The Role of *Auto*ethnography within Anthropology
(How Self Narrative is a Useful Research Tool in Social Science)

Veronica Cluxton-Corley

B.A., M.A. H.Dip. Theology

Submitted in Fulfilment of Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Anthropology

at

Maynooth University, Ireland

May 2017

Head of Department: Dr. Mark Maguire

Supervisor: Dr. Abdullahi El-Tom

I declare that the thesis presented here is my original work and has not been submitted to any other institution.

……

Veronica Cluxton-Corley, 2017.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents ..... **iii**

Thesis Abstract ..... **ix**

Dedication ..... **x**

Acknowledgements ..... **xi**

Introductory Chapter **1**

Introduction 1

Thesis Statement 1

Background/Rationale 2

Context 2

Aims and Objectives 5

Methodology 6

Chapter Outline **6**

What is *Auto*ethnography ? 6

New Wave (Millennium) *Auto*ethnography 7

Categories and Exemplars of *Auto*ethnography 9

*Auto*ethnography within an Irish Context 13

Ethics within *Auto*ethnography 13

Criticism of and Resistance to *Auto*ethnography 14

*Auto*ethnographies New Frontiers 16

Conclusion 18

Chapter One: What is *Auto*ethnography? **20**

Introduction 20

Defining *Auto*ethnography **20**

Mary Louise Pratt and *Auto*ethnography 22

David Hayano and *Auto*ethnography 29

Deborah Reed-Danahay and *Auto*ethnography 31

New Period of Transition **34**

Conclusion 35

Chapter Two: New Wave *Auto*ethnography (New Millennialism) **36**

Introduction 36

Section One: The Emergence of New Millennia *Auto*ethnography **37**

Meet Carolyn Ellis, Chief Proponent of New Wave *Auto*ethnography 37

The Walnut Creek Group 39
Establishing an *Auto*ethnographic Mode of Inquiry 40
Skill Set of *Auto*ethnographer 42
Key Elements Features, and Characteristics of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry 43
Factors contributing to formation of *Auto*ethnography 43

Defining Features of *Auto*ethnography 44
Visibility of Self 44
Strong Reflexivity 45
Engagement 47
Engagement 47
Vulnerability 47
Open-endedness/rejection of finality and closure 48

Section Two: Sub divisions within *Auto*ethnography 49
Analytic *Auto*ethnography 49
Evocative *Auto*ethnography 50
Interpretive *Auto*ethnography 51
Collaborative *Auto*ethnography 52
Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography 54
Performative *Auto*ethnography 57
Feminist *Auto*ethnography 57

Section Three: The Process of *Auto*ethnography 58
Research Sources and Compilation in *Auto*ethnography 59
Pitfalls of Writing *Auto*ethnography 61
Conclusion 62

Chapter Three: Exemplars of *Auto*ethnography (I) 64

Categories One and Two: Indigenous and Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnography . 64
Introduction 64

Section 1: Emergence of New Representational Methodologies 65
Women's Representations of Culture 65

Section 2: Exemplars of Category 1: Indigenous *Auto*ethnography 68
Introduction 68

Native American Indian *Auto*ethnography 69
Ella Cara Deloria 69
Delorias Anxieties and Predicaments 73
Moves towards a 'Practical Social Science' 74
Christine Quintasket (Mourning Dove): Perspective of Half Blood Woman 74

Black South American *Auto*ethnography: 78
Zora Neale Hurston 78
Reviews and Criticisms of Hurston's Work 83
Reflection 88

Section 3: Exemplar of Category 2: Ethnic Identity Ethnography Or Second Generation *Auto*ethnography: 90
Barbara Myerhoff 90
Introduction 90
The Aliyah Centre 92
Coping with Displacement: Importance of Religion and Education 95
Survivors' Guilt and Researcher's Guilt 98
Reflection 100

Chapter Four: Exemplars of *Auto*ethnography (II) 101

Categories Three and Four: Anthropologists' and Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnographies 101
Introduction 101

Section 1: Exemplar of Category 3: Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies: 101
Jean Briggs 101
Negotiating the Field 103
Clash of Cultures 105

Section 2: Exemplar of Category 4: Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography 110
Carolyn Ellis 110
Conclusion 115

Chapter Five: *Auto*ethnography in an Irish Context 117

Introduction 117
Literary and Research Context 117

The Insider's View: Tomás O'Crohán agus Péig Sayers 118

The Outsider's View: Robin Flower, John Messenger, Nancy Scheper-Hughes 127
Robin Flower 127
John Messenger 128
Nancy Scheper-Hughes 131
A Change of Heart 134
Conclusion 136

Chapter Six: Ethics in the Realm of *Auto*ethnography 138

Introduction 138
History of Bureaucratic Ethics 138
Implications of Bureaucratic Ethics on the Social Sciences 141
Work Consequences which give rise to Ethical Considerations 144

Ethics Appropriate to *Auto*ethnography 146
Ethical Issues and Responsibilities of *Auto*ethnographer 147
Ethical Guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers 149
Ten Foundational *Auto*ethnographic Ethical Guidelines 152
Conclusion 154

Chapter Seven: Critiques of and Resistance to *Auto*ethnography 155

Introduction 155

Part One: Critique/Opposition to Anthrop. at Home and *Auto*ethnography 156

James Buzard and *Auto*ethnography 156
Buzard vs Pratt 157
*Auto*ethnography Undertheorised 157
*Auto*ethnographer as Thrice Born Anthropologist 158
Disdain for New Wave *Auto*ethnography 158

Difficulties with Anthropology at Home: 159
Marilyn Strathern 'Limits of Auto-Anthropology' 160
Moslih Kanaaneh 'The Logicality of Autoethnography': A Non- Western Perspective of *Auto*ethnography 161

Critiques of New Wave *Auto*ethnography 163
Criticisms of Autoethnography and the *Auto*ethnographical Method 164
The Question of Integrity of *Auto*ethnnography 165
Literary Textuality in *Auto*ethnography 165
*Auto*ethnography and The Memoir Debate 166

Defending the Memoir 167
Connecting with the Reader 168
Autoethnography, Memoir, Cultural Hybridity, The Holocaust and Empathy 169
Further New Alternative Trends in Academia 171

Part Two: Resistance to the Practice of *Auto*ethnography 172
Breaking the Mold 173
Conclusion 174

Chapter Eight: 'Reflecting on the journey; Resisting Finality'.....175

Introduction.....175

Part One: Thesis Development Thus Far 175

New Dynamics in Anthropology 175

Emergence of *Auto*ethnography.....176

Factors Contributing to Emergence of *Auto*ethnography 177

*Auto*ethnographer's Dilemmas.....177

Features, Characteristics and Purpose of *Auto*ethnography.....177

Autoethnography at Work, Categories of *Auto*ethnography.....178

Comparing the Emic with the Etic.....180

Negative Elements of *Auto*ethnography 181

Part Two: New Evolving Frontiers and Future Dimensions in *Auto*ethnography.....182

Section 1: The Self, Emotions, Empathy, and Introspective Interpretive *Auto*ethnography.....183

The Self.....183

Emotions and Empathy in *Auto*ethnography 185

Contemplative and Existential Anthropology.....187

Michael Jackson, Existential Anthropology and *Auto*ethnography.....187

Introspective Interpretive *Auto*ethnography 190

Considerations.....191

Section Two: Advocacy for *Auto*ethnography Among Various Disciplines ...192

*Auto*ethnography and Geographers.....192

*Auto*ethnography, Medicine, Medical/Mental Health and Education.....193

Mental Health and Mental Health Training 194

Autoethnography and Mainstream Education 196

Section 3: *Auto*ethnography and New Social Media 197

Cyberspace *Auto*ethnography 197

Conclusion/Onwards.....198

Concluding Chapter/Discussion 199

Introduction.....199

Deciphering the term *Auto*ethnography 199

*Autoe*thnography: a morphed genre 200

From Historical to New Definitions of *Auto*ethnography.....200

Thesis Findings: Categories of *Auto*ethnography 203

Critiques of Autoethnography and Autoethnographers 205

Specific claims why Autoethnography is/is not valuable and effective 206
Limitations of Research and Genre of *Auto*ethnography.....207
When is an Autoethnography not an *Auto*ethnography? 207
Anticipations of Autoethnography.....208

Final Conclusion 209

Bibliography 210

Thesis Abstract

The Role of *Auto*ethnography in Anthropology
(How Self Narrative is a Useful Research Tool in Social Science)

This thesis explores the potential of *Auto*ethnography in researching and representing social and cultural phenomena with the self as central. Its primary contribution to the extant literature is to provide a robust analysis of literature and texts, which fall broadly under the *Auto*ethnography heading in order to contribute to the conversation of the place of *Auto*ethnography as a reliable, valuable and ultimately necessary research approach within the academy.

*Auto*ethnography emerged to address the 'something missing' within research through a recognition and appreciation for narrative, both literary and aesthetic, and the emotions and the body as sources of research. The *Auto*ethnographic Mode of Inquiry brings research to life as it supplements, complements, confirms and denies aspects of previous ethnographic research. *Auto*ethnography is also extremely challenging, and thus reflects the trustworthiness of the self as a reliable resource in research and the positive and negative consequences of it.

The research and methodology for this thesis combines a robust review and analysis of literature presented by both exponents and detractors of the method. The review and analysis also provide the structure for the thesis, which begins with examining what *Auto*ethnography is, exploring its origins as the Study of One's Own Culture, to what it has become, a Study of Cultural Phenomena from The Perspective of Personal Experience. Having appraised six texts that could be broadly claimed *Auto*ethnographic, this thesis identified and offers examples of four categories of *Auto*ethnography: The Study of One's Own Culture; Second Generation *Auto*ethnography (or Ethnic Identity Ethnography); Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies and Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography. Contextually, Irish texts are explored to highlight the correspondence between *Auto*ethnography and ethnography and to illustrate how different perspectives focus on distinct issues. Due to the sensitive nature of *Auto*ethnographic topics, and its actors, ethical consequences are also discussed. Additionally, criticism of and resistance to *Auto*ethnography is considered. Finally, *Auto*ethnography the new frontiers of foci for researchers, educators, and academics are outlined. These provide an opportunity to address social issues and concerns previously unspoken but which affect people and society on a daily basis.

The thesis concludes by suggesting that *Auto*ethnography, as a self-reflective method, contributes to Contemplative/Existential Anthropology, where Contemplative pedagogy offers an opportunity for researchers and readers to consider their position in life, give it meaning and make it better.

Dedication

The more you know,
The more you know you don't know
(Dr. Colm Greene, 2002).

To my Grandchildren Clionádh, Jacob and Beíbhinn
Who are thought of every day
And those yet to come, D.V.

May you always be inspired
through other people's experiences and stories,
to be empathetic, kind and compassionate.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank various people for their contribution to this project:

Dr. Abdullahi El-Tom for his interest in this project and professional guidance.
Dr. Mark Maguire for his constructive suggestions.
Dr. Alison Farrell for her most valuable technical support and encouragement.
The Staff of the Dept. of Anthropology, Maynooth University.
Rose, at the Academic Advisory Office, Maynooth University.
The Library Staff of Maynooth University.

To my fellow PhD students in the library, and the Computer Room in the Arts Block.

To Liam Bell, Brendan O' Sullivan and Sylvester Nolan back where it all began.

To the people who facilitated me in many ways especially Noel Merrick, John Brickley, Jimmy Doyle, P.J. Madden, Ben Travers and the Staff of Meanscoil Iognaid Ris, Naas, and Fergus O'Reilly and his Staff of SuperValu Sallins.

To my friends in Seapark and Glencairn, especially Sr. Joan, Rosalie, Agnes and Sandra for the constant vigil.

To Professor Peter Carr for recognising the potential, and his relentless support and positive encouragement.

To my Aunts Maíre and Carmel and many cousins, especially Maíread Graham who despite the trauma of losing Deirdre and Diarmuid (RIP), have always been encouraging.

To my many friends old and new, especially Mairead Ní Fhiacha R.I.P. (1953-2017), who kept the faith with me.

This journey began in a little house in Dunsink. It was there my love of reading and learning was encouraged by my Parents, Charlie & Kay (RIP), each in their own way.

To my siblings Pat, Madeleine and Theresa and their respective spouses, Claire, Desie and Colm, and my Corley sisters and brothers-in-law for their welcome support and encouragement.

To my many nieces and nephews, and nieces and nephews-in-law, for the heartening texts and good wishes, especially Stephen Cluxton (Dublin Goalie, GAA) whose own personal commitment is exemplary.

To my children Mark, Ian, Luke, Yvonne, Matthew, Philip and David – some of you got it, some did not. Nevertheless, you all taught me some valuable life lessons never to be forgotten.

And finally, yet importantly my husband and best friend Jimmy, who stayed the pace through thick and thin, never giving up even when I felt so abandoned. xxxx.

Go raibh Mile Mhaith agaibh to lei

Introductory Chapter

> Stories – we all spend our lives telling them-about this, about that, about people-but some-some stories are so good we wish they'd never end. They are so gripping that we'll go without sleep just to see (*hear)* a little bit more. Some stories bring us laughter and sometimes they bring us tears – but isn't that what a great story does? - Makes you feel. Stories are so powerful they really are with us forever (Dustin Hoffman, 2011, Sky TV advertisement-emphasis added).

> Stories are like the coins of the realm, the currency we implicitly agree to make the meanings of exchange, and as such a means of creating a viable social world. Stories thus disclose not just "who" we are, but "what" we have in common with others, not just "who" we think we are but "what" shared circumstances bear upon our lives and our fate (Jackson, 2013[2002]:15-16).

Introduction

Speaking of stories. Stories are one of the oldest way of sharing information and knowledge. Our ancestors told stories; they spread their history and shared their lives orally and by drawing on cave walls. Stories have travelled down from generation to generation as an important part of instilling cultural and social traditions. Through storytelling, personal testimonies and writings, on topics such as relationships, family, traditions, times or culture we learn about life, society and survival. Anthropology, through storytelling carried out its primary embryonic function of systematically describing cultural diversity for the edification of human kind. Additionally, as our stories changed and how we told them evolved, Anthropologists needed to change their focus and methods to elucidate and capture new social and cultural phenomena. This thesis will examine one of these new methods of research, representation, interpretation and presentation, namely *Auto*ethnography.

Thesis Statement

This thesis will examine how in Anthropology research methods and presentation forms have changed over time. It will specifically examine *Auto*ethnography, one of the most recent alternative methods of research, representation, presentation and interpretation in social science, where *Auto*ethnography also includes self-representation and self-narrative. The thesis will show what *Auto*ethnography is, and what *Auto*ethnography does. *Auto*ethnography as a useful alternative research tool and method of presentation for cultural critique presents the inside story, with a view to bringing research to life and making it more meaningful. *Auto*ethnography supplements, complements, confirms and denies aspects of previous research. In essence, this thesis is an ethnography of *Auto*ethnography.

Background/Rationale

I first encountered *Auto*ethnography while researching for my Master Degree, which focused on literature in women's lives. *Auto*ethnography's immediate appeal as an ethnographic form of research and representation was/is, how the cultural phenomenon described directly connects to an everyday life experience of the researcher, and as such, the self and personal are included. In previous ethnographic forms of cultural critique, emphasis was on cold sterile scientific academic information about culture and politics, often excluding its effect on the individual life experience, author or informant, in order to maintain a professional scientific approach.

In 2011, when I began my research, the term '*Auto*ethnography' was relatively unheard of, or infrequently used within Anthropology. The then Chair of the Anthropology Department in Maynooth University where I was studying, Dr. Abdullahi El-Tom, was open to the idea that this 'relatively new' method required further investigation, identification, defining and analysis as a research method; it merited an examination of its presence and usefulness and both its positive and negative reception among academics. Dr. El-Tom's personal cultural research interest includes a focus on his own natal culture, the Sudanese. In a most recent text, *Study War No More* (2012), he goes behind military warfare scenes and in using the personal narrative of a military leader, he explains and teaches about the cultural phenomenon of war.

Context

Within Anthropology, a re-evaluation of the methods of studying and writing about culture emerged with two major classic texts, the work of Marcus and Clifford (1986) in Writing *Culture, The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* and Marcus and Fischer (1986) Anthropology *as Cultural Critique*. Subsequently, ten years later, a corresponding text *Women Writing Culture* (1995) edited by Deborah Gordon and Ruth Behar prompted further consideration. This was consistent with a change in attitude to representational modes which occurred with the reflexive turn and after the publication of Malinowski's *Diary in The Strict Sense of the Word* (1989[1967]), though for many the use of the personal in Anthropology was subtly downplayed, evaded or avoided for some time to come.

I was anxious to understand more about the *Auto*ethnographic method and mode of research and representation and proceeded to examine its origin, its presence, its modus operandi, its usefulness and its drawbacks and both its positive and negative reception among academics within sectors of social science. Hence, this thesis. I discovered *Auto*ethnography was not so much a new genre, but one downplayed, with the term underused until the New Millennium, when its popularity and prominence as a research method increased. In other

social science sectors, this alternative *Auto*ethnographic method of connecting self-to-research-to-literature had gradually evolved.

Just prior to, and since the New Millennium, Carolyn Ellis and her partner and colleague Art Bochner of University South Florida, and a number of their cohorts felt there was 'something missing' from research and its output, which was not rightly connecting to the lived experience. Ellis et al. have been major proponents of the *Auto*ethnographic Method as a medium to explain/describe social and human behaviour and experience (Ellis et al., 2013). Notably, the research with the self as central, focused upon various previously overlooked personal and cultural phenomena like complex relationships, illness, abuse and divorce. Growth in personal testimonies of experiences of cultural phenomenon, whether it be personal, social, political, economic or religious, can provide a deeper insight into social and cultural phenomena, and offer a more complete comprehensive view. A view from all sides which fulfils the promise of Anthropology, as stated by Marcus and Fischer (1999[1986]: xviii) 'to be the comparative study of culture and societies around the world' to record cultural diversity. Through personal storytelling, writing, and reading we learn about individual experience of society and culture. There are numerous definitions of *Auto*ethnography which will become evident within the thesis but for the moment Jeanne Chieu in her essay 'I salute the spirit of my communities' encapsulates what this thesis hopes to demonstrate, that

> *Auto*ethnographies capture nuanced dynamics of cultural relations. Achieving a voice, these writers compose in diverse genres, incorporating the traditional and modifying it to reflect exigencies and struggles of their contemporary positions (Chieu, 2004: 44).

Heretofore, the Anthropologist went into his/her field of study, often in faraway exotic places, made their observations, recorded them (as field notes) and presented them in ethnography. In *Auto*ethnography, the Anthropologist is from within the field of study; therefore, the ethnography will contain the Self or 'I'. This does not mean that the Anthropologists are telling his/her own personal story, though they could be, but rather they are using their own experience to explain or clarify a cultural phenomenon from inside. This is often loosely referred to by some as Anthropology at Home, or Indigenous ethnography, or to use Marcus and Fischer's expression 'the Repatriation of Anthropology as Cultural Critique' (1999[1986]:111). It is not Autobiography but ethnography from a personal stance (self-ethnography). As Clifford Geertz (1973) suggested the notion of I, Self and personhood varies greatly within different cultures and is something for us to bear in mind when we consider the personal experience of a cultural phenomenon.

The Anthropologist's ethnographic monograph often leaves an indelible mark on the reader, but usually it is down to the inserts, the interviews and the personal experience over theoretical emphasis. For a number of years, the Anthropologist sought to make an exact science of Anthropology with much attention and priority applied to detailed research, methodology and theoretical groundings in the presentation mode. Contradictions appeared as to what an Anthropologist should be and do whether to behave like the white coated laboratory scientist, examining species, or to fully participate in activities of a studied group (participant observation). Frequently in research, intuitions and emotions were denied, suppressed, or certainly cast aside. Personal experience was paid little attention, or emotional psychological traumas, within the community of study, or for the researcher. A factor often completely overlooked or avoided was the impact the experience had on the participating observer personally. Researchers, of whom we will read about later, felt traditional academic texts, research methods or interpretation were not readily addressing questions applicable to contemporary society and living as they knew/know, understood or experienced it. This attitude appears to have been the driving force among so many *Auto*ethnographers, who were concerned their research was compromised. The matters, topics and issues they wanted to investigate were often excluded from research or its results, which led to a reconsideration of what was researchable, and how it should be presented. Traditions and customs as once known and previously the focus of Anthropologists began to dissipate, and society in places was rapidly becoming multicultural and in addition, cosmopolitan, to use Rabinow's expression (1986), to be confined to singularly focused investigation. Therefore, an amalgam of concepts and ideas was required to investigate: how various elements within cultures functioned and influenced the individual, and how the person functioned within these cultures.

*Auto*ethnography departs from original Anthropological ethnography as a form of resistance to hegemonic bodies of discourse. Quantitative measures are held in abeyance, and qualitative narrative research is enhanced, by linking the personal to the cultural. In explicating the personal story, the writer's journey within the investigated culture raises conscious awareness. They are consciously aware of their environment and its impact on them. Disclosing 'truths' about how specific personal and cultural predicaments are dealt with can be emotionally challenging for both writer and reader, but the outcome is often hugely beneficial and creates a better understanding of a community or society. This reflects another dynamic to *Auto*ethnographic research and that is emotion. Lutz and White (1986) offer an in-depth appreciation of the inclusion of emotion in Anthropological research.

By way of example of both how the Anthropologist is inside the work and the benefit of the inside story, I refer to the work of Lawrence Taylor. In his text, *Occasions of Faith* (1995), Lawrence Taylor explains how in the Anthropology of Religion, the Irish case study

explores ways other 'divergent theoretical perspectives' and 'disciplinary approaches' are integrated and 'the anthropologist cannot himself be exempted' (Taylor,1995:5). Taylor's use of the 'letter copybook of Arthur Brooke', an account of a classic social drama as a source shows the value of a personal interpretation of a situation. Through archival research and field work in examining the way religion is integrated in everyday life in Ireland, using non-technical jargon, Taylor demonstrates how the 'framework of experience' (Durkheim, 1912), constitutes and contributes to the 'web of meaning', (Geertz,1973) (Taylor,1995:27-30). Taylor explains how the folklorists of old provided 'relevance to understanding of local religion and *Auto*-ethnographic descriptions of religious practices' demonstrating the usefulness of such contributions to the depth of understanding of anthropology and the study of culture (Taylor, 1995:28).

*Auto*ethnography does not set out to underestimate or dismiss previous accumulated Anthropological information on kinships, social conditions, and economic survival or cultural attributes which has increased knowledge of human beings and society. Rather, *Auto*ethnography is important for comparative analysis and identifying current situational statuses. Human and societal behaviour has changed and now there are different expectations of what research should focus on and provide. In looking from the inside out, and understanding the insider's view of the outside, combined with the outsider's view, we appreciate individual and cultural behaviour by trying to encapsulate it from all sides. *Auto*ethnography complements, confirms or denies previous existing research.

Aims and Objectives

The aim and objective of this thesis is to contribute to the current understandings of *Auto*ethnography, to discern what exactly *Auto*ethnography is and to determine what it does under various research interests and purposes, and to suggest where its future might lie. To fulfil this aim, this thesis includes a number of elements. It will: i) define/examine and provide a comprehensive understanding of what *Auto*ethnography is; ii) explore how it works as a useful alternative and/or complementary method for understanding human behaviour and culture; iii) consider how it compares and contrasts with other ethnographies particularly in respect to Ireland; iv) analyse how it has diversified overtime; v) investigate its ethical consequences; vi) review both negative and positive critiques of it; vii) inquire into resistance to practice it; and finally, peruse how it is applied in contemporary research and borders new frontiers.

Methodology

As a literary dissertation, this thesis focuses on and offers an overview of the literature on *Auto*ethnography. When my research began, there was few publications available on *Auto*ethnography. The term itself was not widely used, but glimpses of the concept of self-disclosure within research were becoming evident. However, I discovered, since 2010 a plethora of publications has emerged on *Auto*ethnography and associated topics within Anthropology. In essence, *Auto*ethnographies are not new. They have previously existed, however they did not bear the title '*Auto*ethnography'. The designation of work of this nature as *Auto*ethnography is significant, and this significance will be discussed in this thesis.

Chapter Outline

This thesis begins with an explanation of what is, tracing its evolution and evolvement through examples of various types of *Auto*ethnography; it explores the formats through which *Auto*ethnography is presented and the reasons for their use.

What is Autoethnography ?

Chapter One will offer a historical background to the term *Auto*ethnography, giving its formal definition, what exactly it implies, and demonstrate how it has evolved overtime. *Auto*ethnography is a derivative of ethnography where ethnography is essentially a map or graph of an ethnic group or culture, or cultural phenomenon. As a practice, ethnography was central to the Anthropologists/ethnographers research as the modem to reflect and present their research. The founder of ethnography Bronislaw Malinowski clearly set down the guidelines for its practice in the first chapter of his *Argonauts of the Pacific* (1922).

By extension, *Auto*ethnography, when broken down, loosely means a map of one's own' people, culture, and/or phenomenon where the *Auto* suggests Self, I, or My Own. Each of the elements are interdependent, where the components *Auto* and ethno are significant because the research is about the personal experience (one's own), of a culture or cultural phenomena. I cannot emphasise this enough in the context of *Auto*ethnography within Anthropology.

There are those who confuse *Auto*ethnography with Autobiography, however, *Auto*ethnography is to ethnography what Autobiography is to biography. *Auto*ethnography is not the same as Autobiography, or biography but to understand it, it might be best to think of it as *Auto*-biographical-ethnography or *Autobioethnography*, in order to separate and distinguish it as one who is studying their own ethnic group. The main distinction between the words Autobiography and *Auto*ethnography is the word ethno (group or culture). Mary Louise Pratt (1992) in her essay 'Arts of the Contact Zone' and her subsequent text *Imperial*

Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation (2008 [1992]) was the first to offer a definitive concise definition of what *Auto*ethnography is and what it was intended to do. An excerpt from her definition states:

> Auto ethnography is a text which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage representations others have made of them (Pratt, 1992: xx).

