data collection and in-depth data analysis/interpretation.

Autoethnography is also reader-friendly in that the personally engaging writing style tends to appeal to readers more than the conventional scholarly writing. According to
Nash (2004), “scholarly personal narratives” liberate researchers from abstract, impersonal writings and “touch readers’ lives by informing their experiences” (p. 28). Gergen and Gergen (2002) also eloquently state, “In using oneself as an ethnographic exemplar, the researcher is freed from the traditional conventions of writing. One’s unique voicing—complete with colloquialisms, reverberations from multiple relationships, and emotional expressiveness—is honored” (p. 14). This unique voice of the autoethnographer is what readers respond to.

Secondly, autoethnography is an excellent vehicle through which researchers come to understand themselves and others. I found this benefit particularly applicable to my teaching of multicultural education. As a teacher educator, I feel compelled to prepare my students to become cross-culturally sensitive and effective teachers for students of diverse cultural backgrounds. Self-reflection and self-examination are the keys to self-understanding (Florio-Ruane 2001; Nieto 2003). Kennett (1999) concurs with other advocates of self-reflection, saying that “[writing cultural] autobiography allows students to reflect on the forces that have shaped their character and informed their sense of self” (p. 231). The “forces” that shape people’s sense of self include nationality, religion, gender, education, ethnicity, socio-economic class, and geography. Understanding “the forces” also helps them examine their preconceptions and feelings about others, whether they are “others of similarity,” “others of difference,” or even “others of opposition” (Chang, 2005). Others of similarity refer to members of cultural groups that one belongs to, feels comfortable with, and share common values with. Others of difference are those who belong to groups that have different cultural standards than the self. Others of
opposition are those who are considered as “enemies” to the self due to seemingly irreconcilable differences.

Not only writing one’s own autoethnography but also reading others’ autoethnographies can evoke self-reflection and self-examination (Florio-Ruane 2001; Nash 2002). Connelly shares a poignant story of how reading the self-narrative of his doctoral student of Chinese heritage stirred up his childhood memory of a Chinese store owner from his rural hometown in Canada (Clandinin and Connelly 2000). Through self-reflection, he discovered shared humanity between this stranger of his childhood and himself. This discovery of self and others is a definite benefit of doing and sharing autoethnographies.

Thirdly, doing, sharing, and reading autoethnography also help transform researchers and readers (listeners) in the process. The transformation of self and others is not necessarily a primary goal of autoethnography but a frequently occurring, powerful by-product of this research inquiry. Coia and Taylors’ (2006) experimentation with “co/autoethnography” illustrates this benefit. In this participatory process, the researchers involved their education students in writing their personal narratives, meeting in small groups weekly to share the narratives aloud and conduct a cultural analysis collaboratively, exchanging newly acquired self-awareness on “their past, present, and future selves,” and ultimately “strengthen[ing] perspective on teaching” (p. 21). In the end, the authors witnessed that students’ self-awareness and cultural understanding were broadened and their teaching philosophies and practices became more inclusive and sensitive to others’ needs.
Self-transformation may be manifested in different ways in the education field. Some may become more self-reflective in their daily praxis (Florio-Ruane 2001; Nieto 2004; Obidah and Teel 2001). Others may adopt “culturally relevant pedagogy” when selecting curriculum content and pedagogical strategies, and interacting students, peer teachers, and the community (Ladson-Billings 1994). Self-transformation may also take place as they seek to reach out to unfamiliar others and pursue a new learning of unfamiliar cultures. As their understanding of others increases, unfamiliarity diminishes and perspectives on others change. As a result, others of difference and of opposition may be reframed to be included in their notion of community, “extended community” in Greene’s (2000) term.

Another type of self-transformation may accompany healings from the emotional scars of the past, which Foster illuminated in her writing (Foster, McAllister, & O’Brien 2005). By sharing with others her painful experience of growing up with a mother with schizophrenia and understanding the cultural root of her “wounds,” Foster experienced liberation and relief from the burden of isolation, loneliness, and shame. The liberating force of autoethnography was the foundation of self-empowerment for Foster.

When manifested in increased self-reflection, adoption of the culturally relevant pedagogy, desire to learn about “others of difference,” development of an inclusive community, or self-healing, the self-transformative potential of autoethnography is universally beneficial to those who work with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. Through the increased awareness of self and others, they will be able to help themselves and each other correct cultural misunderstandings, develop cross-cultural sensitivity, and respond to the needs of cultural others effectively.
Pitfalls to Avoid in Doing Autoethnography

In the shadow of the growing interest and support of autoethnographic research methods, critiques are lurking. The criticism of autoethnography does not necessarily imply that this inquiry is inherently faulty. Rather, it reminds researchers to look out vigilantly for appropriate application of this research inquiry and to avoid potential pitfalls. Here are five pitfalls that autoethnographers need to watch out: (1) excessive focus on self in isolation of others; (2) overemphasis on narration rather than analysis and cultural interpretation; (3) exclusive reliance on personal memory and recalling as a data source; (4) negligence of ethical standards regarding others in self-narratives; and (5) inappropriate application of the label “autoethnography.”

The first pitfall relates to the very notion of culture. In the minds of anthropologists, culture is inherently a group-oriented concept. Culture and people have a symbiotic relationship according to de Munck (2000) who says: “Culture would cease to exist without the individuals who make it up…. Culture requires our presence as individuals. With this symbiosis, self and culture together make each other up and, in that process, make meaning” (pp. 1-2). Therefore, the notion of *culture* predisposes the co-presence of others even in a discussion of “individual culture”—“propriospect” in Goodenough’s (1981) and Wolcott’s (1991) term and “idioverse” in Schwartz’ term (1978 cited de Munck 2000). By these authors, an individual culture is an individual version of their group cultures, which they construct in relationship with others. Autoethnography, therefore, should reflect the interconnectivity of self and others. Unfortunately the methodological focus on self is sometimes misconstrued as a license to dig deeper in
personal experiences without digging wider into the cultural context of the individual stories commingled with others. Autoethnographers should be warned that self-indulgent introspection is likely to produce a self-exposing story but not autoethnography.