Originally, within the realms of Anthropology the term *Auto*ethnography was designated a specific purpose, that is, to categorise those who studied their own culture. A simplistic take on Pratt's definition is that *Auto*ethnography was a response to an outsider's perspective or commentary on one's culture. However, it is more than that; it is also an explanation of one's culture or a personal cultural experience, so it is better understood. Consequentially, *Auto*ethnography also satisfies a main criterion in Anthropology, in that it provides understanding of human behaviour in a cultural context, and by extension, an introspective personal understanding for the researcher.

There have been a number of derivations of the terms since its inception such as those mentioned above. Numerous attempts have sought to explain what exactly *Auto*ethnography is including the works of David Hayano (1979) and Deborah Reed-Danahay (1997). Hayano highlighted features of *Auto*ethnography, while Reed-Danahay (2002) was part of a blazing trail for the use of *Auto*ethnography, focusing on the lives of rural women in France whose stories gave a deep and meaningful understanding of French rural life. Reed-Danahay's (1997) text *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social* is a collection of essays focusing on a number of issues pertaining to the *Auto*ethnographic method. The contributors to the text highlighted advantages of *Auto*ethnography and how it preserved understandings of culture which would have been lost but for personal writings and how for example two accounts from the same region offered entirely different perspectives of life within that culture. Later, the mode of research of *Auto*ethnography evolved to focus more on the 'self' as the centre of the research and the ethnography, that is, more specifically a 'self-experience' or personal cultural experiences, or personal experience of a specific cultural phenomenon also labelled '*Auto*ethnography'. This was not the intended meaning or purpose of *Auto*ethnography when it first emerged. This deviation from *Auto*ethnography's original intention is the focus and subject of the subsequent chapter.

New Wave (Millennium) Autoethnography

Chapter Two will identify and examine what I have termed New Wave (New Millennialism) *Auto*ethnography, to differentiate it from its original counterpart. *Auto*ethnography began to evolve and diverge and maintain a presence in academia late in the last millennium, in response to the despondency of researchers who deemed there was

'something missing' from traditional methods of quantitative research and began to include more personal stories as insights into cultural phenomena. New Wave *Auto*ethnography was born out of recognition of the limits of scientific knowledge, a greater recognition and appreciation for both literary and aesthetic narrative, and the emotions and the body as centres of research. In this chapter, I detail the elements, features, characteristics and purposes of New Wave *Auto*ethnography referring to the work of Ellis et al., (2013) in the *Handbook of Autoethnography*.

The main feature of New Wave *Auto*ethnography is the use of the personal experience to examine and analyse cultural experience, and to comment and critique culture and cultural practices. New Wave *Auto*ethnography places the self and one's personal experience as the central locus for the study. This is different from the original *Auto*ethnographic form where one is studying their own ethnic group. Other characteristics of New Wave *Auto*ethnography are embracing vulnerability with purpose, make contributions to existing research and creating a reciprocal relationship with the audience. Purposes of *Auto*ethnography are to disrupt the norms of research practice and representation and make work more accessible; to work from insider knowledge to illustrate personal hidden nuances, obtaining information normally inaccessible via the traditional route; to break silences and reclaim marginalised voices, and to write to right (Ellis et al., 2013).

In this new formation, *Auto*ethnography as a research method and approach contravenes the old method and includes rather than excludes the self as central to the study. In examining the complexities of the lived experience the *Auto*ethnography demonstrates interpersonal experiences of gender, race, ethnicity and their interconnectedness at the micro level, which connect with larger powerful social systems at work at the macro, thus providing different insights into cultural phenomena. After considering all these contributory factors as to what *Auto*ethnography might be, I have formulated a new definition:

> *"Autoethnography is the study and critique of culture or culture phenomena, using the 'self' as resource, subject and means of research, to understand one's own personal and cultural behaviour and consequently understand human behaviour, culture and cultural phenomena, ultimately making research and life more meaningful. Furthermore, it is useful to note Autoethnography is to ethnography what Autobiography is to biography" (Cluxton-Corley, 2016).*

The two aforementioned major proponents of this method, Carolyn Ellis and Art Bochner, faced down numerous criticisms of this method of research and representation and, very capably and determinately, promoted and argued for the use of *Auto*ethnography as a way/method to explain life situations sadly neglected in former formal research. Ellis and Bochner, in their professional academic capacity, have advanced the use of *Auto*ethnography

by establishing PhD programmes in the University of South Florida. Examples of their work interrogate the use of *Auto*ethnography and its application to topics including common everyday experiences and personal predicaments, such as complex relationships, looking after ill elderly relatives, children etc., to reflect how people understand and make meaning and consequently live better their lives. This is in effect cultural critique in another guise in that the experiences reflect social cultural behaviour and the impact of social policy on individual lives.

Categories and Exemplars of Autoethnography

Chapters Three and Four will give examples of the four various categories and types of *Auto*ethnographies I devised during the course of my research, in order that the term and its function are understood better. The four categories of *Auto*ethnography are: the Study of One's Own Culture; the Study of One's Own Culture One Generation Removed (Ethnic Identity Ethnography); Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies, Anthropologists describing their experience in the field; and the Self-Reflective Experiential model. Chapter Three will focus on those that fit into the first and second categories the Study of One's Own Culture and Second Generation *Auto*ethnography, and Chapter Four will focus on the latter two.

As examples of original *Auto*ethnographic studies of one's own culture, I use the work of Ella Cara Deloria ((2009) [1988]; (1998) [1944]) and Christine Quintasket (1927), who offer the Native American Indians perspective, and Zora Neale Hurston (1995) who offers the Black South American perspective. Quintasket was not an Anthropologist but her novel *Co-ge-wa* (1927) and text *Coyote Stories* (1933) offer an inside view of life for a Native American Half-blood Indian woman using the realist novel as a mode of cultural critique. Deloria and Hurston were pioneers among many female Anthropologists, who studied their own community and reported to Franz Boas as part of the Boasian tradition of salvage ethnography. These writers sought to preserve their culture and language by putting on record a way of life that was vanishing. They also aimed through hugely insightful information to explain their culture, to create better understanding. Deloria also contributed greatly to the preservation of her native language.

To all intents and purposes, the strict ethnographic method did not facilitate Hurston and Deloria's needs, so they both resorted to describing and preserving their cultures through fiction. This contributes to the debate about the use of metaphor and allegory within ethnographic writing. James Clifford in *Writing Culture* (1986), considered this idea at length. Despite their prolific work, neither Deloria nor Hurston achieved academic positions within the establishment, testifying to the attitude directed towards women and their research within academia at the time. All three authors died destitute. Their work largely went

unnoticed until very recently when it resurfaced under the auspice of feminist anthropology, Black Feminist literature and African American literature thanks to Raymond De Mallie and Henry Louis Gates jnr. Deloria's nephew, Vine Deloria worked tirelessly to set the record straight about his aunt's contribution to academia. Now these writers are prestigious among different disciplines in the US.

This chapter examines these writers' dilemmas and academic contributions in depth. It also examines how critics disparaged it, particularly the work of Zora Neale Hurston. Hurston's aim was to explain her culture to outsiders as she suggested natives were reticent about divulging to mainly white researchers. Therefore, she was happy to use her experience, inside knowledge and her training with the 'spyglass of Anthropology' to offer a more complete picture of her society and culture. Both Hurston's and Delorias' work hampered their acceptance and acclaim within the discipline of Anthropology. It is interesting to note here, that contemporaneously *Auto*ethnographers bemoan the fact that they fear practising *Auto*ethnography in case it hampers tenure, career development or academic achievement.

The second *Auto*ethnographic category I examine is that of a generation once removed, Second Generation *Auto*ethnography or 'Ethnic Identity Ethnography', as described by Michael Fischer (1986). 'Ethnic Identity Ethnography' is when Anthropologists search for identity through research of cultures from which they are extracted. Barbara Myerhoff (1978) a second generation Jewish descendent, wished to understand a lifestyle she had not been educated in or practised, and in studying an aging Jewish community in Venice, California, came close to understanding her roots. Myerhoff's primary focus was aging as a cultural phenomenon in the United States. It was by default, one could suggest, she discovered more about her own ethnicity. Her Jewish ancestry benefited her welcome into the community.

Myerhoff contributed a number of original ideas to the discipline. She initiated research on an aging community. She describes the experience of Holocaust survivors who emigrated from Europe and survivor's guilt (which has recently become a much in demand research topic). She contributed to the emergence of Visual Anthropology having her research released on film, *Number Our Days* (1976), and she completed a documentary on her own experience, *In Her Own Time* (1986) which encapsulated her rebirth as a Jew, and her experience with cancer. These are exceptional formats of *Auto*ethnography often overlooked. Appropriately, Myerhoff's work, where she described her own vulnerabilities and challenges as an Anthropologist, introduces us to the next category of *Auto*ethnography that of Anthropologists' (ethnographers') *Auto*ethnographies of their personal experiences and vulnerabilities while doing research.

Chapter Four shows examples of New Wave *Auto*ethnography, the third and fourth categories of *Auto*ethnographies, the Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographic Experience of the Field and Personal Self-reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography. A correspondence in both these categories is that the Anthropologists' personal experience is central to the research. For the third category of *Auto*ethnography, Anthropologist *Auto*ethnographic Experience of the Field, I focus on the work of Jean Briggs (1970) *Never In Anger,* where she offers a detailed description of the Anthropologist's experience. She does so by mapping her personal experience of fieldwork among the Utku. She describes what it was like for the community under study and how things can go wrong in the field, especially where the community's and the researcher's expectations do not coincide. Initially, Briggs' intention was to study Shamanism but she diverted to the study and place of emotions among the Eskimo. Briggs' emotions were implicated in the course of the research. Despite her depression, anxiety and anger she learned and taught much about the community she stayed with, demonstrating a human response to what was/is a sometimes-challenging situation.

Briggs is one of a stable of many Anthropologists and writers who described their field experience and vulnerabilities in the field as testified by Barbara Tedlock (1991) such as Laura Bohannon's *Return to Laughter* (1973) and Paul Rabinow's *Reflections of Field Work in Morocco* (1977) to name but a few. Although not recognised as the stuff of science, it was highly relevant to expectations and concerns of new Anthropologists. Many Anthropologists dismissed such texts, who see the Ethnographer as exaggerating their situation, and the material outside the focus of 'real' Anthropology. Many of Briggs' counterparts used pseudonyms for fear their openness would discredit them, one of the challenges for *Auto*ethnographers. One such Anthropologist is Karla Powie (or Manda Cesara) (1982), who offered an insight into her role as Anthropologist in *Reflections of a Woman Anthropologist: No Hiding Place (Studies in anthropology)*. Until recently, such texts were rarely on course reading lists. What is unique or original about Briggs' *Auto*ethnography is her open discussion on emotions, another subgenre within Anthropology, the Anthropology of the Emotions. This suitably leads to the fourth and final category, Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography.

The fourth and final type of *Auto*ethnography this thesis discusses is Self- Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography or *Auto*phenomenology (Allen-Collinson, 2013) or *Auto*phenomenography. In this context, the researcher's personal, sometimes emotional experience is the subject of inquiry and usually reflects a social cultural phenomenon. By way of example, I focus on the work of Carolyn Ellis (1995) *Final Negotiations*. Ellis' text is a classic New Wave *Auto*ethnography where the author is the central locale of the study discussing a cultural phenomenon rarely brought out in the open i.e. complicated relationships, not least because one partner is suffering from a debilitating illness. In this

account, Ellis reflects on and shares the experience of how she engaged with the situation on a practical and emotional level. She describes the impact of the experience on those connected, the perceptions of others, how medical and societal systems cater for and facilitate such situations, and the quandaries she faced as a researcher. She hoped and anticipated that by sharing her experiences she might help others. Ellis' text is a worthy but challenging one as it highlights many of the difficulties for an *Auto*ethnographer and the reader. Ellis adheres to the rule of describing the minutiae of the everyday, which can be tedious. Nonetheless, Ellis' text is indicative of the beginning of a new forte in cultural critique. Like Briggs, Ellis too highlights the rising sub-genre of Anthropology of Emotions.

Carolyn Ellis' text added a new dimension to social science research and cultural critique, connecting personal emotional experiences with social cultural phenomenon. She was one of a group of cohorts to the fore in *Auto*ethnography who have had their texts published by the Walnut Creek Group. Almost all of their texts offer an insight from a personal perspective into social topics frequently overlooked or ignored. These texts have yet to be interrogated, as insights into cultural critique, or for which a theoretical framework requires to be created. Their topics customarily include abortion, depression, drug and alcohol addiction, emotional physical and child abuse, homophobia, eating disorders, relationships, coping, (not coping) with illness, and adequate or inadequate structures of medical social facilities and support systems and death. Others tell of personal experiences within academia, where students and faculty alike are undermined or disregarded, because they address such issues, and consequently in fear of repercussions, are dismissed and dismissive.

Often, these Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnographies do not reveal society in a positive light and lift the lid on many previously concealed issues or abuses, which previously remained undisclosed, kept secret or in the shadows. These are what I refer to as silent/quiet cultural phenomenon or as Ardner (1975) called them 'muted groups'. Disclosing experiences in more and different ways than we are familiar with, is similar to 'whistle blowing' or 'coming out' and take courage and considerable risk. This is currently a topical issue within the jurisdiction of the Irish Republic.

It is more by accident than design the examples I have chosen are in the main by female authors. Primarily I have been interested in the role literature played in women's lives. I was attracted to earlier female Anthropologists' experience of the discipline. I was curious as to why the work of Female Anthropologists was either ignored or written out. *Auto*ethnographers appear to have faced similar challenges. *Auto*ethnography is not a gender exclusive genre as Barbara Tedlock (1991) testifies. Perhaps the most well known male *Auto*ethnographer is Paul Rabinow (1977). In New Wave *Auto*ethnography many males, such

as Tony E. Adams (2013), K. Berry (2013), A. Sparkes (2009) and J. Spinney (2006) to name but a few contribute the male experience on topics such as homosexuality, coming out, homophobia, relationships with fathers and their experiences with mental health and academia (Adams, 2014, 2011; Grant et al., 2014).

Autoethnography within an Irish Context

To show how *Auto*ethnographies compare with ethnographies of the same place and people, in Chapter Five I consider an Irish dimension, using the work of Tomás O'Crohán, (2000, [1937,1929]), and Péig Sayers (1974, [1936]). Here I juxtapose them with works from outsider perspectives, using the work of Robin Flowers (1985, [1944]), John C. Messenger (1969), and Nancy Scheper-Hughes, (2001, [1977]). An exploration of this nature demonstrates some of the differences of the etic and the emic view, and how the emic, the *Auto*ethnographic view captures elements frequently missed by the outsider. An *Auto*ethnography shows how the outsider may not appreciate, know or understand some of the idiosyncrasies of the insider. By contrast, ethnography shows many things the outsider sees that the insider often fails to notice, overlooks and takes for granted.

Messenger and Scheper-Hughes focused on two sensitive topics to the Irish, the sexual mores and the mental health of their communities respectively. Both of them applied an empirical ethnographic approach, which failed to capture the true nature, character, ethos or sensitivity of the Irish. Much of Messenger's and Scheper-Hughes' work in the Irish context suffered severe criticism from within their fields of study. This criticism highlighted two things. Firstly, the advantage of *Auto*ethnography where it can supplement, complement, confirm and/or deny aspects of previous research, with the result of making Anthropological research a more holistic exercise. Secondly, the response to Scheper-Hughes' work encouraged her to reconsider her Anthropological position particularly from an ethical perspective which is the focus of the following chapter.

Ethics within Autoethnography

Chapter Six examines the critical place of ethics in both *Auto*ethnographies and ethnographies from either the bureaucratic or personal research realm. Despite the emphasis on the *Auto* within *Auto*ethnographic research it is very much relational, familial, community and societal based. Many issues addressed within *Auto*ethnography are by nature highly sensitive and often the *Auto*ethnographic protagonist does not appear in a positive light. Ethics within *Auto*ethnography have to be considered seriously precisely because of these sensitivities and the relationships involved. *Auto*ethnographers are bound by both bureaucratic and *Auto*ethnographic ethics. The issue of bureaucratic ethics highlights difficulties in receiving Review Board consent in response to what Marilyn Strathern labelled

'audit creep' (2006). Many institutions are protecting themselves against litigation and are therefore reluctant to sponsor or support any form of research that does not satisfy certain criteria such as that instituted by the Belmont Report (1979) and the Common Rule (1991). In this instance, instituted criteria suit and facilitate medical and scientific research practice, and are not wholly suited to the humanities and often ethnographic/*Auto*ethnographic research.

Because of the open-ended nature of Anthropology, and *Auto*ethnography in particular, it is difficult to confine it to particular review or ethical criteria. It is to this end that *Auto*ethnography, ethnography and Anthropological research in general, challenges the bureaucratic systems, particularly Internal Review Boards. Consent is not just an issue from the bureaucratic perspective but consent from actors implicated in the research is vitally important too, as Luke Lassiter (2005) testifies.

Rena Lederman et al. (2006) provide a concise overview of bureaucratic ethical dilemmas for Anthropologists in general, following a forum facilitated by the *American Ethnologist* to discuss it. The contributors highlighted how bureaucratic systems curtailed or challenged their research. Martin Tolich (2010) and J.A. Tullis (2013) specifically investigate *Auto*ethnographic ethics. Tolich was particularly concerned with the lack of guidelines and the process of consent, before, during and retrospectively while conducting research or producing an *Auto*ethnography. Tolich offers a set of specific guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers, to protect those involved in the research, its presentation and its outcome. Extending from the question of ethics, the next chapter examines other negative concerns directed against *Auto*ethnography.

Criticism of and Resistance to Autoethnography

*Auto*ethnography has experienced a considerable amount of negative criticism. Chapter Seven considers both the criticisms and resistance extended towards *Auto*ethnographies, and why academics are reluctant to pursue it, as a method of research. This chapter separates both concepts of criticism and resistance to *Auto*ethnography. Resistance pertains to researchers' reluctance to practice *Auto*ethnography because of the negativity extended towards it. Criticism against *Auto*ethnography stems from sceptics within the discipline who are vague about the use and purpose of 'self-narrative', and do not view it as a bona fide genre or form of research or presentation. Frequently, forms and styles of writing, presentation and research approaches are dismissed due to academic elitism, and/or competing personalities within the discipline, where there is a reluctance to break with old traditions. Researchers' can insist on one particular ethnographic research mode, deeming it more superior to others. These divisions over various approaches arise within British, American and non-Western schools (Strathern, 1987; Kanaaneh, 1997).

Criticisms launched against *Auto*ethnography come under a number of themes: the issue of *Auto*ethnography as a genre; the trend towards self-reflexivity; the debate about presentation in ethnography; and among Native Anthropologists. *Auto*ethnography contests and contradicts the scientific unbiased neutral separated (distanced) approach. Anthropology was super self-conscious of its role as a scientific discipline, especially in the wake of many of the crises it endured between the 1930's and 1960's within and without the discipline, particularly the colonial issue. The objective versus subjective is contravened by the very nature of the personal or self, writing from within (home), being central to the research. For some time *Auto*ethnography was dismissed, or relegated to the back burner, as it breached the notion that a researcher should be removed by at least three degrees from the research/topic subject. Thus, observer neutrality was untenable as noted by Dr. Rebecca King-O'Riain (2013). With the threat of bias, *Auto*ethnographic research was not, or could not be, considered scientifically sound, or uncompromised. The close association of the researcher to the subject of inquiry raises questions of reliability and integrity. The notion of three degrees of separation stems from the idea of six degrees of separation as examined by the Hungarian author Frigyes Karinthy (1929) whereby everything and everyone is separated (or connected) by fewer than six degrees (steps) from every other person in the world based on the idea of the shrinking world. This concept is in alignment with the three degrees of influence by Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler (2007) which suggests people can influence distant others through their influence on those close to them. Due to the often 'chaotic' and 'messy' nature of *Auto*ethnography (Pratt, 1992), *Auto*ethnography does not have any gauge or clear criteria to measure it against, so therefore it can be accused of lacking credibility.

*Auto*ethnography has been criticised as being narcissistic, self-indulgent and the work of self-inflated egos, due to the rather sensitive personal and psychodynamic issues often addressed (Buzard, 2003: Delamont, 2009). Another criticism of *Auto*ethnography is the 'thick description' is too personal and intense, labelling it 'nouveau solipsism' (Patai, 1994). It is worth noting when reading quality *Auto*ethnography, the research self is often submerged and pales into insignificance as the message, story or event becomes the focus and the individual becomes less important.

The emergence of *Auto*ethnography coincided with the memoir during the Clinton era when the private went public (Miller, 2000). The memoir as a genre was viewed cynically as an outpouring of sentimentalism. However, the genre has spilled over to academics and has 'critical cultural inflections' of interest to academia [emphasis added]. The memoir is an evaluation of one's life, giving account, making meaning, in the same way *Auto*ethnography emerges from an 'epiphanic' moment giving clarity and meaning to a life event or experience

(Denzin, 2013). However, it is the 'critical cultural inflections' and 'personal inflections' [emphasis added], often leave a lasting impression on the reader.

Such criticisms, negative attitude and bad press toward *Auto*ethnography, deeming it an un-worthy method of research, presentation and form of research or cultural critique, or being unrecognised within either the canon or academia, has contributed to the resistance and lack of willingness to practice it as careers, positions of tenure, and achievement were affected by its deployment. However, Bochner and Ellis have managed to establish a doctoral programme in this approach and students have acquired PhDs in *Auto*ethnography (Moriairty, 2014; Adams, 2013; Holman-Jones, 2013). Personal vulnerability is another reason that contributes to the reluctance to practice *Auto*ethnography. Vulnerability is a key feature of *Auto*ethnography, for both researcher and researched. The inner person is exposed, to academic peers, close friends and family, the public and even enemies. Practising *Auto*ethnography requires strength of character, strong commitment, and willingness to take risk and address sensitive emotional issues. Certainly, there are negative aspects to *Auto*ethnography, which may reflect ethnography: such as poor editing. Equally, some of the information is quite intense but this too may be a matter of opinion, choice or preference; what pleases some critics may not please or interest others. Its general standing and acceptance are considerations to its future.

Autoethnographies New Frontiers

The last consideration of this thesis is the current place of *Auto*ethnography and its place in the future: *Auto*ethnography's New Frontiers. Chapter Eight, the final chapter, will examine how *Auto*ethnography is presently in research and practice across other various disciplines like health, education and geography.

To fully appreciated *Auto*ethnography three concepts require consideration. The first one is the concept of 'self'. The notion of self, individualism and its place within a society. In different societies and eras, 'Self' is attended to through different guises and concepts. The concept of self and social interaction is in flux as traditions and customs, once the sources of Anthropological investigation, are being eroded and replaced. People's sense of identity is changing and some are drawing on other people's stories to contribute to a sense of self. In some cases, people are becoming more isolated (Turkle, 2013). Reflecting on the concepts of selfhood as described by Geertz (1973), who demonstrates how perceptions of the self vary across disciplines and genres, we can see how the notion of 'self' impacts on social and cultural behaviour. Given the importance of 'Self' to *Auto*ethnography, and reflecting on Geertz analysis, we can appreciate how within different eras, cultures and societies each will present and have different meanings for cultural critique.

Secondly, *Auto*ethnography, and indeed Anthropology, needs to acknowledge how emotion has and does affect reactions in/to social and cultural climates. By understanding how emotional reactions make social mores and norms more visible, we can better appreciate social and cultural structures. Nancy Scheper-Hughes *Death Without Weeping* (1992) is a prime example of where emotions reflect social mores. Here infant mortality takes on a different meaning, and is viewed differently by women in different contexts. Emotions and emotional behaviour are tell-tale signs of relevancies within a society.

Thirdly, the importance of the introspective interpretive approach as identified by Norman Denzin, (2013, 2014) within *Auto*ethnography needs to be recognised. The *Auto*ethnographic introspective interpretive approach differs from the general Anthropological interpretive approach in so far as it applies to the individuals' interpretation of a social cultural phenomena or dilemma from a personal perspective, what Denzin described and labelled 'epiphanies'. Experiencing such epiphanies, and understanding them, putting them into context, offers the individual a better sense of self and their place in society. These three concepts combined direct Anthropology and *Auto*ethnography toward a contemplative philosophical route.

Although not specifically mentioned, an undercurrent in the writings of the Walnut Creek Group is to make life more meaningful and understood better for themselves and others and by default *Auto*ethnography is an attempt to establish a new philosophical approach as it were. This theme/concept has also been developed by Michael Jackson through Existential Anthropology (2005, 2009, 2013, 2014[2002]), where he examines the benefits of reflective Anthropology and more particularly ethnography as part of self-development and a greater understanding through contemplation. Through a series of vignettes, combining his personal ethnographic experience and events he witnessed in Sierra Leone, Aboriginal Australia and the Maori of New Zealand Jackson seeks to comprehend and explain how people cope with every day, specifically those who have endured hardship, and consequentially come to terms with a way of being in the world. Jackson advocates an alternative approach for the Anthropologist, to 'just be', and in observing others with no fixed agenda or criteria gains much self-knowledge. The depth of Jackson's work is indicative of how Anthropology and ethnography has diverged which will be discussed in the final Chapter.

This contemplative philosophical, existential route is beyond the scope of this thesis but evidence of its existence is clear within disciplines such as Geography, Medicine, Mental Health and Education. *Auto*ethnography has been seen to offer understanding of how society and culture functions, and impacts on the individual in different circumstances, especially with regards the concept of space and the individual in Geography, coping with mental

illness, the understanding of and provision for same within social systems in Mental Health and Medicine, or marginalised individuals in Education. Through *Auto*ethnographies describing engagement with these social and cultural schemes (or life worlds to use Michael Jackson's term) we can appreciate peoples' modus operandi and how they fit, cope and make life better (or not) for themselves (Till, 2009; Grant et al., 2014; Baxter Magolda, 2009; Duarte, 2007; Starr, 2010; Jackson, 2013).

Equally, *Auto*ethnography will surely develop with reference to the current age of Cybernetics. New trends such as cybernetics, the internet, on line dating, TV/Computer games affect social and personal engagement. This virtual world has opened up new horizons and prompted new direction in research. Religious and other core values and beliefs are in places diluted, where people are turning to other sources and virtual space for meaning and improvement in their lives. Experiences online with which people can empathise may bring its own sense of relief; the reassurance of discovering that one is not alone in one's experience or not the only one having experienced a specific dilemma. Identification, acknowledgment and appreciation of a particular circumstance presented in *Auto*ethnography go a long way towards cultural critique. As Marcus and Fischer note, "well written qualitative humanistic texts can change how we think about the world" (1999 [1986]: xxxii).

Conclusion

This study provides additional insight into a new dimension of Anthropological research, *Auto*ethnography. Social science methods appeared to be tired and well-worn particularly in the context of a new world system, and for some not really getting to the crux of the matter, which was how did social science make life more meaningful, or demonstrate how to make life better. *Auto*ethnography is an alternative approach, which addresses such issues for researchers.

In this overview of the thesis, we have traced *Auto*ethnography's emergence. It begins by explaining what *Auto*ethnography was in its original context. While not strictly a new genre, *Auto*ethnography has risen in popularity since the New Millennium, evolving from the Study of One's Own Culture to becoming Self-Reflective Introspective Experiential Research, studying personal cultural phenomenon (*Auto*phenomenology) with the self as central to the research reflecting social cultural phenomena.

In its divergence *Auto*ethnography, by bringing to the fore the individual view/perspective offers an alternative way of looking at things socially and culturally. *Auto*ethnography remains loyal to the primary concerns of Anthropology, which was to look

at ‘other’ so that one might come to understand oneself, to share knowledge and assist learning, so that the reader comes to understand human behaviour, and the embryonic idea and function of Anthropology, the edification of human kind. This aim still prevails, as through contrast, comparison and reflection *Auto*ethnography enables one to understand the self, better, and is beneficial to the reader who can recognise the self and experience in the writing.

One has to be vigilant of the negative side and disadvantages of *Auto*ethnography. Allowances are required for the differences in societies, and each individual view and experience. This thesis while acknowledging and allaying some of the negativity received hopes to demonstrate how intrinsic and integral this form of ethnography, *Auto*ethnography is, within the discipline.

Anthropology has diversified in its scope and practice over time, and is far too cosmopolitan to be confined to a singular way of thinking. *Auto*ethnography is just another branch on the Anthropological tree and offers a new philosophical approach. This thesis will show *Auto*ethnography has a significant role to play within Anthropology, and deserving of respect as a worthy alternative genre opening up and addressing new horizons.

Chapter One: What is *Auto*ethnography?

Introduction

In an effort to understand what the concept of *Auto*ethnography is, this chapter will define *Auto*ethnography; through an explanation of its origins and elements, identity and location within the theoretical and historical background of Anthropology and Ethnography in general. It will also describe the boundaries and parameters of *Auto*ethnography within the discipline of Anthropology. Later, in Chapter Two we will look at how *Auto*ethnography has evolved over time and how it has diversified to cover a multiplicity of phenomenon.

Defining *Auto*ethnography

In discovering and defining *Auto*ethnography, we need first to examine what Ethnography is. Ethnography has numerous definitions as the *Encyclopaedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* will testify. For Claude Levi Strauss (1963) 'ethnography consists of observing and analysing human groups'. For Clifford Geertz (1973) 'what defines it (ethnography) is what kind of intellectual effort it is: an elaborate venture in, to borrow a notion from Gilbert Ryles, "thick description"'. For Malinowski (1922) it is a goal to grasp the native's point of view and for Sanjek (2002) ethnography has a double meaning, it is both process and product (cited in *Encyclopaedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology,* (2002)).

Ethnography was the first format Anthropologists used to explain and/or describe their work. Ethnography is a map (graph) of a culture; it is the study of cultures, relational practices, common values, beliefs and shared experience. It helps insiders' i.e. cultural members, and outsiders' i.e. cultural strangers, to understand cultural practices, beliefs and phenomena and to comprehend how they contribute to a way of being in the world. In terms of research methods, Ethnography is the study of human behaviour and culture, and a form of presentation for the findings of Anthropology.

*Auto*ethnography is a derivative or extension of ethnography with the inclusion of the *Auto,* which refers to the Self, I, or Own. Thus, *Auto*ethnography loosely means 'a map of one's own' people, culture, and/or phenomenon. To summarise *Auto*ethnography might also be described as a self-reflective narrative on a particular people or culture where the narrative might be either a personal reflection of an ethnographer, or/and a personal reflection of a subject being studied. These distinctions will become clearer as the thesis progresses.

*Auto*ethnography is a combination of ethnography, *Auto*biography and biography, but should not be confused with any one of them. *Auto*ethnography is to Ethnography, what *Auto*biography is to Biography. In its simplest form *Auto*ethnography is 'the study of one's own culture' or 'the study of self within a culture'. Tony Adams (2013) in the Introduction to *The Handbook of Autoethnography* states:

> [A writer writes *Auto*ethnographically] ... to show how the aspects of experience illuminate more general cultural phenomena and how that experience works to diminish, silence, deny certain people and stories ... [A writer writes *Auto*biographically] to tell a story illustrating a sad, joyful or problematic experience but does not interrogate the nuances of the experience in the light of general cultural phenomena or cultural practices ... *Auto*ethnography includes perspectives of multiple subjects but *Auto*biographical personal narrative is the perspective of a single subject (Adams, 2013: 22/23).

There are two distinct disciplinary approaches and perspectives to *Auto*ethnography. Anthropologists typically see and use *Auto*ethnography as 'the Study of One's Own Culture' where they use their own experience to explain that culture or a phenomenon. As Jacquelyn Allen-Collinson says:

> *Auto*ethnographic researchers whose focus shifts toward the "culture" end of the *Auto*-ethno spectrum usually subject to in-depth analysis their lived experiences qua member of a cultural or sub cultural group, with the aim of portraying vividly, and illuminating perceptively, wider cultural experiences, practices and processes (Allen-Collinson, 2013:287).

Other social scientists, from a sociological/communication disciplinary perspective, see *Auto*ethnography as 'the Study of Self within a Culture'. '*Auto*ethnography' is used in some contexts to describe 'self-ethnography', or '*Auto*-bio-ethnography' which is a way of examining one's personal experience, or how one was personally affected by a cultural phenomenon. Jacquelyn Allen-Collinson (2009, 2011b) and Maree Grupetta (2004) calls this angle, dimension or direction of *Auto*ethnography '*Auto*phenomenography':

> The primary focus is upon the researcher's lived experience of a phenomenon or phenomena rather than upon her or his cultural or subcultural location within a socio-cultural context (Jacquelyn Allen-Collinson, 2013: 203).

*Auto*ethnography is subdivided further between Analytic and Evocative *Auto*ethnography where all of these examinations are forms of cultural critique. Some academics instantly reject *Auto*ethnography especially when *Auto*ethnographies cross that/a boundary and are clearly not *Auto*ethnographies, as Anthropologists see them, but rather self-reflective pieces.

The *Auto*ethnographic method is not entirely new but it has remained under the radar particularly in Anthropology. Françoise Lionnet (1989) in an essay titled '*Auto*ethnography: The An-archic Style of Dust Tracks On A Road' described *Auto*ethnography as,

> ... [t]he process of defining one's subjective ethnicity as mediated through language, history and ethnographical analysis (Lionnet, 1989:166).

The term *Auto*ethnography is also a derivative of the French phrase "une Anthropologie figure" which in effect means self-portraiture, the French equivalent of *Auto*ethnography. Lionnet explains how Zora Neale Hurston, in an effort to carry out Boasian 'salvage ethnography' to preserve vanishing cultures, used her own experience. The title of the essay indicates the variance of Hurston's methodology. Subsequently, the term was extended, explained in depth and differentiated by Mary Louise Pratt in her text 'Arts of the 'Contact Zone', (1991:33-40). Pratt was the only female anthropologist mentioned in *Writing Culture*, Marcus and Clifford (1986). This classic work addressed changes in Anthropological research that initiated a revision of Anthropologist approaches (discussed further below).

Mary Louise Pratt and Autoethnography

Pratt first mentioned *Auto*ethnography as part of a presentation she made at a 'Responsibilities for Literacy Conference', in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in September 1990. Pratt was speaking about ways, means and methods of learning: how things written about others may be responded to; how methods of teaching and learning have changed and emerged owing to changes in dynamics of relationships, especially with the onset of multiculturalism and diversity within the realms of education. This has implications for the responsibilities of the writer, teacher and reader. Pratt argued that *Auto*ethnography is an oppositional practice, that is, it goes against the norm. Initially, Pratt was explaining the effect encounters with the 'Other/outsider' has on the 'insider'. For her, *Auto*ethnography is the 'insider's' response, both to the 'outsider' and the 'outsider's' analysis/report of the 'insider' (Emphasis added). To explain herself further she also coined the term 'contact zones', referring to the places and spaces where these contacts occurred, defining them as follows:

> Social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contents of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today (Pratt, 1991:34).

By way of example of *Auto*ethnography Pratt recounts a story about a 1200-page long letter written in 1613 by Felipe Guaman Poma de Alaya, from Cuzco, Peru, to King Philip III of Spain, which in fact turns out to be a first *Auto*ethnography. The letter never reached its destination but in 1908, by Richard Pietschmann, a Peruvian, discovered it in the Danish Royal Archive, Copenhagen. It was written some 40 years after the Inca Empire had fallen to Spain, and was titled 'The First New Chronicle and Good Government'. 'Chronicle' was the title given to the genre of Spanish official discourse. The manuscript comprised of 800 pages of written text and 400 captioned lined drawings. It combined Quecha and poor but expressive Spanish. This was surprising as Quecha had not been thought of as a written language, and there was no awareness of Andean or literate culture. How it arrived in Copenhagen is unknown. In 1912, Pietschmann presented the manuscript as a paper but it was ill received. In the 1970s, it found more favour, when the academic landscape began to change or as Pratt says:

> Positivist reading habits gave way to interpretive studies and colonial elitisms to post colonial pluralisms (Pratt, 1991:34).

Value was now placed on the 'other' side or the 'insider's' side of the story. Poma's 'New Chronicle and Good Government', was recognised as an 'extraordinary intercultural tour de force', by western scholars (Pratt, 1991:34). Pratt was impressed with this text as it exemplified writing and literacy in 'contact zones'. In his text, Poma explained, described and demonstrated the 'sociocultural complexities produced by conquest and empire' (Pratt, 1991:34). Ahead of its time, the text shows how the 'empire writes back', as an example or description of the impact of colonialism from the native's point of view.

Felipe Guaman Poma de Alaya was of Inca descent with Christian influences. He worked with the Spanish administration and learned to write from a mestiso half-brother. Written in two languages, the letter consisted of two parts. Part 1 'The Chronicle' was an adaptation by Poma of the Spanish official discourse genre whereby they represented their conquests to themselves. Poma's purpose was to 'construct a new picture' of the world, whereby the Andean, and not the European, was central to the Christian World. He begins with Adam and Eve and rewrites Christian History, constructing a valid Inca history, reproducing detailed knowledge of Inca society, previously found on quipus and through oral history where Quipu is an Incan device for recording information using coloured threads knotted in different ways. Pratt describes Poma's exercise essentially an *Auto*ethnographic text, which she defines as:

> A text which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage representations others have made of them (Pratt, 1991:35).

She contrasts them with ethnographic texts, which she defines as:

> [t]hose which European metropolitan subjects represent to themselves their 'others', (usually their conquered others) ... *Auto*ethnographic texts are representations that the so defined 'others' construct *in response to or in dialogue with*, those texts (Pratt, 1991:35, Emphasis added).

She goes on to say:

> *Auto*ethnographies are not ... what are usually thought of as *Auto*chthonous *(indigenous view)* forms of expression or self representation - they involve a selective collaboration with and appropriation of idioms of the metropolis or the conqueror (Pratt, 1991:35. Emphasis added).

In this situation, she is thinking about Poma and Inca elders, the literate ex-slaves and abolitionist intellectuals:

> Merged/infiltrated to varying degrees with indigenous idioms to create self representations intended to intervene in metropolitan modes of understanding (Pratt, 1991: 35).

In this interpretation, *Auto*ethnographies were writings in response to ethnographies written by outsiders, as an interpretation of a society or community. A purpose of *Auto*ethnography in this circumstance is to address misrepresentations or inaccuracies. In this context, the *Auto*ethnography is the inside story. Pratt considers audiences' reception of *Auto*ethnography, stating *Auto*ethnographies are indeterminate, and that they 'Constitute marginalised groups' point of view' (Pratt, 1991:35). In comparing American slave *Auto*biographies/narratives and Euroamerican *Auto*biographical tradition, she requests we consider *Auto*ethnographic dimensions and note the differences:

> In recent decades *Auto*ethnography, critique and resistance have connected with writing in a contemporary creation of the 'contact zone', the *Testimonio* (Pratt,1991: 35. Emphasis in original).

Pratt describes Poma's view as revisionist, describing how things might have been had each treated the other as equals. Poma parodies Spanish history; the Spanish took gold and silver from the Indies but brought nothing of value in return. Poma used the conquerors words, constructing 'oppositional representation' speech (Pratt, 1991:35). He mirrors back an image often suppressed by the conqueror, in a language with which he is unfamiliar. The language of representation is not necessarily the language of the observed, therefore, the observed can be (mis)-represented in another's language. This reminds us to be aware of the dynamics of

language, writing and representation in 'contact zones', now a part of Anthropology's programme.

In the second part of Poma's epistle, as Pratt calls it, Poma's *Auto*ethnography alerts the outsider to things that an insider would not miss but an outsider might, (the converse is also true). This section titled 'Good Government and Justice' was a critique of the new regime and in part a way of advising the new authority how they might capitalise on the new situation. Poma's intention was presumably to advise King Philip where and how the invasion was failing. In other words, it is a letter of complaint concerning the treatment of the colonised and a description of the outcome and impact of colonisation:

> [w]ith a passionate denunciation of Spanish exploitation and abuse ... Andean society was being decimated at a genocidal rate (Pratt, 1991:36).

Poma was severely hostile towards and critical of both clergy and coloniser, however he seeks to draw balance by praising good works. He offered a solution by suggesting cooperation in administration. In a question and answer section, or using role reversal, whereby the King asks the opinion of a lowly administrator, Poma offers himself as a consul, gives himself authority on the situation and suggests recommendations. One important aspect of this document is that the Incas were unknown to have a system of writing despite being a large bureaucratic empire, so Poma bilingually adopted, adapted and appropriated the 'representational repertoire of the coloniser' to express Andean interest and aspirations. This is an example of the process of 'transculturation' whereby the members of the subordinated or marginalised group select or invent from materials transmitted by the dominant metropolitan culture.

Fernandez Ortiz a Cuban Sociologist coined the term 'transculturation' in 1940. Ortiz intended the term to replace reductive concepts of acculturation and assimilation used to characterise cultures under conquest. While the subordinate people do not control what emanates from the dominant culture, they determine what is absorbed and how it is used. In other words, 'transculturation' is identifiable as absorption of culture, or cultural absorption, acculturation or hybridisation. Pratt maintains that both '*Auto*ethnography' and 'transculturation' are phenomena of the 'contact zone'. Poma's text (letter) was an insight into the society from within. As such, the text highlighted the presence of transcultural characteristics in both visual and written components. The 400 line drawings are of European tradition but they deploy specifically Andean 'systems of spatial symbolism' (Pratt, 1991:36), which express Andean values and aspirations, and may be recognised as visual anthropology. Incas were unknown to have a tradition of representational drawing. Andean 'spatial

symbolism' denoted appropriateness of place within the image and consequently one's place within society. For example, as Pratt explains, one placed to the left and under the sun, held a position of power over one placed to the right and under the moon. If both were placed at same height, power is equal, and one placed to the right and higher than the one on the left, it would signify an abuse of power. In using such examples, and adapting Andean methods, Poma illustrated how the Spanish conquest had produced a 'world in reverse' (Pratt, 1991:36). Transcultural currents of expression offered in Poma's text, (*Auto*ethnography) still exist in the Andes today through storytelling, ritual, song, dance textile art, forms of governance, religious belief, expressing the effects of long-term contact, and intractable unequal conflict. Poma's version of events is similar to that of Bartolomé de las Casa's (1542) description of the Spanish invasion and atrocities committed against the indigenous population. Similarly, Victor Montejo (1992) a Pan-Mayan writer in exile and Professor of Anthropology at University of California, recounted his and his community's experiences of government repression in *Brevísima Relación Testimonial de la Continua Destrucción del Mayab', Guatemala* as described by Warren (1997).

Without realising it, Poma had competition. At the time of Poma's text another text the '*Royal Commentaries of the Incas'*, a 'canonical Christian mediation between the Spanish Conquest and Inca history' (Pratt, 1991:37), written by Garcilaso de la Vega (1613) was accepted in official Spanish circles. This text written in standard Spanish with no illustrations; coded the Andean past and present, and was less threatening to colonial hierarchy. Vega's text became the standard topic for doctoral scholarship; Poma's remained unread, which is indicative of a textual hierarchy that still prevails today. As previously mentioned, Pietschmann's presentation of Poma was dismissed in 1912, because the text deviated from the norm. Even in 1991, *Auto*ethnography is not well received Pratt explains because

> Any *Auto*ethnographic work appears anomalous or chaotic ... and will read very differently to people in different positions in the 'contact zone' (Pratt, 1991:36).

The 'contact zone' finds expression through *Auto*ethnography, transculturation, critique, collaboration, bilingualism, mediation, parody, denunciation, imaginary dialogue and vernacular expression. The words 'anomalous' and 'chaotic' recur frequently when others describe the use of *Auto*ethnography as a method and pre-empt the fragile conditions experienced in the '*Auto*ethnographic zone' as we shall see later. The 'perils of writing in the 'contact zone'' (Pratt, 1991:37) are miscomprehension, incomprehension, dead letters, unread masterpieces and absolute heterogeneity of meaning. This can be found, is more visible, decipherable and pressing, according to Pratt, in the trans-nationalised metropolis of the

United States. Those who defend 'a stable centred sense of knowledge and reality' (Pratt, 1991:37) once generally ignored such issues. This shall be considered further in Chapter Seven, where we will analyse why *Auto*ethnography is subjected to negative criticism. The 'contact zone' is the place of engagement, where the reported connection occurs. The 'contact zone' creates an image and sense of community, ideas about language, communication and culture in the academy. Languages were seen as part of speech communities, more or less self-contained units and

> [t]heorised as discrete, self-defined coherent entities held together by homogenous competence (grammar), equally and identically shared by its members (Pratt, 1991:37).

As Poma's and Vega's texts suggest Language, Writing, Literacy and Print Capitalism play a major role as identification markers of a community, how it represents itself and how it is distinguished from other communities. Media create invisible networks, constitute literate elites and rule nations. Language exists as a shared patrimony, a code of competence, and in its universality, assumes a unified homogeneous world. Analysis of language assumes principles of cooperation where shared understandings are in effect and normative. At the very core of a modern nation is language and speech and frequently at the core of colonisation is the displacement of a national language. Pratt, in considering linguistic theories was struck by the 'utopian quality', which characterised social analyses of language by the academy (Pratt, 1991:37/38).

Similarly, modern nations can conceive of themselves in a utopian manner, what Benedict Anderson (1983) calls 'imagined communities'. In human communities, despite the fact that members may know very little of each other, in their imagination they belong to the one group and possess images of communion. Interactions are frequently taken for granted and community rules/spirit followed. Where a community sees itself as distinct is evidenced by the way that community imagines itself as separate from other groups. Anderson identifies three characteristics of an 'imagined' modern nation: limited boundaries, sovereignty and fraternity. However, analysis often shows how rules in communities produce or fail to produce orderly coherent exchange. This might occur where the rules may differ slightly for different community members. Pratt gives example of her son in a new school, deemed nicer with fewer rules. The child worked it out; the school was nicer because everyone there was nice, and not to be nice would make things unpleasant. This school is an imagined community. Societies profess to such imagined communities but often fail to achieve them. *Auto*ethnographers also inhabit 'a writing community' of their own, share a fraternity, and were or are limited by boundaries imposed by the hierarchy of academic disciplines and

professionals; they can feel they are in no man's land where they border two cultures, two countries, two roles (Reed-Danahay, 1997:3).

Pratt speaks of positions of authority and challenges both, within language and education. In most cases in examining scenarios (or a community on a micro level), we offer a position to one in authority, for example in a school we might consider pupil/teacher language generally described from teacher/teaching position and not the learner/learning position. In studying the classroom, the tendency is to analyse from the teacher perspective, with the student silent, invisible or anomalous in the analysis. The position of authority lends itself to the question of legitimacy. The same question emerges in Anthropology, the ethnographic and the *Auto*ethnographic community: to whom is authority or legitimacy given? Where is the place for 'unsolicited oppositional discourse'? Or social unity vs. diversity? Where is the place for 'Empire writes back'? Where is the place for *Auto*ethnography?

Pratt highlights how changes, which occurred in the education system in the United States, have a knock-on effect throughout academia and how programmes had to be adapted to facilitate change. In the 1980s, hegemonic forces began to dissolve and the idea of nation state/syntheses evaporated. Internal groups sought inclusion for example racial integration, same sex marriage, equality for women etc. Meta-structures dismantled with the disintegration of Eastern Europe and the USSR. In the 1990s, teachers were less able to enforce a cohesive unified agenda because the national collective was changing with separate and disparate groups seeking recognition. The rhetoric of belonging, diversity and multiculturalism was witnessed. This extended out into university education, where educational democracy was challenged. The hegemonic statutory approach was no longer practicable and the notion of educational democracy brought with it challenges and questions in terms of the canon/curriculum. At Pratt's University, they sought to address this matter introducing a course 'Cultures, Ideas, Values'. In this group, the texts read challenged everyone because of the diverse experience of the students. The classroom became a 'contact zone'. Traditional teaching approaches were impossible – each student had a stake in what was being taught and how it was presented as 'ideas and identities were put on the line' (Pratt, 1991:39). Sometimes students were 'hearing their culture discussed and objectified in ways that horrified them' (Pratt, 1991:39). The challenging nature of this particular university course led to both joyous moments and moments of torment, as each student witnessed the world with him/her in it. The only 'safe house' was the

> [s]ocial and intellectual spaces where groups can constitute themselves as horizontal, homogenous, sovereign communities with high degrees of trust, shared understandings, temporary protection from legacies of oppression (Pratt,1991:40).

Pratt concludes by suggesting Education is required to make a crossroads where the best learning can be at 'the pedagogical arts of the 'contact zone'' (Pratt, 1991:40). From the educational community, this zone could extend to society in general. In the 'contact zone', two communities (or even people) meet, come together, engage with rules of engagement, the 'art' to this process or procedure. Pratt's ideas echo Poma, who clearly suggests in his letter there has to be a case for voice of 'other' to be heard, and once heard has to be understood and accommodated, to allow for progress. Those imposed upon must be shown respect. They may assimilate some of the things you know into their way of living (transculturation/enculturation/acculturation), but there should be no coercion, rather an appreciation of each/their way of living. If there is to be exchange, and not 'looting', both sides should benefit. Pratt is very clear about what she deems *Auto*ethnography to be; it is the right of reply; it is the response to ethnography, the answer to an opinion by an outsider of an indigenous group by an indigenous person. In this sense, it appears *Auto*ethnography is reactive to domination but later we will see how it is a pro-active method of learning about one's own culture, in the vein of Anthropological study.

Contemporary Anthropologists do not merely represent the 'Other'. Anthropology is not confined to one focus, one area, one location or one mode of research or representation. With *Auto*ethnography within Anthropology, we have a different model with which to apprehend and comprehend social reality and human culture. As such we could be said to be building on the work of Ella Cara Deloria (written in 1944 published in 1998), Zora Neale Hurston (1942) and Jean Briggs (1970) who produced research in this fashion, though it was not termed or seen as '*Auto*ethnography' at the time. Pratt highlights *Auto*ethnography's significance in education, a theme further examined in Chapter Eight.

David Hayano and Autoethnography

David Hayano (1979) offers another perspective on *Auto*ethnography. Hayano attempted to explain the term *Auto*ethnography in his essay '*Auto*-Ethnography: Paradigms, Problems and Prospects'. Though chronologically he preceded Mary Louise Pratt, he does not offer a concise definition of the term, but rather explains the Academy's concern with the method. Hayano first heard the term used by Sir Raymond Firth in a seminar on Structuralism in the London School of Economics in 1966. Firth recollected Malinowski's view that eventually and inevitably Anthropology would come home (Firth, 1966). Firth referred in passing to Jomo Kenyatta's study of his native Kikuyu people, *Facing Mount Kenya* (1938). When Kenyatta first presented his work at a Malinowskian seminar a shouting match erupted between Kenyatta and L.S.B. Leakey, a white African and Kikuyu speaker. The argument descended to an exchange in Kikuyu. There was never any clarity on the nature of the discrepancies (Wax, 1976:332). What the argument did highlight was the notion of

> Judging the validity of anthropological data by assessing the characteristics, interest and origin of the person who did the field work (Hayano, 1979:100).