Second, autoethnographers swept by the power of story telling can easily neglect the very important mission of autoethnography—cultural interpretation and analysis of autobiographic texts. Self-narration is very engaging to writers as well as readers and listeners (Foster, McAllister, & O’Brien 2005; Nash 2004; Tompkins 1996). Yet, as Coia and Taylor (2006) say, “It is not enough simply to tell the story or write a journal entry” (p. 19) for the cultural understanding of self to take place. Unless autoethnographers stay focused on their research purpose, they can be tempted to settle for elaborate narratives with underdeveloped cultural analysis and interpretation.

Third, autoethnographers can fall into the pitfall of over-relying on their personal memory as the source of data. Personal memory is a marvelous and unique source of information for autoethnographers. It taps into the reservoir of data to which other ethnographers have no access. Yet, Muncey (2005) reminds us, “Memory is selective and shaped, and is retold in the continuum of one’s experience, [although] this does not necessarily constitute lying” (p. 2). Memory can censor past experiences. When data is collected from a single tool without other measures for checks and balances, the validity of data can be questioned. When the single tool is the researcher self, the unbridled subjectivity of autoethnographers can be more severely challenged. Although the obsession with objectivity is not necessary for qualitative research, autoethnographers need to support their arguments with broad-based data like in any good research practice.

For this reason, they can easily complement “internal” data generated from researchers’
memory with “external” data from outside sources, such as interviews, documents, and artifacts. Multiple sources of data can provide bases for triangulation that will help enhance content accuracy and validity of the autoethnographic writing.

The fourth pitfall stems from a false notion that confidentiality does not apply to self-narrative studies because researchers use their autobiographical stories. Playing the multi-faceted role of a researcher, informant, and author, autoethnographers may be tempted to claim full authorship and responsibility for their stories without hesitation. Clandinin and Connelly’ (2000) poignant question to narrative inquirers, “Do they own a story because they tell it?,” should equally challenge autoethnographers. Since autoethnographers’ personal stories are often linked to stories of others, however explicit the linkage is, the principle of protecting confidentiality of people in the story is just as relevant to autoethnography. Since main characters reveal their identities in autoethnography, it is extremely difficult to protect fully others intimately connected to these known characters. Yet, autoethnographers, like other researchers of human subjects, are charged to adhere to the ethical principle of confidentiality. This inquiry method demands more creativity in practicing it.

The last pitfall concerns the confusion in using the term “autoethnography.” As I discussed earlier in this chapter, the term has been used to refer to a variety of narrative inquiries sprung up in different academic disciplines. The mixed bag labeled with “autoethnography” has confused researchers as well as readers. Since no one can claim an exclusive license to use this label, it is the researcher’s responsibility to become informed of the multiple usage of the term and to define their use clearly to avoid confusion. That is precisely what Wolcott (2004) does in his article, “Ethnographic
Although my use of autoethnography differs from what he proposes—leaving the term to the original meaning by Hayano who refers to autoethnography as a study of the researcher’s own people—his conscious clarification of the term clearly orients readers. With the rigorous effort to distinguish autoethnography from other self-narrative inquiries, readers will be able to understand this research method for what it stands for, distinguishing it from highly descriptive self-narratives such as autobiography and memoir.

**Conclusion**

As the outgoing president of the Council on Anthropology and Education (a subdivision of American Anthropological Association), LeCompte (1987) once asserted in her speech, later published as article, that all research endeavors are autobiographic. I understood her remark to imply that research topics, methods, and processes that we select reflect our personal interest, biases, and circumstances. When I reflect on my ethnographic and qualitative works, I find her comment insightful and accurate.

My preference of case-specific narratives, field-based research methods, and adolescents has led me through a series of ethnographic/qualitative studies. Beginning with American high school students on the West Coast of the U. S. A. (Chang, 1992a), I moved on to a study of Korean female students in a vocational high school (Cho & Chang, 1989; Chang, 2000), to Korean-American high school students (1992b), and to Christian high school students in Pennsylvania (Chang, 1998). Venues have changed,
but my dogged commitment to ethnography and adolescents has persisted. What is the cultural root of my persistence?

Searching for answers to questions such as this is what autoethnographers do and what I have done in my autoethnography. Although I reserve an elaborate cultural analysis of myself for another place, here I can safely note that the research process has been empowering and transformative. My teaching and doing autoethnography has helped my students and me (1) connect our individual past with our individual and collective present, (2) understand culturally rooted reasons for our comfort with others of similarity, discomfort with others of difference, and aversion with others of opposition, and (3) expand this understanding into culturally unfamiliar territories. Opening-up to the new understanding and new possibility is the definite benefit of autoethnography, which gives a foundation to cross-cultural coalition building to embrace others, even others of opposition, in the multicultural society.

Endnotes

1. The “kinsgram” refers to a kinship diagram that visually shows one’s relation to other members in his/her kinship structure, created or dissolved by birth/death, marriage/divorce, and other forms of attachment/separation. Kinship diagram is often adopted in anthropological fieldwork (see Bates and Fratkin 2003, p. 282; and Puples and Bailey 2003, p. 190).

2. The “culturegram,” a self-coined term, refers to a web-like chart on which autoethnographers display their multi-faceted self-identity in terms of multicultural
categories such as nationality, ethnicity, race, language, gender, religion, socio-economic class, and other interests (Chang, 2002).
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