The focus of Hayano's 1979 paper was to examine (1) how Anthropologists conduct and write ethnographies of their 'own people'; (2) the problems of methodology and theory associated with this approach; and (3) whether anthropology can profit from these exercises. Some forty and more years on the questions still linger. Hayano suggests that while *Auto*ethnography is not a specific research technique, method or theory, it affects all three, as they are employed in fieldwork. For Hayano *Auto*ethnography raises questions of observation, epistemology and 'objective' science and there are issues around researchers' involvement and intimacy with both the project and its subjects.

Experience of fieldwork in a non-Western society was both a professional rite of passage and of paramount importance to future scholars of Anthropology in British and American schools throughout the history of Anthropology. However, this idea was contravened in the 1990s, when veterans and scholars reverted to *Auto*ethnography. According to Hayano, there were several reasons for this. Firstly, it was no longer possible to conduct fieldwork under friendly colonial authorities, as former tribal peoples were disappearing and urban systems had diminished small isolated groups (or so it was thought). Secondly, many foreign and minority anthropologists were emerging, and had clear priorities and propensity for studying their home territory. Thirdly, specialisations such as urban, applied or active anthropology, and other interdisciplinary studies led graduate students to 'study their own backyard'. Finally, shrinking research funds and increased competition led to reduced support for fieldwork abroad.

Hayano lays out what he deemed to be the types of, and the criteria for, doing *Auto*ethnography. For Hayano, *Auto*ethnography is commonly written by people whose 'master status' is obvious and important to their self-identity. The second major type is that written by researchers who have acquired an intimate familiarity with certain sub cultural, recreational or occupational groups. A sub-category of the latter group are those ethnographers who become formally and informally socialised after indoctrination into a specific group or role type with some specialised knowledge or way of life. Hayano contrasts these with Ethnographers/Anthropologists who research a distinctly different group than their own, such as Malinowski, through participant observation. For Hayano, no matter the depth of Malinowski's Trobriand knowledge, he was never a native.

Deborah Reed-Danahay and Autoethnography

Almost twenty years after Hayano's work, Deborah Reed-Danahay emerged as another proponent of *Auto*ethnography. In her work, *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social'* (1997), she studied the permutations of the word *Auto*ethnography. She separates the word with a forward slash, *Auto*/ethnography, (otherwise known as an oblique slant or solidus) suggesting separateness or distinction. In the text's introduction, she identifies *Auto*ethnography as a postmodernist construct where it is a synthesis of both postmodern ethnography and postmodern *Auto*biography. Danahay defines postmodern ethnography as ethnography where 'realist conventions and objective observer position of standard ethnography are questioned', and postmodern *Auto*biography whereby 'the notion of a coherent individual self is questioned' (Reed-Danahay,1997:2). Danahay analogises *Auto*ethnography in three ways: with 'native anthropology', where peoples that were once subjects of ethnography are now authors of studies of their own group; with 'ethnic *Auto*biography' which includes personal narratives, written by members of ethnic minority groups, (often understood, as we have said, in the context of the 'empire writing back'), and with '*Auto*biographical ethnography', where anthropologists interject personal experience into ethnographic writing. Reed-Danahay believed the use and meaning of personal narrative or biographical genres helps us examine, ways cultural forms and we ourselves, are culturally constituted (Reed-Danahay, 1997).

Reed-Danahay's text is a collection of essays from a number of contributors focusing on issues pertaining to this method: the issue of *Auto*/ethnography as a genre; the debate about self-presentation; the trend towards self-reflexivity in ethnography; and 'native' Anthropologists. She also identifies key questions raised and addressed by *Auto*ethnography such as binaries of self/society, objective/subjective, identity, selfhood, voice, authenticity, cultural displacement and exile. *Auto*ethnography is both genre blurring and genre blending:

> the ability to transcend everyday conceptions of selfhood and social life is related to ability to write/do *Auto*ethnography. This is a postmodern condition. It involves rewriting of the self and the social (Reed-Danahay, 1997:4).

Reed-Danahay provides a brief history of the term *Auto*ethnography synopsising the perspectives of Heider, Van Maneen, Strathern, Brandes, Denzin, Deck, Lejeune, Dorst and the aforementioned Pratt and Hayano. Though *Auto*ethnography had been in existence for two decades when Reed-Danahay wrote her text *Auto*ethnography was not an accepted approach within the Academy. Some of these commentators distinguish between the ethnographic nature of *Auto*ethnography and the (*Auto*) biographical nature of it. Reed-Danahay highlights the dual nature of *Auto*ethnography as both ethnography and life history.

For Reed-Danahay, a main characteristic of the *Auto*ethnographic perspective is that the *Auto*ethnographer is a boundary crosser, a role characterised by dual identity (Reed-Danahay,1997:3).

She recounts Karl Heider's essay in the *Journal of Anthropological Research* (1975:3) where he writes of 'Dani *Auto*-ethnography', whereby he asked 60 Dani school children questions, 'the simplest routine-eliciting technique imaginable', which resulted in their own *Auto*chthonous (indigenous view) accounts, their own ethnographies. Brandes (1982) focuses on Anthropologists uses of life history in the early 1980s. He distinguished between forms of life writing: 'ethnographic *Auto*biography', as a first-person narrative told by a commoner or ordinary person in society i.e. a non-Anthropologist and 'anthropological *Auto*biography', where the Anthropologist is the *Auto*biographical subject.

Norman Denzin (1989) distinguished several different forms of writing: *Auto*biography, ethnography, *Auto*ethnography, biography, ethnography story, oral history, case history, case study, life history, life story, self story, and personal experience story which he encapsulated into 'biographical method', citing Vincent Crapanzo's (1985) *Tuhami* as an example. For Denzin, the important characteristic of *Auto*ethnography is that the writer does not adopt the traditional convention of 'objective outsider' and incorporates elements of personal life experience when writing about others, further distinguishing it from straight ethnography, life history and *Auto*biography.

Philippe Lejeune (1989) in his essay 'Those Who Do Not Write' criticises outsider ethnography and is suspicious of the non-native ethnographer. Distinguishing between '*Auto*-ethnology' and 'ethno-biographer' he encourages development of both ethno-biography and *Auto*-ethnology as a method to avoid a gap or screen of ethnology as he sees it. These forms represent voices of peasants and working class, and deemed more authentic by comparison with the ethnologists' voice.

Subsequently, Alice Deck (1990) further distinguishes between the 'self reflexive field account', using Shostak's (1981) *Nisa: The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman* and the '*Auto*ethnography' using Zora Neale Hurston's (1942) *Dust Tracks On A Road* as respective examples of each. For Deck, the former employs a 'hierarchy of voices' referring to and relying on outside anthropological and historical sources to verify the indigenous voice. The latter, the *Auto*ethnographer, is the 'native expert', whose authentic first-hand knowledge of the culture lends sufficient authority to the text.

Reed-Danahay highlights John Van Maneen's view (1995:8-9) on new approaches to ethnography. He suggests four types of 'alternatives to ethnographic realism': (i)

'confessional ethnographies', where the focus is on the ethnographer (the signifier) and not the Natives (the signified) (ii) 'dramatic ethnography' (iii) 'critical ethnographies' using Willis (1977) *Learning to Labour* as an example (iv) self- or *Auto*-ethnographies "where the culture of one's own group is textualised" (Reed-Danahay, 1997:6). In *Auto*ethnographic writing such as this, the ethnographer becomes the native.

Presenting an entirely different perspective to *Auto*ethnography John Dorst, in his text, *The Written Suburb* (1989) represents a critique of ethnography from a non-anthropologist perspective. Dorst applies the term to art and craft materials, and objects produced in semi-rural Chester County, Pennsylvania. He suggests that they constitute both self-referentiality and self-inscription where he sees *Auto*ethnography as post-ethnography, aligning it as Reed-Danahay had with post modernism:

> if the task of ethnography can be described as the inscription and interpretation of culture, then post modernity seems to render the professional ethnographer superfluous… [in light of] the…impulse for self documentation and the reproduction of images of the self that pervade our every day practice (Dorst, 1989:3 cited in Reed-Danahay, 1997:8).

Dorst is suggesting that the role of the 'ethnographer' maybe redundant and proposing that tales, images and objects from within provide a deeper insight into social and cultural phenomena. This represents the challenge of ethnographic representations over self-representation.

Reed-Danahay develops further the idea of deeper insight into social and cultural phenomena from inside in the text, *Sites of Memory: Women's Autobiographies From Rural France,* (2002). This is a compilation of three narratives all exemplars of *Auto*ethnography. Reed-Danahay writes about the difference between the newly industrialised heavily unemployed France compared to past rural simplicity as seen through the lens of three elderly women, Antoinette, Emilie and Yvonne. Rural memoirs had become a cultural phenomenon, especially in France, in their own right and they are analogous with ethnographies as the writers are returning to a place of childhood as a 'foreigner'. Each woman's story demonstrates the cultural norms and practices with regard to education, employment, rural agricultural life versus urban life, marriage and children. Reed-Danahay points out how these stories continue to affect future generations, the lives of their daughters, granddaughters and great granddaughters.

It is interesting to note that both Mary Louise Pratt and Deborah Reed-Danahay are both interested in *Auto*ethnographic pedagogy, and how *Auto*ethnography improves education. This is further discussed in Chapter Eight. Comparably, Nina Panourgia's (2000)

review of Reed-Danahay's text takes issue with the title of the text and the combination of essays, suggesting they are mismatched, yet she uses them in her undergraduate classes and mentions how very well received they are by students. Later, in 2003, James Buzard notes that Robert Lowie (1937) also highlighted that Boas "encouraged the training of native anthropologists on the assumption... it was the trained native who could best interpret native life from within" (Buzard, 2003:66). Buzard's interest in 18th century novels consider how they are *Auto*ethnographic in their own right (See Chapter Seven).

New Period of Transition

Hence, though the conversation about *Auto*ethnography continued, and still does, one could say that it gathered its real momentum in response to Anthropology's 'Crisis in Representation' at the Postmodernist Reflexive Turn, as demonstrated by George E. Marcus and Michael M.J. Fischer in *Anthropology as Cultural Critique* (1986) and James Clifford and George E. Marcus *Writing Culture* (1986). These texts highlighted a general distrust of theories and ideologies as well as a problematical relationship with the notion of 'art'. Not for the first time did Anthropology experience such a dilemma. Anthropology had to weather a storm of accusations related to: its alignment with, or sponsorship by various governments; using Anthropological skills inappropriately to garner information; and consequently, for the purpose of taking advantage. The time was ripe for new opportunities in social science research to emerge. New emphasis wanted to resist colonialist sterile research, to resist impulses to enter a culture, exploit its members and then write about it for profit or personal academic accreditation without due consideration to its cultural members. Ever more frequently, Anthropologists and other social researchers contemplated their alliance with literature over physics, though Anthropology could satisfy scientific criteria encompassing the main tenets of science including systematic and objective rigorous and robust research approaches. Anthropologists/*Auto*ethnographers encounters are by their nature more closely tied to their informants, and consequently carry the weight of respect and consideration. The debate about whether Anthropology was a science or an art still ensued with resonances of Ruth Benedict's Science versus Humanist (1948) debate still lurking. This was not only the era of Post Modernism but Post Colonialism as well and it was at this time the empire began to write back.

Previously, in its attempts to become more 'scientific', Anthropology faced further criticisms. Debated issues included the nature of the reporting, and whether or not it was serious research or whether Anthropological research had gone too serious. Also questioned was how the essence of the research i.e. 'understanding human behaviour' from the perspective of self, was not research. In addition, the structure of the research had become

so pre-determined and methodical, as in Introduction, Literary Review, Method, Results and Conclusion, it has lost something of its original nature. At the time, positivism ruled; with emphasis placed on systematic data collection and traditional analysis, over imagination and storytelling. One can appreciate reservations about methodology and results particularly if policymaking and economic development are reliant on research results but the intellectual environment was changing under Post Modernist, Post Structuralist and Feminist influences which contested issues of authority, representation, voice and method.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to offer an insight, understanding and appreciation of what *Auto*ethnography is by locating it within its historical background, seeking to lay out the emergence of the concept and its definition in the context of Anthropology. I have presented some early-recorded ideas surrounding *Auto*ethnography from particular viewpoints in an effort to establish its background, and clarify what exactly it is, and its role and purpose within cultural critique and social understanding. As a derivative of ethnography, we can see that *Auto*ethnography is not simply a methodology or approach to the research of culture, but rather it is also a process, a form of presentation and a product. It is an alternative modus operandi and vivendi for the Anthropologist and other social scientists, which no longer confines them to researching 'other' cultures.

The next chapter will describe and examine new developments in *Auto*ethnography, New Wave *Auto*ethnography, which shows how the scope and use of *Auto*ethnography has developed and expanded even further to capture more diverse cultural phenomenon often overlooked because of their sensitive nature or because the Academy, through oversight, has not found space to appreciate them thus far.

Chapter Two: New Wave *Auto*ethnography (New Millennialism)

Something Missing

Where and why?
What is the problem?
I feel a need - that is not being met
Now, you might be wrong
I hear the tale you are telling
But it's impartial, incomplete
...something is missing.
(Anon., *Handbook of Autoethnography,* 2013:85).

Introduction

Building on the explanation of the origins of the concept of *Auto*ethnography, and the definition of the term in Chapter 1, this chapter will examine how *Auto*ethnography has evolved, expanded and diversified into what I call New Wave *Auto*ethnography. In the postmodern, poststructuralist epoch, but particularly in the New Millennium, *Auto*ethnography as a contemporary modern research approach, process, and method of presentation has evolved to include personal cultural phenomena not previously addressed. As Chapter 1 suggests *Auto*ethnography is about how people record and publish their own, and their community's everyday life from a personal, insider's perspective, in order to offer an understanding of their culture. In this manner, private lives are in the public sphere, where *Auto*ethnography is a combination of method, process and product simultaneously.

This chapter consists of three segments. The first segment will explain the reason for *Auto*ethnography's further development and expansion as an alternative method of research and presentation as described by its chief proponents and promoters. It will also identify *Auto*ethnography's characteristics, elements and features. The second segment will identify variations of *Auto*ethnography and the third will examine the process of compiling *Auto*ethnography in comparison with and contradistinction to Ethnography.

Section One: The Emergence of New Millennia
*Auto*ethnography

Historically, the personal subjective experience was systematically eradicated from human and social research over time, in response to calls for parallel methods of research in the natural sciences. Due to dominant cultural and political conditions, such as positivism, scientism and neo liberalism, something was lost. Geertz suggests that there was something going awry with research:

> We lack the language to articulate what takes place when we are in fact at work. There seems to be a genre missing (Geertz,1995:44).

From earlier days, Masters of Anthropology were critical and concerned that ethnography was the result of strict methodological intelligent empirical research. The conflict between Anthropologists and Sociologists centred on one groups wish to preserve the old ways, and the others to carry out scientific examinations of societies. Sociologists see societies as explainable through a universal law of human development; they are concerned with social welfare and progress and claim to predict the course of social change (Jackson: 1987:7). For a long time, Anthropology was the poor cousin of Sociology, as Gelya Frank noted

> There is an old joke about the place of Anthropology among the priorities of most universities: "Where is the anthropology department?" "Keep going till you find the oldest building on campus" (Frank,1996:210).

Contemporary Literary Criticism, Modernism and Deconstructionism insisted that texts be read/interpreted in an objective, cold and sterile way, often at the expense of the 'real' meaning and understanding. Emphasis focused on systematic data collection and traditional analysis, over imagination and storytelling. As a result, the person's value was often neglected in research and the personal circumstances of individuals within communities were unknown.

Meet Carolyn Ellis, Chief Proponent of New Wave Autoethnography

In 1995, Carolyn Ellis broke the mould and produced a classic *Auto*ethnographic text *Final Negotiations,* inserting herself as the main protagonist in the research, to highlight and address social and cultural issues. Hers is an example of the Personal Self –Reflective Experiential model (See Chapter 4 below). This was a new beginning in sociological research. Initially, Ellis had no mentors to emulate and found recognition and

acknowledgement for *Auto*ethnography challenging until she discovered likeminded colleagues such as Bochner, Denzin, Goodall, Allen, Pelias, Richardson, Holman-Jones and Adams who reassured her about the method. Collectively these academics were disillusioned and dissatisfied with strictly theoretical, formulaic mainstream academic literature because it failed to address issues within society in an accessible understandable fashion. Consequently, it was not applicable to living in the 'real' world; it could not address the purpose of their research satisfactorily or offer solutions or resolution to social issues. Ellis and Bochner (2000) felt that the limitations of ontological, epistemological and axiological questions of social science had increased; the master narrative had become defunct and a gap had emerged.

Bochner, Ellis and their academic colleagues trained in quantitative methods, which they felt failed to accommodate subjectivity, emotionality or the researcher's position within the research. Equally, their research did not appear relevant, nor practically applicable to ordinary life situations. Many questions remain unanswered satisfactorily by surveys or statistical analysis (Tullis, 2013:245). As Margaret Mead (1959) said of Boas' work 'the work was so technical that it tempted no humanist within its pages' (Mead, 1959: xvii). Almost 50 years later, Bochner (2013), a trained empiricist technician was 'Uncertain about how these skills could be applied in the real world of human communication' (Bochner, 2013:51). The view of 'something missing' is echoed by Kitrina Douglas and David Carless in the same volume, and is a current theme among those in favour of a more humanised approach to research:

> We are not alone in coming to the view that it is understandings about the subjective dimensions of personal experience that are missing from many existing academic texts-subjective dimensions that are best expressed through the personal voice (Douglas and Carless, 2013:88).

Ellis helped establish the *Auto*ethnographic movement in academia in response to this despondency. She applied *Auto*ethnography as a medium to explain/describe human behaviour and experience. Coming from a sociological background, she found

> *Auto*ethnography felt perfect to me... it combined interests in ethnography, social psychology of self and role taking, subjectivity and emotionality, face to face communication and interaction, writing as inquiry and evocation, storytelling, social work orientation toward social justice and giving back to the community (Ellis,2013:17).

In another context, Ellis said anecdotal evidence plays a big part in the delivery of lectures where the 'human story' impacts more when explaining some grand theory. It is worth noting that Ellis uses/recommends a number of novels for the purpose of her course, which discusses two of the most sensitive topics humankind has to endure: Illness and Loss, whether through bereavement or relationship break up. In introducing an undergraduate course

'Communicating Illness, Grief and Loss', she stated 'Human beings make sense of their experience through hearing and telling stories' (Ellis, 2006: Course Outline). As such, there was a 'reality clash'; a collision whereby readers found they were unable to assimilate the content of academic texts with reality, personal experience or life, as they knew it. The clash occurred because 'personal experience challenges theories, categories and interpretations' (Adams, 2013: 88). As C. Wright Mills (1959:5-6) stated

> the challenge is to develop a methodology that allows us to examine how the private troubles of individuals are connected to public issues and to public responses to these troubles (C. Wright Mills (1959) cited in Denzin, 2013:123).

The Walnut Creek Group

From the 1990s Ellis, her colleague and life partner Art Bochner, and their aforementioned colleagues, further distinguished *Auto*ethnography. These academics had/have most of their work published by Walnut Creek Left Coast Press Group, which is synonymous with the publication of *Auto*ethnographies and related material. As part of their work, Bochner and Ellis developed a research programme to mentor students in interpretive social science, which focused on narrative and *Auto*ethnography. As Douglas and Carless (2013) recognised there was a

> growing need to address, consider and include what is found to be missing from writings based solely on scientific research methods, the voice of personal experience (Douglas and Carless, 2013:89).

The Walnut Creek Group began to address Ruth Benedict's (1948) question in relation to the sciences and humanities, where they sought to make scholarship more useful, emotional and evocative. In her essay 'Writing Lives: Ruth Benedict's Journey from Biographical Studies to Anthropology' (2009) Judith Schachter recounts how it was a lifelong ambition of Benedict's to include biographical data in research so as to reflect a fuller understanding of individuals within society:

> proposing a new anthropology that would include the emotions, ethics, reasoning, and experiences of individuals ... the driving force of and individual trajectory informs the anthropologist's attempts to present the terms by which life is lived in diverse settings (Schachter, 2009:348).

In the more recent New Millennia *Auto*ethnographic context, a new relationship began to emerge between the author, the audience and the text, addressing the missing subjective dimensions from academic texts. The author was no longer 'dead' but was seen, appreciable and/or understood through his/her penmanship. A long-standing attraction of

*Auto*ethnography has been the linking of personal stories to broader cultural issues and scholarly literature; in this approach, stories are valued over theories. *Auto*ethnographies gave insight into situations not readily accessible, understandable or usually off limits to researchers. In the main, many *Auto*ethnographers focus on Self-ethnography 'One Studying *Oneself* within One's Own Culture' (my emphasis) and fail to differentiate between Anthropology's definitions of *Auto*ethnography, 'One Studying One's Own Culture', i.e. the insider responding to the outsider (though it is not necessarily confined to a response to an outsider view). Thus, for them, *Auto*ethnography was/is not merely a response to a critique of a culture; rather it establishes a focus on a particular element/phenomenon within society as experienced by the individual. Through *Auto*ethnography, the Anthropological philosophy that we come to know ourselves through knowing others is reversed almost. In *Auto*ethnography, through understanding the particular we can come to understand the general: micro/macro, local/universal. Evocative *Auto*ethnographers view *Auto*ethnography as not simply a research method but 'a way of being' in the world, in a sense existential and philosophical. Ellis suggests that:

> *Auto*ethnography is not simply a way of knowing about the world; *it has become a way of being in the world*, one that requires living consciously, emotionally and reflectively (Ellis, 2013:10. Emphasis added).

Establishing an Autoethnographic Mode of Inquiry

In its infancy, New Modern *Auto*ethnography had no strict methodological criteria to follow, and many new *Auto*ethnographer's writings followed heart and instinct. Previously, in ethnography, clear institutional research guidelines were in place: the who; the what; the where; the when; and the how one goes about research, especially where it was in receipt of funding. For *Auto*ethnography, conventional ways of doing/thinking about research were restrictive, limiting and sometimes parochial. Innovative thinking was unwelcome. The lack, however, of an agreed methodological approach resulted to some extent in a lack of clarity with regards *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry. In the first instance, *Auto*ethnographic Inquirers resembled 'eclectic bricoleurs', drawing upon a range of materials like personal memories and musings, along with objective data like field notes and informant interviews. *Auto*ethnographers collate and interpret data in different ways, often using improvisation, experimentation and alternate methods as they proceed. Secondly, they do not conform to traditional social science journal article structure. Because of its innovativeness *Auto*ethnographic methodology was and still is difficult to identify, recognise, label and categorise. *Auto*ethnography requires additional ways of doing and presenting research within a performative social science approach. Until recently, literature on *Auto*ethnographic Methodological Inquiry was limited, though a number of rich *Auto*ethnographic texts now

exist. These texts tend to blend methodological description into the main narrative, if addressing method at all:

> *Auto*ethnographic inquiry is guided less by specific techniques of data collection than it is by a set of ethical, aesthetic and related sensitivities that can be ... incorporated into a wide variety of *Auto*ethnographic modes of inquiry (Ellis, 2013:65).

As such, *Auto*ethnography shatters prevailing perceptions of what Cultural Anthropologists do because *Auto*ethnography is a combination of *Auto*biographical personal narrative with ethnography. A key feature of *Auto*ethnography is its methodological openness (Holman-Jones et al., 2013:64-65). It requires non-scientific qualities such as evocative and engaging aesthetics using 'account/narrative telling conventions' (Ellis et al., 2011:10). The very notion of 'account/narrative telling conventions' raised concerns for early Anthropologists, scientists and researchers, because immediately they associated it with fiction, untruths or fabrications. This was at odds with the search for truth which is paramount to the researcher; anything that deviates from that causes concern. Yet, cultures were built on oral traditions, which are essential for cultural aspects and facets. As Mary Louise Pratt indicated, few within the regime could handle the chaos or deal with the status quo being disrupted (1990:36). Given its disruptive potential it is hardly surprising that *Auto*ethnography was not wholly accepted as a genre within the canon, for some time (Ellis et al., (2011). Equally, like many before them, over different periods within different genres, they were challenging of 'the canon' where canonical forms may have emerged from white, masculine, heterosexual, mid/upper class, Christian, able bodied perspectives suggesting hegemony, patriarchy, authoritarianism and superiority (Ellis et al., 2011:4).

In 2006, Leon Anderson in an essay titled 'Analytic *Auto*ethnography' introduces five key features of Analytic *Auto*ethnography 1) Complete Member Research 2) Analytic Reflexivity 3) Narrative visibility of researchers' self 4) Dialogue with informants beyond self and 5) Commitment to Theoretical Analysis which are largely adapted from Hayano (1979) and later largely reconstituted in association with Glass-Coffin (2013). Below I will examine those reconstituted key features more closely but some of Anderson's features are worth noting here. Complete Member Research is how the researcher is a complete member in the social world under study. Adler & Adler (1987) further distinguished researchers into two types, 'opportunists or converts'. The 'opportunist', is someone born into a group or thrown in by chance circumstance, or has acquired intimate familiarity, through occupational, recreational or lifestyle participation; "in each case membership precedes the decision to conduct research on the group". The 'convert', is one who begins with a pure data–oriented research interest in the setting, but becomes converted to complete immersion and membership during the course of the research. Analytic Reflexivity involves introspection in

an effort to understand the self and others by examining one's own actions and perceptions in comparison with and to others. Narrative visibility of the researcher's self is where the researcher is highly visible in the text. Dialogue with informants beyond self, suggests the research is not simply about the researcher but an engagement and dialogue with others pertaining to the research. This is accomplished by addressing encounters between narrator ((*Auto*)-ethnographer) and members of the studied group. Commitment to Theoretical Analysis suggests the research further contributes to revisions of theoretical understanding and the analysis intersects with analysis of patterns and processes.

Expanding on this, in 2011, Carolyn Ellis, Tony E. Adams and Arthur P. Bochner produced an article titled '*Auto*ethnography: An Overview' whereby they encapsulated the evolvement of *Auto*ethnography, cataloguing the process, potentials, issues and criticisms culminating a collection of ideas on *Auto*ethnography from many and various contributors in the previous ten years. Referring to Ellis, 2004 and Holman-Jones, 2005, they defined *Auto*ethnography as

> an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyse (*graphy*) personal experience (*Auto*) in order to understand cultural experience (*ethno*) (Ellis et al., 2011:1. Emphasis in original).

*Auto*ethnography is a re-enactment of an experience shared with readers evoking empathy where Ellis suggests empathy brings a text to life, and highlights the role and importance of the interpretive community. *Auto*ethnography is about alerting readers to experiences previously shrouded in silence: about identity politics, the passive vs. the active researcher, and the questioning of how involved, if involved at all, an Anthropologist/researcher should be. With *Auto*ethnography, the goal was/is to produce meaningful, accessible and evocative research, which not only acknowledges but values personal experience. This is sensitising research; it is not just about observing but rather it concerns understanding and feeling, creating forms of representation that deepen empathetic capacity (Ellis et al.,2011:3). Similarly, purpose is at the heart of *Auto*ethnography and it is this key point that distinguishes it fundamentally from *Auto*biography. *Auto*ethnography aims to practice aesthetic and evocative 'thick descriptions' of both personal and interpersonal experience accomplished through discerning patterns of cultural experience described via facets of storytelling and evidenced via field notes and interviews (Geertz,1973).

Skill Set of Autoethnographer

*Auto*ethnography requires a certain type of person with particular skills and approaches, because in some cases the work is draining, emotionally and psychologically. *Aut*oethnographers, due to their various approaches and use of accessible prose, make

personal experience and cultural experience engaging, thus appealing to a wider, more diverse audience often disregarded by traditional, conventional or presentational research methods. In producing accessible work and texts, and in making the personal experience meaningful and available for consideration, they are illuminating, illustrating and highlighting many dark silent secret cultural phenomena of society; the things that are often ignored, hidden, submerged and subverted. Some *Auto*ethnographers address issues not openly dealt with previously or with such intimacy in academia e.g. personal relationships; domestic abuse; homophobia; eating disorders: father/son relationships: adoption and looking after elderly parents or other silent or quiet cultural phenomena. Edwin Ardener spoke of the 'muted groups' within society who are silenced by structures of dominance (Ardener, 1975b: 21-23); *Auto*ethnographers represent these 'muted groups'. Ellis tells how her life has been enriched through *Auto*ethnography because *Auto*ethnography breaks silences and it addresses issues often neglected (Holman-Jones et al, 2013:35-36). *Auto*ethnographers feel by writing about these experiences, they are 'writing to right' (Bolen, 2012 cited in Holman-Jones et al., 2013:36).

Key Elements Features, and Characteristics of Autoethnographic Inquiry

In 2013, the Walnut Creek Group amplified and refined the ideas of Ellis, Adams and Bochner (2011) in the *Handbook of Autoethnography,* further explaining the aims and purposes and process of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry. To achieve their aim, they also integrated features shared by various practitioners and critics of *Auto*ethnography (Denzin, 2006; Anderson, 2006; Ellis and Bochner, 2000; and Hayano, 1979), in an effort to contribute to *Auto*ethnography's establishment and recognition within academia, to provide some authority and credibility to *Auto*ethnographers' existence, their methodology and contribution to research. They accomplished this through analysing and establishing criteria that makes *Auto*ethnographers work identifiable and classifiable as research. These collated criteria appear to have been reformatted, adapted and re-titled to fit into the characteristic features of *Auto*ethnography.

Factors contributing to formation of Autoethnography

The Walnut Creek Group identified four interrelated historical trends, which contributed to the formation of *Auto*ethnography. They are: i) the recognition of the limits of scientific knowledge i.e. the science versus humanities, quantitative over qualitative,

subjective versus objective research debate; ii) the heightened concern about ethics and the politics of research; iii) the greater recognition and appreciation for literary and aesthetic narrative, emotions and the body as sources of research, and iv) methods of representation and the increased importance of social identities and identity politics. (Holman-Jones et al., 2013:25).

Additionally they noted the purposes of *Auto*ethnography, which are summarised here: 1) to disrupt norms of research practices and representation: 2) to work from insider knowledge illustrating personal hidden nuances to answer questions, by obtaining information hardly achievable via traditional methods 3) to manoeuvre through pain, confusion, anger and uncertainty, towards making life better 4) to break silences, reclaim voice, write to right 5) to make work accessible (Holman-Jones et al., 2013:32-36).

Defining Features of *Auto*ethnography

The Walnut Creek Group also highlighted defining characteristics and features of *Auto*ethnography. The main characteristic that binds all *Auto*ethnographers is the use of personal experience to examine/critique cultural experience, and to purposefully comment and critique culture and cultural practices. Other characteristics include embracing vulnerability with purpose; to contribute to existing research; and to create a reciprocal relationship with the audience, compelling a response. Anderson and Glass-Coffin (2013) labelled the varying modes of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry as follows: Visibility of Self, Strong Reflexivity, Engagement, Vulnerability and Open-endedness or Rejection of Finality and Closure (Holman-Jones et al., 2013:22). In examining these features, we find overlapping, intertwining and interdependency, as the elements are contingent upon each other. To fully appreciate Anderson and Glass-Coffin's five modes of inquiry, and how *Auto*ethnography is contingent upon them, we will now look at them separately.

Visibility of Self

Visibility of Self became the hallmark of *Auto*ethnographic writing. It is essential to *Auto*ethnography Inquiry, both in the research and the writing (Meneley and Young, 2005). *Auto*ethnography departs from or may be similar or at total variance to traditional ethnography in terms of structure and format where boundaries become blurred by calling into play, implicating and establishing the place of the personal. Heretofore, due to 'professionalism' the ethnographer remained outside the paradigm. Within *Auto*ethnography the 'I' emerged, was foregrounded and became central to the dialogue with the emergence of sub categories such as 'Self-ethnography' i.e. work focusing on personal social cultural dilemmas/phenomena, and *Auto*phenomenology, (Allen-Collinson, 2013), work focusing on

deeply personal emotional phenomenon. In *Auto*ethnography, the writer's subjective experience contributes to the final analysis, as he/she becomes a primary participant, reflecting on daily experiences, situations, cultural phenomenon and attitudes within a specific culture, as opposed to remaining neutral and objective. The depth to which the individual and his/her experience appear in *Auto*ethnography varies and depends on the topic. In *Auto*ethnography, the 'I' changes by the inquiry, is both actor and agent, acting and reacting visibly to the implications of the study. Though the 'I' appears to be in control it is only through framing by the 'Other' that it exists at all. In *Auto*ethnography, both the researcher and reader share responsibility. There is a combination of inward/outward experience for both (emic/etic). The researcher shares the inward experience with the reader, making it outward. The researcher reflects on, and the reader empathises with the writing, considering how these experiences connect with his or her own. In other words, the reader reflects on the reflexive writing of the researcher. This is most notable and understood in reader-response criticism (Iser, 1978; Fish, 1980; Tomkins, 1980). Aestheticism and evocativeness, as components of *Auto*ethnography, stem from 'showing' and 'bringing the reader into scene' particularly through thoughts, emotions and actions, to experience an experience (Ellis et al., 2011:12). Relevant to the 'I' in *Auto*ethnography, is connection, position and context rather than separation. As Ellis (2004), in *The Ethnographic I: a methodological novel about Autoethnography*, explains:

> [t]he Ethnographic I is very visible and multifocal in its meaning. The 'I' of the researcher is made visible in the research process. 'I' that not only looks, but is looked back at, that not only acts but is acted upon, by those in her focus (Ellis, 2004: xix).

Strong Reflexivity

Strong reflexivity is the second fundamental characteristic and a central dimension of *Auto*ethnography, both for researcher and recipient. The term came from Mc Corkel and Myers (2003). The use of the word strong suggests a deep thoughtful approach to the subject under study, and its impact on both researcher and audience. Reflexivity became a buzzword within social science research, but has a multiplicity of often-ambiguous meanings (Anderson, Glass-Coffin, 2013:72). Charlotte Davis (1999) notes that:

> In its most transparent guise, reflexivity expresses researchers' awareness of their necessary connection to the research situation and hence their effects upon it...*and it on them* (Davis, 1999:7. Emphasis added).

In *Auto*ethnography, researchers' reflexivity is conspicuous, dualist, reciprocal and cyclical. The common strategy in writing strong reflexivity involves describing and reflecting on one's self experience at different points in time. Strong reflexivity entails self-conscious introspection; the intention of the research is to understand better both the self and others,

through self-examination of one's actions and perceptions with reference to and in dialogue with those of others. Reflexivity is about not only the researcher's connection to the research situation and how it is used, but also the effects of the situation, the research and the outcome on both the researcher and the reader. The researcher, in addressing a deeply reflected upon issue, is saying what s/he sees and feels and writing about the impact of the issue and the research. *Auto*ethnographers use their experience among others, and their knowledge of others to develop knowledge of self (Davis, 1999). *Auto*ethnographers frame their accounts with personal self-reflexive views, which form part of the representational process. Reflexivity further extends to the reader. Strong reflexivity is reciprocal between *Auto*ethnographers, their environment and other participants in the research. As Dutta and Basu (2013) remark, *Auto*ethnography is a process of endless reflection, a reflection on reflexivity to the point of deconstructing oneself and one's text (Dutta and Basu, 2013:157).

Keith Berry, (2013) recognised reflexivity as both a contested concept and methodological strategy. Reflexivity is constant self-questioning, of oneself, oneself within the research, oneself within the cultural phenomenon discussed, and one's relationships with others. In this context, reflexivity forms part of cultural critique. Echoing Pratt, Berry states: 'Working reflexively can be complex, knotty and uncomfortable (Berry, 2013: 211). Equally, this method of research may resurrect unpleasant experiences, which challenges psychologically or emotionally, and the researcher questions: "do I really want to go there?' The reflexive potential in *Auto*ethnographies is the tackling of difficult issues such as 'coming out', pressures of ambivalent pregnancy, hardship post economic recession and personal secrets such as bulimia or anorexia to name but a few (Berry, 2013). As Berry says: '*Auto*ethnographers have made available cultural portraits previously unavailable and, at times, unimaginable' (Berry, 2013:214). *Auto*ethnography may also lead to researcher transformation (Berry, 2013:214-223). It lends itself to a better understanding and appreciation of certain cultural phenomenon 'in revealing and prioritising how one moves through culture', not only for the researcher but also for the reader. Where this is no longer avoided or disdained, clarity emerges and a certain amount of peace is ascertained (Berry, 2013:212). Self-reflexivity as a component of *Auto*ethnography testifies that *Auto*ethnography is anything but objectivist. *Auto*ethnography is about exploring the unthinkable and offers much by way of conciliation and coming to terms with life issues for many:

> The possibility for change, the chance to understand ourselves more closely, and to re-reflect on what was, and who we once were, in contrast to what is and who we are now, is one of *Auto*ethnography's greatest gifts (Berry, 2013:216).

Engagement

Engagement within *Auto*ethnography is a process by which the *Auto*ethnographer is thoroughly involved in the research; crosses borders and intersects with binary opposites such as self/other, insider/outsider, and native/colonialist. Through engagement the *Auto*ethnographer negotiates with and becomes (or is) part of a theme. *Auto*ethnographic research calls for personal engagement as a medium, rejecting the distinction between objective and subjective. There is the conflict between 'staying out' of the research and participating. If working from 'outside' the researcher is not in a position to comment or criticise, but if working 'within the research', the *Auto*ethnographer may contribute by reflecting and contributing own experience. Engagement also requires the researcher, as agent of knowledge, presenting the results of the research to the investigated or represented individuals or communities and being placed along the same critical plain as the object of inquiry. Feminist methodologists suggest researchers should have the same level of scrutiny directed towards them as is directed towards subjects of inquiry (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013:73). Engaged research may be very rewarding but can also be very risky (See Chapter 7).

> *Auto*ethnographic inquiry calls for personal engagement as a medium through which deeper understanding is achieved and communicated (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013:74).

Vulnerability

Vulnerability is a crucial feature of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry. There is no one concise definition of 'vulnerability' within *Auto*ethnography but it certainly involves the author being willing to embrace exposure (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013), to open up to the world (Douglas, 2013) and intertwine his/her life with others (Ellis, 2013) with no shields or guards or guarantees of protection or retraction. The purpose of vulnerability within *Auto*ethnography coincides with one of the purposes of *Auto*ethnography in general 'to manoeuvre through pain, confusion, anger and uncertainty towards making life better' (Holman-Jones et al., 2013:34). In *Auto*ethnography, the author is exposed to vulnerability on two fronts. The first is the researcher's personal vulnerability, the exposure of the element of the personal experience. *Auto*ethnographers embrace vulnerability with a purpose, sometimes intentionally, though not exclusively. They present themselves as a vulnerable subject, disclosing secrets and personal histories, in order to create or contribute understanding towards an improved society and/or to make personal and social change possible. The creation of a reciprocal relationship compels and evokes a response, which entices the audience to consider and reflect on the issue raised. Evocative *Auto*ethnography is successful when it is both evocative and emotionally compelling, and readers are touched by what they read. In this way, *Auto*ethnographers open themselves to criticisms of narcissism and self-

indulgence, which leads to the second front on which the *Auto*ethnographer is vulnerable: the second is 'external' vulnerability within academia, relating to one's career, progress and development, and the vulnerability of others, those related to and implied in the research (See Chapter 7).

Open-endedness/rejection of finality and closure

Open-endedness/rejection of finality and closure is an important feature of *Auto*ethnography because *Auto*ethnography is not a maths formula; there is no '*quod erat demonstrandum'*. *Auto*ethnography represents understandings and insights captured at a point in temporal socio-cultural contexts and portrays the 'processual nature of social life' (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013:78). Social life, identities and relationships are fluid not static with constant evolution and change. *Auto*ethnography's resistance to finality/closure is reflective of the conception of self and society as relational and processual. The mutuality of the writing, the combination of self and society at a particular moment opens onto a 'panoramic, albeit unlimited future of possibilities' (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013:78). Brett Smith (1999) in describing his battle with depression explained there was no 'transcendent epiphany' or 'no Phoenix to rise from the ashes, no neat and tidy ending' (Smith, 1999: 274). Dutta and Bassu write of the (im-) possibilities of representation and the 'inevitable realisation of the incompleteness written into politics of representation' (Dutta and Basu, 2013:159). *Auto*ethnography is a vignette of a particular experience at a particular moment in time; we cannot tell the whole story at once and we can never know the end of each of our stories. There is no finality or conclusions, because human beings and life stories cannot be corralled into tidy corners. The informal nature of (*Auto*) ethnographical research makes it boundless and timeless. Usually the *Auto*ethnographer is referring to a particular episode in a lifetime. As a project, it has to be squared off, otherwise it never ends. This emulates another characteristic of *Auto*ethnography in that it defies closure. That is both the nature and the beauty of *Auto*ethnography as we find ourselves wanting to know what happens next or what happened before. It is a continuum.

> In scholarship, scepticism, premise of doubt, a condition of vulnerability or openness is a way of assuming responsibility - closure should not come too quickly (Strathern, 2006:533).

Having recounted the reasons for the emergence of New Wave *Auto*ethnography, its aims, objectives and purposes, and identifying characteristics and features, and subsequently the modes of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry in this section, the following section will identify and distinguish various approaches associated with the process of *Auto*ethnography.

Section Two: Sub divisions within *Auto*ethnography

Depending on the purpose and objective of the research, *Auto*ethnographers employ alternative approaches pertaining to the characteristics and features of *Auto*ethnography, such as Analytic *Auto*ethnography; Evocative *Auto*ethnography; Interpretive *Auto*ethnography; Collaborative *Auto*ethnography; Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography; Feminist *Auto*ethnography and Performative *Auto*ethnography.

*Auto*ethnographers deploy a different medium, depending on which message they wish to send. In typical *Auto*ethnographic fashion, there may be crossover and blend in the various methods of presentation used within *Auto*ethnography. The forms differ with regard to the issue being researched, the emphasis placed on the study of others, and the viewpoint towards the issue. Also important are: the researcher's 'self' within the paradigm; the researcher's interaction with others; traditional analysis; the interview context and power relationships. Previously in ethnography, accounts were told or translated with the Anthropologist giving voice to the raconteur; in *Auto*ethnography, the raconteur uses his/her own voice. In *Auto*ethnography within different contexts, various methods of inquiry and presentation are employed/applied such as Indigenous/Native Ethnographies, Narrative Ethnographies, Reflexive Ethnographies, Reflexive Dyadic Interviews, Interactive Interviews, Community *Auto*-ethnographies, Co-constructed Narratives, Layered Accounts, and finally Personal Narratives/accounts (testimonies) (Ellis and Bochner, 2011:15-24). These will become clearer as we examine each approach and what they mean separately.

Analytic Autoethnography

In 2006 Leon Anderson, as afore mentioned, in his essay 'Analytic *Auto*ethnography' distinguishes between Analytic *Auto*ethnography and Evocative *Auto*ethnography. Analytic *Auto*ethnography is likely to articulate an explicit methodology, tending to focus on issues of research other than self-focused inquiry. Analytic *Auto*ethnography tends to be utilised and published more frequently in Anthropology. Analytic *Auto*ethnography uses Narrative Ethnographies which are texts presented as stories incorporating the ethnographers experience into ethnographic descriptions and analysis of 'others' (Ellis et al., 2011:17). For Anderson, Evocative *Auto*ethnography emerged as a response to postmodern sensibilities and its 'advocates distance themselves from realist and analytic ethnographic traditions':

> The dominance of evocative *Auto*ethnography has obscured recognition of the compatibility of *Auto*ethnographic research with more traditional ethnographic practices (Anderson, 2006:373).

Evocative Autoethnography

Evocative *Auto*ethnography as a method of research examines and presents social trauma, which may or may not be culturally invoked. It can help one (the researcher) come to terms with and appreciate one's position. It can assist someone else (the reader) come to terms with his or her own situation. It is a way of manoeuvring through pain, confusion, anger, uncertainty with a view to making life better:

> Personal stories become vehicles for social critiques through which readers gain understandings of *Auto*ethnographers' social realities and of the social forces contextualising their experiences (Chang, 2013:109).

*Auto*ethnographers in writing Evocative *Auto*ethnography tend to use Personal Narratives/Accounts (testimonies), (Ellis et al., 2011:24). The authors tend to view themselves and/or their experience as the phenomenon, and write evocative narratives specifically focused on academic research and personal lives. Personal narratives propose to understand a self and some aspects of a life as it intersects with a cultural context. They connect to other participants as co-researchers. They invite readers into the author's world, to use and reflect upon what they learn in order to understand and cope with their own lives (Ellis, 2004:46). Evocative *Auto*ethnography is contingent on the reciprocal element of the features of *Auto*ethnography in that it draws the reader (audience) in, evoking a response. Another form of presentation and research are Reflexive Dyadic Interviews (Ellis et al., 2011:18). These focus on interactively produced meanings and the emotional dynamics of the interview itself. However, the focus lies with the participant and his/her account/narrative with the words, thoughts and feelings of the researcher considered, e.g. personal motivation for doing project, knowledge of topic under discussion, emotional response to interview. Most notable is the way the interviewer changes during the process. While the researcher's experience is not necessarily the central topic, their personal reflection contributes context and layers to the participants' stories (Ellis, 2004:61-63). Evocative *Auto*ethnographers also use Reflexive Ethnography to document the ways fieldwork changes them as researchers. Reflexive Narrative Ethnography coexists on a continuum with the ethnographer's personal biography, and their ethnographic study of cultural members' lives. These emerge as memoir or what Van Maneen (1988) refers to as 'confessional tales'. These forms of *Auto*ethnography are often controversial for traditional social scientists, especially when not connected to scholarly literature, or accompanied by traditional analysis.

Interpretive Autoethnography

Interpretive *Auto*ethnography as defined by Norman Denzin (2014,2013) is a research method that interrogates a memory that surfaces for a subject and requires examination in order that the subject understands better their contemporaneous place in life. The subject matter of Interpretive *Auto*ethnography is 'meaningful biographical experience'. The basic features of this approach are: lives, performance, representation, epiphany and interpretation (Denzin, 2013:126). The context of Denzin's 'sting of memory' may be more closely associated to Self-Ethnography rather than *Auto*ethnography, where the personal experience is the cultural phenomenon. Interpretive *Auto*ethnography is a process and/or performance where someone in the course of living experiences a 'sting of memory' (flashback) which can be unsettling and raises questions. In many ways, it is introspective interpretation of a personal experience. Denzin and others also call the 'sting of memory' an epiphany; a moment of great revelation; a significant moment that impacts the trajectory of life forcing one to re-examine life after a crisis or experience when life is/was no longer the same and thus revealing ways to understand and negotiate situations. Another way of viewing epiphanies is to see them as small dramatic social events, which represent ruptures in the structure of daily life. An epiphany/event is a mundane or unremarkable event that somehow cuts to the inner core, leaving an indelible mark. Such experiences affect people at different levels. On the surface level, they may be hardly noticeable. At a deeper level, the experience, like flashes of memory, can leave someone vulnerable, 'knocked for six', disoriented. A 'liminal phase' follows the epiphany, where the sting is examined/interpreted and put to rest. Liminality relates to a transitional stage, like bordering two plains simultaneously, belonging to neither one nor the other:

> liminal phase of experience is a kind of no person's land, on the edge of what is possible, betwixt and between, the structural past and structural future (Broadhurst, 1999 cited in Holman-Jones et al., 2013:132).

Interpretive *Auto*ethnography examines the epiphany and interrogates it, in order to make sense of it and its impact. The interrogation/interpretation of the sting/epiphany leads to an understanding of a cultural condition that contributed to it. Denzin explains how one negotiates liminality using Victor Turner's (1986) Processual Ritual Model: breach, crisis, redress, reintegration or schism. (Introspective) Interpretive *Auto*ethnography is the method of negotiating these existential turning points or liminality. It can be both analytic and evocative, as the biographical experience explains a social or personal phenomenon, which also reflects society at a particular time. *Auto*ethnographies are narratives people tell one another to make sense of these epiphanies or existential turning points. An example could be domestic abuse see Tamas (2011) *Life after leaving: The remains of spousal abuse*.

Denzin elaborates further, and associates and includes with Interpretive *Auto*ethnography or other variations of *Auto*ethnography the 'mystory', ('mystery'?) as opposed to history. For Denzin, 'mystory' is a combination of personal mythology, a public story, a personal narrative and a performance that critiques (Denzin, 2013:133). The researcher reflects on a personal experience and shares it as part of the *Auto*ethnographic process. The 'mystory' forms part of a critique process. First, you have the critique of the researcher, then the critique of the reader and subsequently it becomes a critique of a social phenomenon or society. The emphasis is not simply on reading the text but the exchange, the participation (the engagement) of both reader and researcher. The 'mystory' has all the elements of narrative whereupon the researcher has to devise a narrative framework. It contains the plot, setting, characters and characterisation, temporality, dialogue, protagonists, and antagonists. The 'mystory' is comparable with popular culture, whereupon anxieties and fears about an existing social order or problem are addressed. A component of Interpretive *Auto*ethnography that coincides with other *Auto*ethnographic formats is the commitment to social justice. It can be a tool documenting oppression and for making oppressive structures of culture visible. The 'mystory' functions both as inquiry and as critique, culminating in a political aspiration that the social order has to change if problems are ever to be resolved:

> There is a political component to Interpretive *Auto*ethnography, a commitment to a social justice agenda - to inquiry that explicitly addresses issues of inequity and injustice in particular social moments and places... if status quo is maintained, if actors change and not the social order then systemic processes that produce problems remain – problems are still produced. We are left then with just our stories (Denzin, 2013:125-134).

Thus, *Auto*ethnography moves between the personal, biographical, political and historical. Potential gifts of *Auto*ethnography are release, freedom, empowerment and love. Though *Auto*ethnographic risk can be very high, (hence the vulnerability), the payoff can be to move forward, find new spaces, new identities, new relationships, new radical forms of scholarship and new epiphanies.

Collaborative Autoethnography

Collaborative *Auto*ethnography or 'Co-scripted' *Auto*ethnography is similar to collaborative ethnography in that more than one voice speaks. The focus of the research is normally a social phenomenon personally experienced jointly. Formerly, in collaborative ethnography, the researcher voiced the experience of the participant but the participant's voice was more important. Heewon Chang (2013) writes of the complexities and difficulties as a participant in Collaborative *Auto*ethnography. She explains how as a method Collaborative (*Auto*) ethnography can be hugely problematic, as it involves constant

consultation and negotiation to ensure the contributors are on the same page. The method uses Interactive Interviews that provide

> an in depth and intimate understanding of people's experiences with emotionally charged and sensitive topics (Ellis et al., 1997:121).

Interactive interviews are collaborative endeavours between researchers and participants, where the research activity probes issues that transpire in conversations about particular topics e.g. eating disorders, drug addiction, sexual and other abuses, effect of government policies. They differ from one on one interviews with a stranger, in that, they consist of multiple interview sessions, and are located within the context of emerging and well-established relationships among/between interviewer and participant.

Collaborative *Auto*ethnography is also known as Community *Auto*ethnographies, which use the personal experience of researchers-in-collaboration with other community members to illustrate how a community manifests particular social/cultural issues e.g. whiteness, racism, classism, inequality, discrimination. Community *Auto*ethnographies facilitate 'community building' research practices and provide opportunities for social cultural intervention. An example of this is Dutta and Bassu's (2013) experience of academia from a Third World perspective in the First world realm, who coincidently describes Postcolonial *Auto*ethnography (See Below).

Co-constructed Narratives are another example of Collaborative *Auto*ethnographies, which illustrate meanings of relational experiences, how people cope with ambiguities, uncertainties and contradictions of being friends, family and/or intimate partners. These *Auto*ethnographies work within a closer more intimate, personal paradigm than community does. These narratives view relationships as jointly authored, incomplete and historically situated affairs. Joint activity structures co-constructed research based in or about an epiphany or experience with each participant writing his/her own experience, followed by sharing and reacting to the account/narrative of the other. An example of this is Ellis and Bochner co-constructed narrative on their personal experience of abortion (Ellis and Bochner, 1992).

Layered Accounts are similar to Collaborative *Auto*ethnography but the research departs in a different direction. Layered Accounts focus on the authors' experiences in conjunction with data, abstract analysis and relevant literature. In other words, the engagement is with other forms of literature, one's own thoughts intermingling with what others have written on the topic. The procedural nature of research is emphasised in this

form. Layered accounts illustrate how 'data collection and analysis proceed simultaneously', and are similar to grounded theory (Charmaz,1993). They frame existing research as the 'source of questions and comparisons' and not measures of truth. Layered accounts conceive of identity as an 'emergent process' and they consider evocative concrete texts to be as important as abstract analysis (Rambo, 1995).

> In revealing through research and evocative writing the humanity that we share, personal insights and understandings may resonate for others so that the private, which has been made public, becomes an opportunity to enhance the lives of others as well as the self (Foster, Mc Allister and O'Brien, 2006:50 cited in Dutta and Bassu, 2013:149).

Post Colonial Autoethnography

Post Colonial Autoethnography is an extension or derivative of post colonial studies and post colonial ethnography with the added dimension of a researcher describing how post coloniality not only affected one's own culture but how one was personally affected. Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography examines both the impact of colonialism and the impact of its disbandment, from an insider's (colonist's) perspective. Post Colonialism emerged and was established within the theoretical/methodical academic realm, in literature, in response to how the colonised felt when the colonisers departed, and how they were culturally represented in literature:

> Post colonialism refers to social, economic, political and cultural practices which arise in response to resistance to colonialism, where colonialism or the colonial project can be explained as the paradigm of "representing the 'other' as inferior and radically different, and hence incorrigibly inferior" (Chatterjee, 1993:33 cited in Basu, 2013:147).

Post colonial political history has shown how cultural knowledge was manipulatively erased through programmes of white privilege via colonialism, under the guise of altruism. Post-colonial scholarship distinguishes a number of perspectives. Firstly, there are post-colonial studies including post-colonial histories, describing and explaining both the impact of colonialism and how things stood as the empire began to disband. Secondly, the scholarship that responds to the way colonists are/were represented in texts. Thirdly, the scholarship which describes life, after the colonialists had departed, and finally, the scholarship that describes what it is like for individuals who emigrated to other continents, but nonetheless are still part of a postcolonial culture. The Post Colonial *Auto*ethnographic method or scholarship of the postcolonial individual as Archana Pathak (2013) notes:

> allows the *Auto*ethnographer to analyse her/him self as both subject of study and as product of larger social, political and cultural systems (Pathak, 2013:595).

There is a distinction between Post Colonial *Auto*ethnographic literature and early Post Colonial English literature. The former has the personal experience at the centre of the research, and usefully describes how a post colonist might feel or think. The latter includes works such as Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* (1958), Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1994[1902]) and Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), which opened up this realm for research, in explaining what colonialism was, and how it was perceived by both colonised and coloniser.

In Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography, the researcher is both subject of study and researcher as in Said's memoir *Out of Place* (1999). Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography serves to reveal and disrupt dominant structures of oppression. It highlights that the process of knowledge production requires constant scrutiny to ensure scholarship does not reproduce systems it seeks to dismantle. Pathak (2013) suggests *Auto*ethnography challenges Imperialism on two fronts; the Imperialist Regime which dominated both societies and cultures for many years and the Scientific Imperialism of the academy, which is to be objective and maintain distance from the object of study. Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography, as does most *Auto*ethnography, speaks for and to those on the margins. It centres knowledge in self-narrative permitting individual stories to serve as social critique, especially the impact of various policies and institutions. The *Auto*ethnographer is possessor of the discordant voice, which does not easily blend with that of the mainstream. In many situations, Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography is pointing out the obvious but often remains imperceptible because of strictures and structures in place. The Post Colonial *Auto*ethnographic Turn facilitates Post Colonial subjects to make sense of the power and politics imbued in their culture through their academic work. Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography is written from the standpoint of the post colonial subject, and from within the postcolonial marginalised context.

Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography further describes postcolonial positionality as explained in a co-scripted essay (Collaborative *Auto*ethnography) 'Negotiating our Post Colonial Selves, from the ground to the Ivory Tower', by Mohan J. Dutta and Ambar Basu (2013) who reflect their positions as health workers educated in the First World Eurocentre paradigm while from Third World centres. The title of their essay is very telling as they constantly negotiate their position; it is an ongoing saga, from their position as researchers in the field, (on the ground) to their position within academia (Ivory Tower). Positionality is a recurring theme among *Auto*ethnographers and ethnographers alike. Dutta and Basu also write about their 'positionality', (almost an amalgamation of identity and position), which for them is one of imbrication, liminality between two worlds, as natives and among academics. On the one hand, they hold a position of privilege having received a western education; on the other, they are subjects of vulnerability, because, being restricted by criteria laid down in

academia, they cannot reflect the true situation. They examine the impact of Eurocentre policies in countries that found themselves in dire poverty and extreme famine conditions as Colonialism disbanded. The World Health Organisation implemented health and economic policies wholly unsuitable to the local economy or situation. Using poetry, another presentational format acceptable in *Auto*ethnography, along with drama (*Auto*ethnodrama), Dutta and Basu compare the situation of the 'white' ethnographer coming and their own position as:

> Brown souls doing post colonial work, part of privileged academe, so called experts (Basu, 2013:145).

'The White Man Cometh'

He comes
With his interview protocols
And questions
About cultural practices, magic and ritual.
He comes
Because he has the tools
Of this thing
He calls Ethnography
Through which
He says he can
Figure out our culture
And explain our weird customs.
He comes
To conquer
Disguised as a friend
Lives amidst us, eats our food,
And dances in our pagan dances
Only to write back
To his other White friends
About our primitive stories (Dutta, 2013:150-151).

Constantly held accountable and questioned on the integrity and validity of their field work, Dutta and Basu highlight the difficulties in demonstrating their research findings because an element of their research information is immeasurable as one 'could not communicate pain and suffering experienced' (Dutta,2013:145). What they endeavour to do through *Auto*ethnography is 'explicate our positionalities/politics as Post Colonial scholars' (Basu, 2013:146) which requires hyper reflexivity on their part. Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography demonstrates the usefulness of *Auto*ethnography. It is an example of how silenced stories become projects of activism. Indigenous/Native Narratives emerge from colonised or economically subordinated people. They frequently address, even disrupt power, in research, in particular the 'outsider'/etic right and authority to study the 'exotic' other/emic.

Performative Autoethnography

Performative *Auto*ethnography is an alternative approach to *Auto*ethnography. Is also an alternative approach to presenting the findings of both *Auto*ethnographic and ethnographic narrative i.e. poetry, art and drama. It is both an innovative method and practice to create understanding whether by poetry, art or drama. Performance *Auto*ethnography re-presents everyday rituals and cultural interaction and is an attempt to make *Auto*ethnography both visual and tangible. The *Auto*ethnographic element of performance *Auto*ethnography is when the drama, poetry or image reflects an individual's self-reflective experience of a cultural phenomenon. Performance *Auto*ethnography is frequently used in education to assist students makes sense of their reality, similar to Drama therapy. There are three approaches to performance: Mimesis, performance that displays one's role and position (Goffman, 1959); Poesis, performance that demonstrate culture and cultural values, as in ritual (Turner, 1974); and Kinesis, performance that challenges established norms through movement e.g. activism (Conquergood, 2002). Norman Denzin (2003) provides the ultimate insight into the contents, theory and practice of Performance Ethnography in a text by the same title. Tami Spry (2011) provides a guide on how to do performance *Auto*ethnography in *Body, Paper, Stage; Writing and Performing Autoethnography*. Dramatic Performance *Auto*ethnography does not work in isolation but is a process of engagement with others while on display and those observing. Ron Pelias (2011) offers an insight in to the practice of the compilation of Performance *Auto*ethnography particularly through poetic inquiry.

Feminist Autoethnography

Feminist Autoethnography is a form of *Auto*ethnography whereby women recount female and feminine experiences. Feminist *Auto*ethnography is a new area of research and also a response to the manner in which women were/are treated by the discipline. It is not feminist in the sense of radical feminism (although it can be) but more the reflections of a social cultural experience on a personal level e.g. domestic abuse, divorce or broken relationships, which acknowledge a private personal phenomenon as also a cultural one and make it public. The feminist *Auto*ethnographic approach gives voice to personal experiences rarely discussed or represented in public. It reflects societies approach to gender from varying perspectives e.g. marriage and a career or just marriage, or just a career. Feminist *Auto*ethnography calls for a considered reflexive approach to the research process and result. The question of Feminist (*Auto*) ethnography is aptly covered in both Judith Stacey's (1988) and Abu Lughod's (1990) corresponding essays 'Can there be a feminist ethnography?' and in the work of Ruth Behar and Deborah E. Gordon, (editors) *Women Writing Culture* (1995). Feminist *Auto*ethnography has a deeper scope not permitted here, and does not discount the tendency among women to write *Auto*ethnographically, see next chapter.

In choosing a specific research and representational approach, the *Auto*ethnographer demonstrates the purpose of their research, the position they hold on an issue and the perspective from which they are writing. Having expanded somewhat on various approaches and themes of *Auto*ethnography here, the next section will examine the Process of *Auto*ethnography. Compared to ethnographic research, *Auto*ethnography is researched and compiled differently, in the interest of transmitting a different message.

Section Three: The Process of *Auto*ethnography

Having identified sub realms within *Auto*ethnography this section will examine the process and compilation of *Auto*ethnography. *Auto*ethnography acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity, emotionality and the researcher's influence in contradistinction to a neutral, impersonal and objective stance. A key feature and virtue of *Auto*ethnography is its methodological openness (Holman-Jones et al., 2013:64-65). This 'openness' allows subjects or issues once hidden, or presumed to be non-existent, to be examined under the research lens. *Auto*ethnography through multi-vocality, multi-scribal and multi-valuing offers a new lens on the world, resisting rigid definitions of what constitutes meaningful and useful research, disrupting the boundaries of Anthropological research, expanding it to new horizons. The *Auto*ethnographic approach helps the researcher to understand the kinds of people we claim to be or can be perceived as (Ellis et al., 2011:4). It influences interpretations of what we study, how we study it and what we say about our topic. Many *Auto*ethnographers feel both stymied and challenged, to make their research 'fit' within the establishment criteria. This is another reason for lack of methodological clarity:

> an aspiring new *Auto*ethnographic scholar can miss the trees from the forest, failing to grasp how to collect basic data that create bigger *Auto*ethnographic story or mosaic (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013:64).

The *Auto*ethnographic Process is similar to that of ethnography with the selection of a topic, field, method, research, analysis and presentation. *Auto*ethnographic research interests stem from the researcher's experiences, which shapes the inquiry. Once the research topic and field is selected, the researcher begins with participant observation in culture, whereby the Anthropologist takes field notes of cultural happenings, and notes their part and others' engagement (Geertz, 1973: Goodall, 2001). Van Maneen stated

> Ethnography is 'the peculiar practice of representing the social reality of others through the analysis of one's own experience in the world of these others' (Van Maneen, 1988: x).

For the *Auto*ethnographer the field varies and differs widely in comparison to that of the Ethnographer. Rather than travel to exotic places in *Auto*ethnography, the researcher is immediately in the field or frequently the field is within their own four walls, or their own backyard, or h/she may be the field and carry it around with them all their life. Anderson and Glass-Coffin also suggest the field as one 'which involves experiences with other people, or it may just be a 'state of mind' assumed when recording personal experiences' (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013:67). This is a delicate area because the experience may be negative. Heewon Chang aptly summarises the field and fields work within *Auto*ethnography

> *Auto*ethnographic fieldwork takes place in the *Auto*ethnographers' offices or homes, archival libraries, their significant others' places, interview locations, and other locations pertaining to studies: any where they can create encounters and re-encounters with their memories, with objects, and with people (Chang, 2013:108).

The *Auto*ethnographic Process further entails use of methodological tools such as: interviewing cultural members; examining members' way of speaking/relating; investigating use of space and place; examining and analysing relevant cultural artefacts i.e. clothing, architecture etc.; analysing research literature e.g. books, movies, photographs etc. This may require comparative analysis between personal experience and existing relative research and in this way, make cultural characteristics familiar to insiders and outsiders. An *Auto*ethnographer must also consider what brought him/her to the topic of interest, how 'others' experience similar epiphanies, or personal experiences, and how he/she conducted the research and the things that affected the researcher during the research in order to illustrate facets of cultural experience. These tools are common to most research but must be adapted to place emphasis on the aesthetic, cognitive, emotional and relational values to fit *Auto*ethnography.

Research Sources and Compilation in Autoethnography

The sources of Data common to *Auto*ethnography are: field notes, interviews, personal documents, diaries and artefacts (such as photographs) are used and provide valuable data for *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry. The *Auto*ethnographer's research focus influences how data is conceptualised, collected and collated. The method employed for *Auto*ethnographic research involves a daily diary, journaling, self-interview, self-analysis and research of archival records, with writing as the vehicle to create a self/cultural understanding. These data potentially open up the researcher to further reflection on relevant experiences and relationships or evoke compelling images, emotions or understandings in other readers.

Field notes are a signature authorial form and core method of inquiry in both ethnography and *Auto*ethnography. Central to *Auto*ethnographic field notes are self-description or introspection, and self-presence tends to be maximised, but where and how the self is inserted varies considerably. In the context of *Auto*ethnography a distinguishing feature of field notes is that they involve not only the social reality of others' but also that of the researcher. There are distinct differences in the way *Auto*ethnographers/ethnographers write and format their field notes. Some write their field notes while present in the field, or immediately following participant observation; others write contemporaneous field notes which document a particular experience, 'a slice of experience'. However, writing in the immediate from contemporaneous field notes, leaves no time for detailed reflexivity in the present time; others focus on the lived experience within the community being studied, and rely later on recollection. The danger with the latter approach is the changing of ideas after an interlude, absence or distance. Some *Auto*ethnographers create field notes revisiting/retelling specific emotional memorable events in their lives, from distant memory, while others build field note chronicles or fragmented vignettes; others are written over a period of time, or about observations over a long period. These chronicles and vignettes are a distinguishing feature for *Auto*ethnographers from traditional ethnographers, as disclosing information from personal notes was/is not normally the tradition of the Anthropological ethnographer, who usually used the life histories of others (Ellis et al., 2011; Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013). Field notes open up interrogation by the research self at a new point in time where the opportunity for reflexive engagement also emerges, confirming the open-endedness non-closure aspect of *Auto*ethnography. *Auto*ethnographic researchers are encouraged to reflect on how their engagement in the field contributed to an understanding of themselves, and is contingent upon how they emerge from experiences in their lives. Laurel Richardson's view is that field note writing can be self-defining:

> Writing is also a way of 'knowing' - a method of discovery and analysis. By writing in different ways we discover new aspects of our topic and relationship to it (Richardson, 1994:516).

Personal documents are a resource used by *Auto*ethnographers, to chronicle their life experience. Individuals are endowed with personal documents which provide identity as members of a particular society working under certain conditions and rules e.g. birth certificate, baptismal certificate, passport, school reports, certificates, records of achievements, medical records, inoculations record, social services registration, career promotions and even death certificates. Different disciplines place different emphasis on the use of personal documents as resources. Historically, personal documents are recognised as important 'original' sources. In Anthropology, the use of personal documents challenges the traditional Anthropological canon of doing research and writing. Using items of a personal

nature are seen as blurring the boundaries. Despite this, personal documents are valuable in showing how people personally respond to certain social and cultural constructs, and indicate societal responses to these issues or vice versa. One form of written expression as a useful tool for understanding a cultural condition and a historical moment is the diary, as evidenced by Anne Frank (1947). There are other examples of diaries within Anthropology helping us to understand cultural and historical events. For example, the Diary of Amhaloimh O'Suilleabhain, *Cín Lae Amhlaoibh* (*Diary of an Irish Countryman* 1827-1845*)* describes and explains the life and culture of Irish people in Co. Kilkenny, Ireland and Malinowski's (1967) *Diary in the Strictest Sense of the Term*, provides an in-depth description of how he found life as an Anthropologist among the Trobrianders

Similarly, Photography and Visual *Auto*ethnography/Anthropology is another sub and specialised genre within *Auto*ethnography. Photos provide rich media for introspection and evocative presentation. Family albums and videos are invaluable to opening up concrete understanding of particular experiences and occurrence. Barbara Myerhoff demonstrated the value of visual anthropology. She initiated visual anthropology in her college and carried out her last researches through the medium of film. (See Section 2 of Chapter 3).

Writing as part of the *Auto*ethnographic Process includes writing selectively and retrospectively about 'epiphanies' that originate from being part of a culture and possessing a particular identity. Writing is a way of knowing, a method of inquiry; questioning canonical stories and conventions. Authoritative and projective account/narrative lines can help authors to make sense of self and experience and might purge their burdens. Writing *Auto*ethnographic personal stories can be therapeutic for both participants and readers. *Auto*ethnographic writing is a form of release where one might understand and improve relationships, reduce prejudice, encourage personal responsibility and agency, raise consciousness, promote cultural change and give people voice.

Pitfalls of Writing Autoethnography

Heewon Chang (2008) in '*Autoethnography as Method'* offers advice on the medium of *Auto*ethnography as a research tool, recognising increased interest in self-narrative in contemporary society. She promotes the importance of cultural appreciation with theoretical support in combination with the personal experience. She highlights some pitfalls of *Auto*ethnography: the emphasis on self; too much emphasis on the narrative, rather than on analysis and cultural interpretation; reliance on personal memory and recall as data resource; negligence of ethical standards; and inappropriate application of the label *Auto*ethnography. In order to differentiate what *Auto*ethnography is and does from 'ordinary' ethnography the elements must be aligned in a certain way, as Chang shows. This is examined further in Chapter Seven.

As a reliable method and process of research, *Auto*ethnography should be used only in a manner that informs how a culture works. It takes (is presented in) different forms from straightforward linear narrative to poetry, to drama and art. Previously societies recorded their 'own' ethnographies through totem poles, tapestries, woodcrafts, skins and stories. Today we can observe a proliferation of media forms and genres and an expanded range of personal documentation. *Auto*ethnographers have now recourse to their mobile phone, email and text messages, digital videos and Facebook to compile their research. As in other genres, conventions such as characters, scenes and plot development occur in *Auto*ethnography. We see semblances of chronological and fragmented account/narrative progression. *Auto*ethnography illustrates new perspectives via the lens of personal experience, which both find and fill in gaps, the 'something missing' in existing related account/narrative lines. According to Mitch Allen, publisher of a number of *Auto*ethnographies at Left Coast Press, an *Auto*ethnographer must:

> Look at experiences analytically. Otherwise (you're) telling (your) account/narrative – and that's nice - but people do that on Oprah [a U.S. based television programme], every day. Why is your account/narrative more valid than anyone else's? What makes your account/narrative more valid is that you are a researcher. You have a set of theoretical and methodological tools and a research literature to use. That's your advantage. If you can't frame it around these tools and literature and just frame it as 'my story', then why or how should I privilege your account/narrative over anyone else's I see 25 times a day on T.V. (Mitch Allen, (2006), Personal Interview cited in Ellis et al., 2011:8).

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to explain the reason for the emergence of New Wave *Auto*ethnography, as an extension of *Auto*ethnography in the original, and as a response to the call to address the 'something missing' in research. In distinguishing *Auto*ethnography's features, characteristics, modes of inquiry, approaches and process like disrupting the norm, the presence of the self, the use of vulnerability, complete processual engagement from the inside, adapting the field and the process in order to create a better understanding of society, this chapter sought to create an understanding of how *Auto*ethnography works.

By way of expanding on this information, the following two chapters will examine how the principles of practice of *Auto*ethnography play out in previously published Anthropological *Auto*ethnographies, using exemplars. In my research, I have identified four areas of foci for *Auto*ethnography: a) the Study of One's Own Culture, Indigenous Ethnography; b) the Study of One's Own Culture once removed, Second Generation

*Auto*ethnography (Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnography); c) Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies; and d) Self Reflexive Experiential *Auto*ethnography, or (*Auto*phenomenography). In the context of ethnography, some cases slipped below the radar or not accorded academic acclaim, because they did not satisfy contemporary research criteria laid out in the domain. However, if we examine them closely as *Auto*ethnographies we will appreciate how they offered/offer huge insight into matters socially, culturally and personally relevant both within and without the academy. Others are of the New Wave *Auto*ethnographic mould and offer an insight into cultural phenomena sometimes previously overlooked.

Chapter Three: Exemplars of *Auto*ethnography (I)

Categories One and Two: Indigenous and Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnography

Introduction

In the previous chapters I outlined the origins and an understanding of *Auto*ethnography where *Auto*ethnography can be applied to serve two purposes, indigenous ethnography, that is, the 'Study of One's Own Culture' (Pratt, 1992) and New Wave (Millenial) *Auto*ethnography, which is, 'using one's own personal experience to explain a cultural phenomenon' (Ellis et al., 2011:1). As already mentioned I discovered *Auto*ethnography suitably fits four categories: 1) the Study of One's Own Culture 2) Second Generation *Auto*ethnography, (Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnography) 3) Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies 4) and Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnographies. In order to appreciate the practice of *Auto*ethnography, and to demonstrate its viability as an alternative method of research and presentation, this and the subsequent chapter will examine examples of *Auto*ethnographies from different periods.

This chapter will focus on the first two categories, the indigenous perspectives, which are Studies of One's Own Culture and Second Generation *Auto*ethnography, (Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnography). In Chapter Four, we will look at Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies and New Wave *Auto*ethnography. Most notable is *Auto*ethnographies are of a malleable nature, and therefore similar elements are identifiable in each category. There is a correspondence between both Chapters Three and Four as they focus on examples of *Auto*ethnographies.

This chapter consists of two sections: firstly, we will look at the political background within Anthropology that gave rise to the emergence of new representation methodologies. Secondly, we will look at exemplars of *Auto*ethnographies of the first two categories, which demonstrate how the definition of *Auto*ethnography and its focus has diluted and reformulated over time. In the subsequent chapter, we will look at the remaining two categories of *Auto*ethnography and note how *Auto*ethnographies diversified to address the purpose of their authors, but more importantly how they responded to, complemented, supplemented, confirmed or denied previously written ethnographies.

Section 1: Emergence of New Representational Methodologies

Coinciding with the emergence of New Wave *Auto*ethnography was the review of women's contributions to Anthropology along with the quest to find new methods of representation. In his introduction to *Writing Culture* James Clifford (1986) suggested Anthropology should become more innovative, dialogic, reflexive and experimental. This 'new ethnography' would reflect profound self-consciousness of workings of power and partialness of truth. 'New ethnography' would not resolve issues of inequality in the capitalist world but it might decolonise power relations 'inherent in representations of 'Other'' (Clifford, 1986:21). The main point of *Writing Culture* (1986) was that Anthropologists write, they write ethnographies that are both method and text and the sum of an Anthropologists research or study. A major oversight in *Writing Culture* was the exclusion of women from the platform; Clifford sought to explain the exclusion by his infamous claim- suggesting women Anthropologists failed to satisfy the criteria! 20th century women writers 'crossed the border' between Anthropology and literature. As confessional and popular writing, it was classed as 'illegal' or contraband. *Writing Culture* reiterated, reproduced and re-emphasised the gendered hierarchy and power structure existent in Anthropology, the academy, and society and purported women as non-analytical or non-theoretical enough to measure up.

Women's Representations of Culture

In the text, *Women Writing Culture* (1995), Ruth Behar and Deborah Gordon, (editors), through a collection of essays written by contemporary female colleagues about former female Anthropologists, explore the history of the emergence of female Anthropologists, how they represented their findings, how their work was academically received, and their place within the discipline of Anthropology. The scope of Behar's and Gordon's text is extremely broad. Containing twenty-two chapters, its range covers women's early origins in Anthropology to a changing mood within the discipline. Although Behar and Gordon claim, *Women Writing Culture* was not a direct response to *Writing Culture* (1986) they acknowledge it as a sequel. The term co-respondent is probably more apt. According to Behar and Gordon the "discipline is deeply rooted in the male quest" and they question if the history of Anthropology would be different had female writers been taken seriously (Behar and Gordon, 1995). *Women Writing Culture* alerts us to some extremely well known matriarchs of Anthropology for example Parson, Benedict and Mead and some who completely slipped under the radar like Camilla Wedgewood and Ruth Landes. Written twenty years ago *Women Writing Culture* (1995) had a 'mild ambition':

> This text will make it impossible to ever again think about the predicaments of cultural representation without seeing the central role of women in its theory and practice (Behar and Gordon, 1995: xii).

Elaine Showalter (1979) identified three phases of modern women's literary development. The feminine phase (1840-80), during which women writers imitated the dominant male tradition; the feminist phase (1880-1920), when women advocated for their rights; and the female phase (1920-present), when dependency upon opposition, that is, on uncovering misogyny in male texts is replaced by the rediscovery of women's texts and women. Within the present or "female' phase, Showalter describes four current models of difference taken up by many feminists around the world: biological, linguistic, psychoanalytic and cultural. Lila Abu Lughod (1990) and Judith Stacey (1988) coincidentally wrote an essay titled 'Is there a Feminist Ethnography?' raising the question regarding Feminist Ethnography and if it could it be distinguished from Anthropology of Women i.e. understanding the lives of women across cultures, or Feminist Anthropology i.e. understanding the ramifications for women as second sex. Within the two arguments, regarding whether there can or cannot be a Feminist Ethnography, Stacey and Lughod produced two different outlooks. Stacey's view was pessimistic; feminist politics rooted in idea of domination were/are incompatible with the basic premise of Anthropology.

> the research product is ultimately that of the researcher, however modified or influenced by informants (Stacey,1988 cited in Behar,1995:14).

Abu Lughod's view is more optimistic, granting a possibility of feminist ethnography, grounded in the particularities of women's lives and stories. Lughod suggests for feminist Anthropologists to assert their professional status they need to detach themselves from the tradition of literary and popular ethnographic writing associated with 'untrained' wives of Anthropologists (Lughod, 1990 cited in Behar, 1995:14). In Behar's view ethnography is a strange cross between a novel, a travel account, a memoir and a scientific report. Behar observes Anthropologists were no longer unique purveyors of knowledge about cultural meaning and understanding. The tides were turning: Third World Developing Countries and minority women were writing. The privilege of authorship no longer prevailed; academic elitism was challenged, as was the distancing and alienating of forms of expression. The style of both these texts did not separate creative from critical writing providing another way of looking at things, as *Auto*ethnography does. Feminist Literary Critics note, how writing matters so much to women, and 'how they plot themselves into fictions has everything to do with how they plot themselves into life' (Behar,1995:15). Male authors were supportive of

the reconsideration of a new method of presentation. These include Turner, 1981, 1978; Denzin, 2013, 2014; Bochner, 2000, 2014 and Rabinow, 1977. Clifford Geertz suggested Anthropology needed to examine itself in a corresponding way to literary criticism (Geertz, 2004: Interview) and even George Stocking took a 'glimpse into his own black box' (Stocking, 2010).

In closely examining the writngs of some of these female Anthropologists, I found they contained features and elements of *Auto*ethnography. The contributors to *Women Writing Culture* tell the story of their personal engagement with the work of former female Anthropologists who put the Anthropologist, or his/her culture or personal life centre stage. More specifically in my research, I have found that *Auto*ethnography suitably fits into four categories, and to outline the particular characteristics of each category I examine exemplars of work in each. The first category is Indigenous Ethnography (or salvage ethnography), 'The Study of One's Own Culture', as described by Mary Louise Pratt. To explain this category, I draw on Ella Cara Deloria (1944), Christine Quintasket (Morning Dove) and Zora Neale Hurston (1942) by way of example. The second category I have identified is the Study of One's Own Culture once removed or Second Generation *Auto*ethnography for which I use Barbara Myerhoff's work *Number Our Days* (1978). The third category is Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies where the Anthropologists describe their personal experience of studying culture, such as Jean Briggs (1970) *Never In Anger*. Finally, the fourth category is what I term New Wave (New Millennium) *Auto*ethnography: Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography or *Auto*phenomenography, where the personal experience of a cultural phenomenon is the central focus of the research using Carolyn Ellis (1995) *Final Negotiations*. This is the first *Auto*ethnography of this particular genre within *Auto*ethnography. It is not by design that I have chosen women's writings as exemplars. By its nature, *Auto*ethnography is neither gender, race nor class specific but accepting of all stories and research that offer an understanding of life, human behaviour and culture.

The purpose of examining these various categories is to demonstrate the practice of *Auto*ethnography, and how it achieves the researcher's objective. In looking at each category we will recognise elements and features of *Auto*ethnography and the *Auto*ethnographic Method as identified earlier, such as describing one's own culture from within, putting oneself inside the research, adding to and building on previous culture research, using alternative methods of presentation in order to address the issue of 'something missing' as identified by Bochner (2013). Within each of these categories common themes appear to prevail which also provide deeper understanding of culture and human behaviour. These themes often overlap and intertwine and in some, there may be more emphasis on one over another. An overriding common theme to all categories is vulnerability: the vulnerability of the subject of study and that of the researcher. The practice and application of

*Auto*ethnography is not without its difficulties and these will be recognised and identified as the chapter progresses and subsequently addressed in Chapter 7. This chapter aims to demonstrate how Anthropologists used *Auto*ethnography in the past, although it was not recognised or labelled as such, and how as an alternative approach *Auto*ethnography provides an insight into a culture or cultural phenomenon otherwise overlooked, unknown or misunderstood both within and outside the academy.

Section 2: Exemplars of Category 1: Indigenous *Auto*ethnography

Introduction

In *Women Writing Culture* (1995) I found three authors whose writings could be described as indigenous ethnography, 'the Study of One's Own Culture', they are Ella Cara Deloria, Christine Quintasket (Mourning Dove) and Zora Neale Hurston. Both Deloria and Hurston were Anthropologists from the University of Chicago, and students of the revered Franz Boas, the doyen of the Chicago school. Although Boas encouraged many women to join Anthropology, and he relied on women's willingness to work for little or nothing, when it came to recommendations for permanent positions he favoured men (Gardner, 1988: Introduction, *Waterlily*: xi). At the turn of the 20th century, Boasian Anthropology was in the grip of 'salvage ethnography' capturing the elements and essences of cultures rapidly dying out. Boas was committed to documenting comprehensively North American Indian Culture and Black South American Culture. As a Native American Indian Ella Cara Deloria was a lucky find for Boas as she knew the language and various dialects of the Dakota/Sioux people. Boas valued Deloria more as an informant than scholar. Mourning Dove (Christine Quintasket) was an Interior Salish woman of mixed breed and Irish descent who collected tribal stories from among the Northern Plateau peoples, while Hurston was a Black Southern American, and her task was to capture and help preserve their folk tales through her access to the community.

These women's writings portray a number of themes including : their role as educated women and Anthropologists within their own community; the important role of 'story telling' within their community, as portrayed through ethnography, *Auto*ethnography and novels, (consequentially addressing the question of fiction/novel as a reliable form of information and alternative method of expression, within and about a culture); their position and relationship with their mentors; and finally the challenge for them to find their voice and preserve their own traditions while satisfying necessary disciplinary criteria. Unfortunately, all three women suffered consequences similar to their modern *Auto*ethnographic counterparts, where they were rejected by the dominant hierarchical powers in the Academy.

Native American Indian *Auto*ethnography

Ella Cara Deloria

> This may sound as a little naive ... but I actually feel that I have a mission: to make the Dakota people understandable, as human beings, to the white people who have had to deal with them. I feel that those who came out to teach and preach went on the assumption that the Dakotas had nothing, no rules of life, no social organisation, no ideals...they tried to pour white culture into a vacuum...what they should have done first, before stating their programme, was to study everything possible of Dakota life (Deloria, personal communication to H. Beebe, (1952), cited in Finn,1995: 132) and also (DeMallie,2009: 237-238, Afterword in *Waterlily*).

Janet Finn (1995) provides a deep insight into the life and world of these women. Ella Cara Deloria (1889-1971) despite many challenges wrote with an emic voice to explain her Native Indian Culture through the genre of the novel. Deloria was born a Sioux Indian named Anpetu Wa´ste (Beautiful Day Woman), on January 31st, at the Yankton Indian Reservation, South Dakota. At the time, the U.S. Government was carrying out its civilising mission of Native American Indians. Federal policy intended to eradicate Native American Indians' way of life and acculturate them into the Whites ways, on the basis that the native's way of life was inadequate and 'civilising processes' similar to the colonising process occurring in other parts of the globe was necessary. The aims and objectives of the U.S. 'civilising mission', as seen from extracts of the *Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, by Thomas J. Morgan, (1889), demonstrate the obstacles Native American Indians faced in trying to preserve their own culture and identity:

> First - The anomalous position heretofore occupied by the Indians in this country can not much longer be maintained. The reservation systems belong to a "vanishing state of things" and must soon cease to exist.
>
> Second - The logic of events demands the absorption of the Indians into our national life, not as Indians, but as American citizens.
>
> Third - As soon as a wise conservatism will warrant it, the relations of the Indians to the Government must rest solely upon the full recognition of their individuality. Each Indian must be treated as a man, be allowed a man's rights and privileges, and be held to the performance of a man's obligations. Each Indian is entitled to his proper share of inherited wealth of the tribe, and the protection of the courts in his "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness". He is not entitled to be supported in idleness.
>
> Fourth - The Indians must conform to "white man's ways" peaceably if they will, forcibly if they must. They must adjust themselves to the environment, and conform their mode of living substantially to our civilisation. This civilisation may not be the best possible, but it is the best the Indians can get. They cannot escape it, and must either conform to it or be crushed by it.
>
> Fifth - The paramount duty of the hour is to prepare the rising generation of Indians for the new order of things thus forced upon them. A comprehensive system of education modeled after the American public school system, but adopted to the special exigencies of the Indian youth, embracing all persons of school age, compulsory in its demands and uniformly administered, should be developed as rapidly as possible.
>
> Sixth - The tribal relations should be broken up, socialism destroyed, and the family and the *Auto*nomy of the individual substituted. The allotment of lands in severalty, the establishment of local courts and police, the development of a personal sense of independence, and the universal adoption of the English language are means to this end (Morgan, 1889 cited in Finn,1995:131-132)

The Federal Policy shows scant regard for the life of Native American Indians. Its violent language indicates an intention to eradicate and erase the Native American Indians identity and way of life. With the breakup of tribes and families and under terms and conditions, such as adoption of the English language, the Native American Indians were to 'conform' to the American way and be absorbed as 'American citizens' with certain rights and obligations. Deloria was born into this civilising process. Her maternal Grandfather, Saswe was a traditional healer and visionary who converted to Christianity. She also had a white grandfather, Brigadier General Alfred Sully who was an Indian fighter. Her father, Philip, was the first Episcopalian Christian convert ministering the reservation. Deloria was educated at mission boarding schools. She combined a deep Christian faith with an enduring respect for the 'inseparable spiritual and cultural values of the Dakota people', which contributed to her biculturalism (Finn, 1995:133).

Both Deloria and Mourning Dove subtly and openly criticised the boarding school project for removing Indian children from their family/culture and placing them in adoptive homes and boarding schools, stripping children of their Indianness, cloaking them with patriotism and individualism and instilling a fear of God, as part of the Federal Assimilationist Policy and Anglo Practices. Finn points out that there exists a wealth of knowledge and literature on the boarding school project and experience, looking at the system in terms of the Protestant ideology, capitalism, republicanism, women's experiences, personal accounts of students, forced assimilation and the cultural politics of such schools within the larger economic context. Some government policies introduced with the peoples' best interest at heart were not always suitable. Mourning Dove's narrative accounts of the trauma of isolation from family, and how fragmented and frustrating her education was, are testimonies to the powerful presence and control the Jesuits mission boarding schools had on the reservation (Dove, (1990) cited in Finn,1995:135). Nevertheless, despite concerns and criticism of the system and boarding schools as places of cultural inscriptions, Deloria and Quintasket seized opportunities presented them to develop skills and practice cultural mediation; besides which, it was unfortunately the only situation through which Native American women could access a respectable job. Jean Briggs (1970) also considers the effect that taking children away from their families had on the community. As Finn says the experiences presents a

> complex incorporation of cultural knowledge that challenges the educational assumptions of the boarding school project (Finn,1995:136).

Deloria was a gifted educator, lecturer, ethnographer and storyteller who attended Oberlin College, Teachers College and Columbia University, and held various teaching

positions at Indian boarding schools, colleges and adult education programmes. Boas encouraged Deloria to study the habits and action of thought among Dakota children, including the details of everyday life and religious attitudes, conducting her fieldwork at Standing Rock. Deloria is known primarily for her linguistic and ethnographic work with Dakota, Lakota and Sioux (Nakota) Indians. She spent most of her scholarship transcribing the Dakota language and history, keenly aware of the power of the written word. She was the first to translate James Owen Dorsey's legacy of unpublished manuscripts of Lakota stories. Boas employed Deloria to verify previous accounts of social organisation, ceremonies and vision quests among the Sioux especially the Sundance which she did in her novel *Waterlily* (2009 [1947]). For Boas Deloria was a Godsend as he sought a native speaker to assist his research on the Sioux language and eventually to co-author with him *A Dakota Grammar*. On this topic, Boas said of Deloria:

> She has a thorough grasp of grammar of the Dakota, the Teton, Yankton and Assiniboine dialects, she is thoroughly conversant with the forms and intricate psychological background (Medicine,1980:23).

Deloria's personal inside knowledge of the culture enabled her valuable contribution to various committees, and a wide and varied career. In 1929, as a research assistant for a Columbia University psychologist, she tested motor skills and social habits of girls on Standing Rock Reservation (Murray,1974 cited in Finn,1995:134). She chaired a Commission on Indian Education in 1961 and she worked for the Over Museum at South Dakota University. She later taught at a private Episcopal girls school, which was funded by the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR). Deloria had no fixed or permanent position or tenure and worked from contract to contract. Deloria engaged in the exchange and preservation of cultural knowledge with diverse audiences, giving voice to Native American Women's experience through performance, which is akin to performative *Auto*ethnography, in the hope of building cross-cultural understanding.

Between the 1920s and 1970s Deloria wrote numerous texts on: Dakota language, *Dakota Texts* (1932); public policy documents including, *The Navajo India Problem: An Inquiry,* (1939); and ethnographic accounts of the Sioux such as The *Sundance of the Oglala Sioux* (1929) and *Speaking of Indian* (1998[1944]) for popular audiences. *Speaking of Indians* (1998[1944]) published in Deloria's lifetime was intended to enlighten white people about 'a scheme of life that worked' (Deloria, 1998[1944]:24). This short book had a straightforward intention: to explain the origins of the American Indians and the emergence of the Indian nation, their cultures and languages because there were no textual records of this life that once was. It was only through word of mouth and storytelling these things were remembered. *Speaking of Indians* maps the kinship system that governed and stabilised their lives, the

traditions, means and methods of existence, family life and child socialisation, and their subsequent erosion and associated difficulties with coerced cultural change, as Indians were absorbed and assimilated unto the reservations. Deloria notes:

> We may know about a people, but we cannot truly know them until we can get within their minds, to some degree at least, and see life from their peculiar point of view (Deloria, 1998[1944]:18).

Deloria believed that by producing texts and explaining the Indians to white people and vice-versa they would each come to know each other better, and 'the future would be less rocky and discriminatory' (Gardner,2009: xi). Susan Gardener says of Deloria's texts, that they 'tell the same story about the essential humanity and valid life ways of the "Sioux" (Dakotas, Lakotas, and Nakotas)' (Gardner,2009: vii).

Subsequently Deloria encapsulated her ideas in a novel titled *Waterlily* (2009, [1998, 1947]. *Waterlily* was a lifelong work published posthumously, forty years after it was written. The text follows a young Dakota woman's life, Waterlily on the Indian Plains in the late 19th century, describing Dakota life from a female perspective. The many themes covered by the text are those generally investigated by Anthropologists, particularly female Anthropologists: Motherhood, child rearing and relationships. Deloria uses her novel to educate and explain the role of women among the Dakota, particularly the significance of a woman's dignity as evidenced in appropriate propitious behaviour, the vital importance of a good reputation, dealing with courtship, marriage proposals, marriage, in-laws, birth, child rearing and death. Within the community topics of a delicate nature such as matters of sexuality, were not widely discussed. Women did not share intimate secrets; a woman lived and died with her own secrets, out of respect for herself, her husband and her kin. Deloria was as discreet as her informers were and because of her single status was excluded from certain topics, such as contraception, abortion, childbirth and transvestism. Deloria pays special attention to the central place children hold within Dakota life.

The novel *Waterlily* demonstrates the importance of the storyteller and storytelling within the Native Indian community. We learn how through the visits of Woyaka the storyteller, the adults and children alike are informed of their history, their historical beliefs, and the old ways which created cultural patterns counter to the story's contemporary events. Echoing Keith Basso (1996) in *Wisdom Sits in Places* who noted how discipline and social mores were maintained through the custom of storytelling, we see how stories were an educational tool, teaching children and adults through experiences of others. Storytelling was both relational and emotional with the story inseparable from the act of telling. It was almost sanctified, as one elder in *Waterlily* describes it: 'Grandson, speech is holy; it was not

intended to be set free only to be wasted. It is for hearing and remembering' (Deloria,2009[1988, 1947]:50).

Delorias Anxieties and Predicaments

Despite believing the intentions of her work, Deloria suffered anxiety, writing about her people and breaching confidentialities, as her people were very conservative and reserved about loose tongues. Though Deloria's was anxious to catalogue her experiential knowledge and preserve the Dakota culture there were boundaries she could not cross without insulting the position of her kin, being aware of the 'epistemological chasm that resonates through works of indigenous scholars' (Finn, 1995:138). Despite her prime position to carry out this work, she experienced liminality and blurred boundaries as many *Auto*ethnographers do (Denzin, 2013). Deloria sought to alert Boas to the sensitivities surrounding her accumulating knowledge. While Boas presumed Deloria could remain an objective researcher, and detached from the world, she was conflicted by trying to fulfil her scholarly obligations and to address personal and family commitments. A letter to Boas encapsulates some such predicaments, explaining how her ailing father required her attention; as Finn suggests she was caught in a 'complex web of responsibilities' (Finn,1995:138). However, she vowed to keep up the work: 'I will only be too glad to continue after my term is up, and give, without pay, next fall what time I am losing now' (Finn,1995:139). Despite conforming to the inclinations of the Academy, through a commitment to the objective, Deloria was never appointed to a permanent position within academia and depended upon the patronage of white scholars (Murray, 1974 cited in Finn,1995:136).

As an accessible way of knowing the complex and cohesive world of the Dakota Sioux, in terms of form, the novel was the best means for Deloria to share her ethnological research with a wider audience. Ruth Benedict was supportive of the *Waterlily* project and worked closely with Deloria on its editing. The novel form presented challenges where she struggled to squeeze Sioux narrative style and values into a EuroAmerican epistemological style, squaring the circle as Gardner suggests (Gardner, 2009). She was never content with a fixed image on a page as a finished product constantly revising and revisiting her work. This dissatisfaction with her work later delayed publication. 'Ethnology has to be objective and impersonal' she wrote to Virginia Lightfoot in 1946 (DeMallie, 2009:238). Deloria had difficulty maintaining scientific objectivity as *Auto*biographical detail interrupted linear scientific narrative thus fiction liberated her from the representational constraints enforced by Anthropological discourse, resulting in a more conversational approach. In a personal correspondence to Benedict in 1947, she admits the significance of the relationship with her informants, which out of respect for her, her peers were willing to communicate:

> It is distressing to find it so hard to do this writing in any detached, professional manner! ...I try to keep out of it but I am too much in it, and I know too many angles. If the outside investigator is like a naturalist watching ants, I am one of the ants! I know what the fight is about, what all the other little ants are saying under their breath! (Cited in Gardner, 2009: xviii, Introduction to *Waterlily*).

Moves towards a 'Practical Social Science'

However, despite this relationship, Deloria's competence, in either her topic or her approach was restricted in light of the move towards practical social science, which became a *tour de force* after World War II. Nonetheless in the Afterword of *Waterlily,* De Mallie (2009) states that the text is a unique portrayal of nineteenth century Sioux Life, unequalled for its interpretation of Plains Indian culture from the female perspective. There is no other work by an American Indian, which describes several generations of women's experiences before the closing of the frontier on the Northern Plains existed. He claims that the 'special insiders' perspective' (*Auto*ethnographers), not only infuses the narrative but provides ample material to permit a re-examination of the previously written record of traditional Sioux life. Deloria was the *quintessential emic voice* that would provide an insight into a culture that no outsider could possibly capture (Emphasis added). Raymond J. De Mallie, Susan Gardner and Deloria's nephew Vine Deloria did much to resurrect Ella Cara Deloria's work so that the value and contribution of these representations were not lost. Gardner and Raymond J. DeMallie cannot emphasise enough the value of *Waterlily*, describing Deloria as a:

> Tribeswoman in academe 'transitory, marginalised, ill paid, and yet irreplaceable to the scholarship and reputation of the stellar linguists and cultural anthropologists for whom she worked (Gardner,2009: ix).

Deloria's work is a prime example of Indigenous Ethnography, *Auto*ethnography, which in recognising the limits of scientific knowledge, sought to address the question of social identities and identity politics using narrative, to make the work more accessible and add to and complement previous research while writing to right.

Christine Quintasket (Mourning Dove): Perspective of Half Blood Woman

Continuing in this vein 'One Studying One's Own Culture', as a second example of, is Mourning Dove aka Christine Quintasket, (1884-1936) a contemporary of Deloria who was an Interior Salish Woman land who lived a comparable life. Dove was a member of the Colville Confederated Tribes of Northeastern Washington State and an Indian with Catholic

and Salishan beliefs. As such, she encountered and experienced spiritual dualism, which was symptomatic in the context of Christian missionary influence. Dove did manual labour, domestic service and migrant farm work. She experienced chronic ill health due to harsh living conditions. Though married twice her economic situation was extremely precarious as both spouses were dependent on the vagaries of the migrant labour market. Determined to read and write, Dove credits an Irish boy Jimmy Ryan, with helping her; Dove's mother had papered the walls with yellow back novels and Jimmy went from wall to wall to find the next page to read to her. These 'penny dreadfuls' were a source of inspiration, initiating a love for romantic fiction which she chose later as her genre. In exchange for matronly services, she was educated at the Fort Shaw Indian School in Montana. Later, on the Okanogan reservation, she worked as a secretary and taught. Dove collected folklores intermittently, while moving from place to place as a migrant worker, which she wrote down each evening. She saw her task as documenting the primitive folkways of the Okanagan people or, as insinuated by her patron Lucullus Virgil Mc Whorter, preserving the cultural history of her people:

> It is all wrong, this saying that Indians do not feel as deeply as whites. We do feel, and by and by some of us are going to be able to make our feelings appreciated, and then will the true Indian character be revealed … [Mourning Dove, quoted in the Spokesman Review, 1916 cited in Encyclopedia of Washington State, History link .org: 2015].

Mourning Dove is accredited with being the first Native American Woman to publish a novel, *Co-ge-we-a, the Half Blood, A Depiction of the Great Montana Cattle Range* (1927). It is based on an epic buffalo roundup she had witnessed. Quintasket's text was published eleven years after she wrote it. Dove also wrote a collection of Okanagon folktales entitled *Coyote Stories* (1933). *Co-ge-we-a* sheds a different light on Native American women's life experience. Although not an Anthropologist, Mourning Dove writes of her own culture by meshing her own identity as a half blood into the main character Cogewea. Cogewea's half-blood identity locates the conflicts and contradictions of the current social position within the body of woman. *Co-ge-we-a* relates the difficulties of life for a mestiza, showing the diverse uncertain position and experience of a half blood Indian women married to a white rancher in the rural west of the 1900s. The character's private thoughts work as a social commentary, which highlight gender/race conflict and the question of trust and betrayal, demonstrating what it was to be pulled between the roots of Okanagan culture, and pressurised to assimilate into the encroaching white world. Mourning Dove weaves in features that are central to Salishan culture such as spirit power and the sweat lodge, a place for purification before a ritual. The reader moves into the private world of the spiritual woman, 'who chafes against the constraints of gender, race, culture and class identities' (Finn, 1995:142). Cogewea was a

metaphor for the community's larger struggles: for the preservation of native kinship, land and resources (Finn, 1995:143).

Mourning Dove was supported and encouraged to tell her people's stories by Lucullus Mc Whorter, founder of the *American Archaeologist* and self-styled Indian Activist, homesteader and historian. However, Mourning Dove's voice was distorted because Mc Whorter kept adding new material, changing her text and including ethnographic footnotes, thus delaying its publication. She did not get to proof read her manuscript and hardly recognised the published copy as there were so many changes (Dove, 1928 cited in Encyclopedia of Washington State, History link.org:2015). Clifford Trafzer and Richard Scheuerman (1991) argue that Dove's stories were revised and adjusted by Mc Whorter. Mc Whorter enlisted Heister Dean Guie (1896-1978), a Yakima newspaperman; to shape Morning Dove's traditional stories into 'what they thought should be presented' (emphasis added). As it happened Guie's wife Geraldine (1897-1994) was an early graduate of the University of Washington Anthropology programme, and it is understood influenced editorial decisions. Later, original orators, elders of the Colville-Okanagon, found the stories unrecognizable to those they had told (Trafzer, Scheuerman, 1991 cited in Finn, 1995: footnote 3). Dove was a prolific writer and left 20 folders of miscellaneous writings in the care of Heister Dean Guie. Upon Guie's death, his wife Geraldine upon realising the writing contained many *Auto*biographical fragments, handed them to Erna Gunther (1896-1982) of Washington University but little or no headway towards a manuscript was made. In 1981, Gunther insisted that some pages be shown to the University of Washington press. Jay Miller, who had worked with the Colville reservation, reorganized them into a thematic structure resulting in an *Auto*biography *Mourning Dove: A Salishan Autobiography*. This was published in 1990, by Lincoln and London, University of Nebraska Press. Finn maintains the organization and chapter titles of Mourning Dove's *Auto*biography resemble a classic ethnographic text format that may reflect the literary style of the editor and not Dove's authorship (Finn, 1995:132). Similar to Deloria, Mourning Dove made her personal experiences and political concerns public, speaking to civic groups and campfires, telling stories of Okanagan life. In 1935, she was elected to Colville Tribal Council. She died at an early age of 50 from 'exhaustion from manic depressive psychosis' (Finn, 1995:141).

Comparisons and contrasts made between Deloria and Mourning Dove exhibit similar themes through shared common experiences. They both shared an ambition to write against dominant discourse/representations of Native Americans in order to achieve cross-cultural understanding. They both played the role of advocate against a complex backdrop to preserve their cultural traditions (Finn, 1995:133). They wanted to communicate emotive experience, (evocative *Auto*ethnography) through recurring meaningful themes such as trust, betrayal, authority of written word, appropriation and the politics of knowledge production. Janet

Finn's (1995) apt essay title 'Ella Cara Deloria and Mourning Dove: Writing for Cultures Writing against the Grain' indicates these authors had to use an alternative method and transferred combined cultural knowledge and lived experience into expressive forms to make their story heard. Choosing to write novels as a vehicle for voicing their experiences as Native American Women, and reach audiences they hoped to transform seems like a prudent decision. As conduits through which knowledge and experience was channelled, their form of communication was a struggle, between being authentic, accepted and academic. Both texts were political statements against previous image making of the Indian, and challenged popular scholarly representations of Native Americans, as well as the limits of ethnographic authority. As Dove explains:

> No foreigner could possible penetrate or research these [the legends, religion, customs and theories of my people] because of the effort needed to overcome the shy reluctance of the Indian when it comes to giving information to whites (Dove cited in Finn, 1995:140).

Despite their passion, commitment and determination to writing as writers, activists and cultural mediators Deloria and Quintasket shared economic vulnerability and faced dilemmas as women of colour while scholars. With responsibilities as caregivers and labourers both had to overcome material struggles and emotional demands. Neither of them had children, though Dove had lost a child. Because of lack of professional credentials both women had to negotiate their way through academia and owing to the necessity for patronage were beholding to white male mentors, often victim of editorial control and manipulation of their voices. Despite their unique position as researchers and insiders, Deloria and Mourning Dove's outside status within the Academy meant their work, which was considered inferior, went unrecognised and suppressed for many years.

Janet Finn was attracted to these works in lieu of the questions they raise about the 'truth value' of both the novel and the ethnographic text in representing cultural experience. She was puzzled by the fact that if a work is considered fiction, does that demean it in any way; does it remove the 'knowledge' from the realm of argumentation; 'In what forms can knowledge be packaged to best challenge the histories of misrepresentation by dominant group?' (Finn, 1995:133). The debate about the novel as an ethnographic text is too broad for consideration in depth here, but there is certainly a case to be made for its usefulness.

Deloria and Mourning Dove, as examples of the first category of *Auto*ethnography, 'the Study of One's Own Culture' (Indigenous Ethnography), demonstrate some of characteristics and features of Autoethnography indicated in Chapter Two. Both researchers were visible in their texts. Their purpose was clear, to make their own culture more accessible

and understandable to outsiders. They were both vulnerable as members of academia; and had to rely on another form of presentation, the novel. They thereby disrupted the norms of research practice and representation; building on previous knowledge to break silences, and reclaim the voice of native American Indians. They also provided a better understanding of the society as a whole. Staying within the theme of 'Studying One's Own Culture', we now look to the work of Zora Neale Hurston.

Black South American *Auto*ethnography:

Zora Neale Hurston

Zora Neale Hurston (1891-1960) Anthropologist also wrote from the indigenous perspective examining the world of Black Southern American Society, and their folktales. Graciela Hernández (1995) in her essay 'Multiple Subjectivities and Strategic Positionality: Zora Neale Hurston's Experimental Ethnographies', shows how Hurston developed 'representational strategies' to negotiate her position as a researcher and a writer. Hurston's experiences were not unlike Deloria and Dove's, with regard to their work. As a student of Boas, Hurston was delighted when she received sanction to study her own people. It was Boas' view that few researchers had really came to understand the Black Southern Americans. In the foreword of Hurston's first ethnographic text, *Mules and Men* (1935), Franz Boas wrote of the inadequacy of previous research of Black Southern America particularly descriptions of Negro magic (his word) and voodoo, (Hoodoo). Boas suggests that Hurston had accessed more information and places in Southern America than most:

> the great merit in Miss Hurston's work [is] she entered into the homely life of the Southern Negro as one of them... she penetrate[d] through that affected demeanour by which the Negro excludes the White observer effectively from participating in his true inner life. Miss Hurston has been equally successful in gaining the confidence of the voodoo doctors and…throws a new light upon the much discussed voodoo beliefs and practices... the charm of a loveable personality and of a revealing style which makes Miss Hurston's work an unusual contribution to our knowledge of the true inner life of the Negro (Boas, 1995[1935]: Foreword in *Mules and Men)*. [This is a direct translation and the word 'negro' appears in the text].

Zora Neale Hurston was born in Eatonville, Florida, a pure Southern American town with charter, mayor, council and town marshal. When Hurston's mother died a once privileged life ceased, her father remarried and Hurston was separated from the family. She was dependent on precarious sources of income, again similar to her compatriots Ella Cara Deloria and Mourning Dove. Her mother's death affected her profoundly, and Hurston's life

and academic career was heavily influenced by her mother's memory, with later texts focusing on death and death ritual. Hurston attended Morgan Academy Baltimore, Howard Academy Washington D.C. and later Barnard College, New York City, having been chosen from among her school friends for having intellectual talent. Her ambition was to be a writer of fiction. Robert E. Hemenway, author of *Zora Neale Hurston, A Literary Biography* (1977), depicts a very vivid picture of the type of person Hurston was:

> She carried most of her belongings in her bag, including a number of manuscripts that she hoped would impress. Even if they did not she was confident of her ability to survive in the big city: she had been on her own since the age of fourteen. Brown skinned, big boned with freckles and high cheek bones, she was a striking woman; her dark brown eyes were both impish and intelligent, her voice was rich and black - with a map of Florida on her tongue (Hemenway, (1977) cited in Hernández, 1995:152).

In 1930, Hurston considered the possibility of doctoral study in Anthropology with Franz Boas focusing on Folklore.

> Boas encouraged Hurston to explore the wider implications of her work...and urged Hurston in her early fieldwork trips to focus on behaviour or stylistic aspects of the story telling sessions she saw in the South (Gordon, 1988 cited in Hernández, 1995:155).

Hurston gained financial support for her research from her patron, Mrs. Rufus Osgood Mason. However, the relationship with Osgood Mason was difficult not least because of Hurston's tendency to act outside normal researching criteria. Hurston noted that Osgood Mason would track her and then accuse her of not staying within her remit:

> My relations with Godmother were curious... there was and is a psychic bond between us... a letter would find me... "You have broken the law", it would accuse sternly (Hurston, 1995[1942]:688).

On winning a Rosenwald Foundation fellowship Hurston pursued her studies. Foundation officials expressed doubt about her commitment to study, and guaranteed funding for one semester only, and not two years. In the wake of this limited support, Hurston lost all ambition to get the degree and decided to write professionally. Her letter to the foundation President Edwin Embree, encapsulates her feelings on the matter:

> You would understand that I would not be able to do anything important towards a doctorate with a single semester of work. So I did what could amount to something I wrote two plays... I wrote the first draft of my next novel (Their Eyes Were Watching God) which already has been accepted by my publisher. It was six months of intensive labour, because I considered it *simply must* count constructively... Please accept my profound thanks... It [the fellowship funding] was short but important in my career (Hernández, 1995: 153.Emphasis in original).

Hurston was in a difficult position, trying to compromise between competing writing styles and requests of three disparate mentors namely, Osgood Mason, Boas and Locke. These desired different things: one of which was the 'scholarly objective, attentive to designating larger meaning' and the other the 'popular, laying out objects as if in a museum', along with her own ambitions (Hernández, 1995:154/155). Hurston had a quick turn of phrase and a humour to her writing that made it enjoyable. Fortunately, she met with other leading intellectuals who attempted to establish their own cultural sensibility at the time, W.E.B. Du Bois, Charles S. Johnson, Alain Locke, Wallace Thurman and Langston Hughes. These were all members of the Harlem Renaissance Cultural Movement (1918-1937). They worked together to disseminate theoretical perspectives on the relationship between art, culture and politics and published their opinions in a magazine called *Fire!!*. In effect, this was an analysis of the bourgeois interpretation of art versus a proletarian-based conception. Meeting with the group led Hurston to negotiate between established theoretical traditions and methodologies and a new approach. One articulation of this unconventional style was her use of folklore and local dialect. This frustrated some of her counterparts, such as Langston Hughes, who wanted to dissociate himself from such ideas and embrace new international forms promoted by modernism. Hurston was aware of the issue of race, and distinguishes between 'race pride', 'race prejudice', 'race man', 'race consciousness' and 'race solidarity', and the differences between the quiet spoken Negro, the educated Negro, the upper class Negro, and the under-privileged Negro (Hurston, 1995[1942]:720). Hurston frequently uses the word 'negro' in her writings and rather than see it as 'victim hood' she celebrated her origins and sees it as a celebratory status.

Hurston wrote two ethnographies, *Mules and Men* (1935) and *Tell My Horse (*1938), and an *Auto*biographical fiction, *Dust Tracks on a Road* (1942). In her ethnographies, she uses an un-neutral style and introduces authorial presence, eschewing the assumption the author/ethnographer had to stand outside the work, the social relations and subsequent representations of fieldwork or what Anthropologists understand to be three degrees of separation. In this matter, Boas' notion of 'the plasticity of human types' influenced Hurston. This was mentioned by Françoise Lionnet (1989) in '*Auto*ethnography: The An-archic Style of Dust Tracks on a Road' (Emphasis in original). Lionnet was emphasising the fact that Hurston's text was *Auto*ethnographic in two senses: Hurston's style was very much *Auto*ethnographic and anarchic as she used none of the controlling rules or principles as is typical of 'normal discourse' and she was writing from inside her own culture. Francoise Lionnet suggests Hurston's style is An-anarchic *Auto*ethnography:

> *Dust Tracks* amounts to "*Auto*ethnography that is the process of defining one's subjective ethnicity as mediated through language, history, and ethnographical analysis" (Lionnet, 1989:166).

Hurston's comparative text/monograph *Mules and Men* examines the social and cultural life of three different communities, Eatonville, Loughman and New Orleans. In her introduction to *Mules and Men,* she explains why she chose to go back to Eatonville. She knew the people would take no notice of her college education or the fact she was driving a Chevrolet; she would still be Zora to them and they would be open with her:

> I was glad when somebody told me...You may go and collect Negro folk-lore...it was only when I was off in college, away from my native surroundings, that I could see myself like somebody else and standoff and look at my garment. Then I had to have the spy-glass of Anthropology to look through at that... (Hurston, 1995[1935]:9).

Hurston knew there was a lot of material available and she would be in no danger or come to no harm. What she was highlighting here was the Academy's concern for female anthropologists out in the field researching alone. Hurston as a 'native anthropologist' could see past the tactics her fellowmen used against white interrogators:

> The Negro in spite of his open faced laughter, his seeming acquiescence, is particularly evasive... we smile and tell him something or her something that satisfies the white person because knowing so little about us, he doesn't know what he is missing. The Indian resists curiosity by a stony silence. The Negro offers a feather-bed resistance the Whiteman is always trying to know someone else's business ... he can read my writing but he sho' can't read my mind (Hurston, 1995[1935]:9).

Hurston's focus was the folktales on which she was reared. These include adaptations of the Bible, to suit the imaginations of young people under the guise of Brer Rabbit, Fox, Deer, 'Gator and Dawg, the Frog, the Massa (Master), and his wife including tales where the devil tried to outsmart God and the Hero John/Jack Henry outsmarted the devil or his Master. Her first collection of folklore is from Eatonville, the first 'all black town' in Florida, her own community. It was her intention to collect these folktales before they died out. She was recognised instantly, as she drove into the town:

> Ah come to collect some old stories and tales and Ah know y'all know plenty of 'em and that's why I headed straight for home ... "them big old lies we tell when we're jus sittin' around here on the porch doin' nothin'... don't you come here and tell the biggest lie first thing. Who you reckon want to read them old-time tales?"… We want to set them down before it's too late ... before everybody forgets all of 'em' (Hurston, 1995[1935]:13-14).

College achievements did not impede her gaining the information; she was still a 'native daughter' of the community:

> I didn't go back there so that the home folks could make admiration over me because I had been up North to college and come back with a diploma and a Chevrolet. I knew they weren't going to pay either one of these items too much mind. I was just Lucy Hurston's daughter, Zora, and even if I had - to use one of our down - home expressions - had a Kaiser baby … I'd still be just Zora to the neighbours (Hurston, 1995[1938]:9).

Hurston's experience in her 'home' town contrasted significantly with the second community she visited, Polk County, where she was not a native and in unfamiliar territory. This community operated different race, class and gender dynamics. Initially, the people were wary of her for two reasons: they thought she was a Revenue or Law officer and secondly her appearance suggested a position of high social and socio economic standing. The difference between a $12.74 dress from Macy's and a $1.98 mail order instigated a barrier with the townswomen. In order to access men, the keepers of the folkloric tradition, and to dispel other women's suspicion she sacrificed her physical integrity, pretending she was in a relationship. However, the community's other women saw Hurston as a threat, especially Lucy and Ella, who threatened to kill her (Hurston, 1995[1935]: Chapters IV-X).

In providing ethnographic details of distinctive folk traditions, songs, community tensions, work ethics and spiritual expressions, Hurston demonstrates her adeptness as interlocutor moving from one community to another. Her work contributes important historical information on Southern rural communities, their beliefs, values and practices as an essential segment of the African American population. Her work evidences two things in particular: the socially constructed nature of race and gender; and how these constructions vary, over time and place. She articulates social beliefs and practices through powerful descriptions of African American cultural life. Alice Walker praised Hurston for capturing the Southern Negro Folks sensibility. Walker while researching for *In Search of Our Mothers Gardens* (1983) and *The Color Purple* (1982) found Hurston's work the only one that provided a close and detailed understanding of the way of life Blacks Southern American society (Walker, 1975). Hurston challenges her readers to actively engage with her words and construct their own interpretation of subjective accounts. For her 'the creation of meaning is as much a matter of a reading strategy as it is about her own writing strategy' (Hernandez, 1995:156). One of Hurston's conventions was using direct local dialect:

> Them kind of by-words...They all got a hidden meaning, just like de Bible. Everybody can't understand what they mean. Most people is thin-brained. They's born wid they feet under the moon. Some folks is born wid they feet on de sun and they kin seek out de inside meanin' of words (Hurston, 1995[1935]:125).

In the second part of *Mules and Men* Hurston demonstrated her interests in researching spiritual traditions, spirituality and the body mainly through Hoodoo, a spiritual

practice originated in West African beliefs and practices. As an initiate of Hoodoo, she added both attraction and complication to her research, as her own person and psychic state become the central focus of the narrative, as in *Auto*ethnography. Louisiana and New Orleans were the Hoodoo capital of America, particularly around the French Quarter. Hurston offers an insight into a world not readily understandable yet common practice in certain communities. Initially, she had to overcome some difficulties in securing reputable mentors. Hurston first sought out those who knew of Marie Levee, a shaman of Hoodoo, closely aligned with a snake. Upon the death of both Leveau and the snake, Leaveau's nephew Luke Turner inherited the art and the power, using the snake's skin to carry out shamanism. Initially, Turner was sceptical about Hurston's sincerity in becoming a Hoodoo practitioner, but later acquiesced (Hurston,1995[1935]:189-191). Hurston recounts a number of initiation ceremonies that require days of preparation, of fasting, of purification, of solitude. Some initiation ceremonies involved nakedness, some involved bathing and nearly all involved candles and altars and the exchange of blood. What is curious about Hurston's participation in these rituals is her entrusting her naked body to the hands of mostly male practitioners and other male witnesses. Hurston deviated from standard ethnographic conventions, which demand the distant voice, and through a self-reflexive mode uncovered the asymmetrical relationships, which exist between the researcher and the community studied:

> Hurston's ethnographies demonstrate that self reflexivity in and of itself does not necessary ameliorate disparate power relations (Hernandez, 1995:151).

Reviews and Criticisms of Hurston's Work

Hernández's project was to both attribute and negotiate meaning of, Hurston's work. In looking beyond Hurston's life and considering her enigmatic personality, and the intellectual social and political milieu that simultaneously structured her world and informed her work, Hernández recognised that historical forces 'circumscribed' Hurston's scholarship which was polarised between lionising and disparagement. Hernández provides a comprehensive overview of other male/female writers' view of Hurston's position within the academy that question how her experimental ethnographies and other works placed her within the tradition, yet she was effaced by masculinist bias in both theory and practice of Anthropology (Hernández, 1995:148). Negative responses to Hurston's work were that of a 'limited cultural vision' on matters such as race, class, gender and methodology and appear to trivialise the complexity of the African American community life (Hernández, 1995:156). They delimit the role of cultural expression, as they appear resentful that African Americans might indulge in social pleasures. Lewis Gannett of the *New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review* suggested that Hurston's informants lied to her as only black men lie to a dark girl whom they trust (Gannet, 1935 cited in Hernández, 1995:156). Gannet misinterprets what

Hurston meant when she spoke of 'lies'; 'lying' was a metaphor used by Hurston to explain the variations of the folktales as told under different circumstances. What she meant was that each folktale, story, or event took on new meaning each time it was told. Hurston was trying to convey the importance of the observer knowing their material, so they can easily identify and recognise when informants are adding or padding. As Hurston said, it was not about the words but the tune (Hurston, 1995[1942]:706). This is an advantage the *Auto*ethnographer (being an insider) has: they know the material (Hurston, 1995[1942]:706). As Hernández suggests: the 'text cannot be separated from a complex web of social relationships' (Hernández, 1995:161). H.I. Brock's comments (1935) in the *New York Times Book Review* appear both patronising and racist based as they are on assumptions of a dominant culture, and failed to recognise the value of Hurston's work, suggesting she had regressed by studying her own people:

> the writer has gone back to her native racial quality entirely unspoiled by her Northern college education. She has plunged into the social pleasures of the black community and made a record of what is said and done when Negroes are having a good gregarious time, dancing, singing, fishing, and above all, incessantly talking (Brock, 1935 cited in Hernandez, 1995:156).

These were boundaries that, in the opinion of both her peers and her superiors within the academy, she should not have crossed; this behaviour was a contributing factor to her work being downplayed.

Three significant developments influenced Hurston's life and work: a) the popular interest in race relations, b) the theoretical shifts in Anthropology and c) the institutionalisation of Anthropology within the academy. In 1920s, American Anthropology there was shift from diffusionist and evolutionist approaches to social analysis. At Columbia University, under the guidance of Boas and Benedict, both cultural relativity and psychoanalysis were being emphasised. Hurston was committed to the study of black women and by virtue of her background was able to contribute at a different level. Like many female writers and Anthropologists Hurston seemed to struggle with addressing disciplinary concerns and theoretical issues, stressing malleability and the blurring of genre boundaries instead. One strategy for managing this is presenting herself as an actor; this is a crucial feature in her (*Auto*) ethnographic accounts:

> Nothing that God ever made is the same thing to more than one person. That is natural. There is no single face in nature because every eye that looks upon it, sees it from its own angle. So everyman's spice box seasons his own food. Naturally, I picked up the reflections of life around me with my own instruments, and absorbed what I gathered accordingly to my inside juices (Hurston, 1995[1942]:599).

In an article, 'What White Publishers Won't Print', published in *Negro Digest* (1950) Hurston questions why the internal lives and the emotions of the 'Negroes' (Hurston's word) had not been investigated. Hurston criticises the fiction built around upper class 'Negroes' and suggests that the lack of literature about minorities in general contributes to continuing ignorance. Prior to the rise of the Civil Rights Movement of the 60s, she proposed that understanding 'Negroes' as people and not just another race would be beneficial to the new post war nation and ridicules the 'reversion of type' folklore. Other works were published along these lines, but Hurston noted that:

> these works should be followed up by some incisive and intimate stories from the inside... for various reasons, the average, struggling, non-morbid Negro is the best kept secret in America... this knowledge will destroy many illusions and romantic traditions which America probably likes to have around (Hurston, 1995[1950]:954).

Hurston admits that Anthropology as a method and tool gave her the impetus to evaluate her own culture while serving as a sense of power; potentially bringing that which is far from view into sharp and static focus. While Hurston proceeds to codify knowledge, and consolidates the discipline of Anthropology, using theory and methodology to legitimise her work, she also 'undermines the ethnography as a final repository of knowledge' and challenges the status quo (Hernández,1995:151). The 'subjective' view destabilises ethnographic authority but provides a vantage point from which one may observe shifting allegiances. Her texts defy disciplinary frameworks, if we are to consider her life and her cultural production from the perspective of social scientists and black feminist literary critics (Hernández, 1995:151). Hurston advocates for *Auto*ethnography by putting herself at the centre of the research. Hurston may have felt it incumbent upon her to do so, if she wanted to represent her own culture and community with authenticity. This afforded Hurston the opportunity to develop her perspectives on representation as her experimental, experiential discursive style subverts the established authority. Hurston's model offers an opportunity to researchers and cultural workers to recognise the limitations of representational strategies and offers a gauge through which others can measure their own efforts as they grapple with the subjective presence in writings and practices in the field. *Auto*ethnography as a 'representational strategy' has been evaluated and criticised too [See Chapter 7]. Hernández sees Hurston's representational strategy as 'Literary Harmonic' due to her use of polyvalent meanings.

Gwendolyn Mikell (1983) and Deborah A. Gordon (1990) critically studied Hurston's 'representational strategies'. Mikell (1983) asserts that Hurston inhabited three worlds: rural southern black, the cultural dynamism of the Harlem Renaissance and the intellectual atmosphere of Columbia and noted Hurston received little credit for the anthropological traditions she inherited. These factors influenced Hurston's appreciation of African American

and Caribbean culture and formulated her work. Works of Elsie Clews Parson, Ruth Benedict, Ruth Landes and many more were similarly challenged for their literary strategies and inserting themselves within the studied community. The focus of these women's work was relationships, the home, women themselves, motherhood, childrearing and sustenance, all of which are a microcosm of the larger macro picture. This work asserts that understanding the micro Malinowski's minutiae and Geertz 'thick description' contributes to greater understanding e.g., what happens in the home (micro) reflects what happens outside (macro) and both influence each other.

It is unsurprising that problems occur when narrow definitions of literature and strict definitions of ethnography are disrupted, but new methods are/were needed to be deployed to appreciate black and other women's cultural artefacts. Michelle Wallace, a cultural critic in an essay titled 'Who Owns Zora Neale Hurston? Critics Carve Up the Legend' (1990) considered the 'displacement of crucial social categories'. She was particularly concerned with Harold Bloom's erasure of interpretive frameworks used by scholars especially that of Zora Neale Hurston, in a text *Zora Neale Hurston* (1986) which Bloom edited. Wallace felt Bloom had objectified Hurston in a

> sexually charged image of Western culture's embedded anti-feminism. Hurston's silent black body floats to the surface of a systemic dilemma (Wallace, 1990:176)

Wallace, in posing the question about how cultural contributions and intellectual insights of African Americans were appropriated, counter poses scholarly work done by men with that of women; similarly, contributions made by whites are set against those made by African Americans. Black feminist critics such as bell hooks (1990) consider it necessary to claim back black women's cultural traditions and recognise the current politically demanded intellectual traditions. Hazel Carby, again quoted by Hernández notes

> [that] black feminist criticism be regarded critically as a problem, not a solution, as a sign that should be interrogated, a locus of contradictions, Black feminist critical theory should yield a vantage point from which to regard 'racisms and sexisms...as particular historical practices articulated with each other and with other practices in social formation' (Carby,1987:1-18).

P. Gabrielle Foreman (1990) in an essay titled 'Looking back from Zora, or Talking out Both Sides of my Mouth for Those Who have Two Ears' wrote

> The lack of a discernible tradition has been a silencing agent in the history of Blacks, of women, of Black women, of indeed marginalised groupings. Without a 'tradition' into which to fit us, we have been misunderstood, misinterpreted, and finally often quickly dismissed (Foreman, 1990: 662).

Diane L. Wolf in discussing 'feminist dilemmas in fieldwork' quoted by Hernández says:

> [scholars should] consider how we as feminist researchers are constituted as culturally, socially, and historically specific subjects in particular global configurations of economic and political powers (Wolf, 1993:6).

Reviews of Hurston's work demonstrate the consequences of her previously unknown highly experimental technique and the narrow conservative view of people who knew little of who or what she was studying. Hernández comments on Hemenway's (1977) assessment of Hurston as it fails to 'contextualise her accomplishments and failures', (Hernández, 1995: 153). Hernández recommended that an 'expansive vision of textual production' was required because the cultural artefacts of black women both exceeded and challenged already established scholarly boundaries of traditional approaches (Hernández, 1995:151). Previously, the voices and the texts of many female (feminist) scholars whether African American, Native American Indian, Chicano and others, whose discourse often reflected race and gender analysis were overlooked, undermined or ignored. This was due to male hegemonic forces at work within the discipline, where the female/feminine/feminist literary approach was not considered suitably academic or sufficiently scientific/analytic, to satisfy the status quo in Anthropology. This is indicative of the powerlessness of women's inscriptions in the political moment of writing.

A further example of how women's writing was not taken serious is the critique Pritchard made of Mead's works, as *Rustling-of-the-Wind-in-the-Palm-Trees School of Ethnographic Writing* (Lutkehaus, 1995:187). Kamala Visweswaran (1988) in her work 'Defining Feminist Ethnography' suggested the ethnographic canon be revaluated to allow for literary forms such as the novel, the short story, the memoir, the *Auto*ethnography to underscore the 'intertwining of race and gender with questions of genre' (Visweswaran,1988:39). Recent scrutinising of and challenging traditional literary and anthropological canons have reversed the erasure of these writers, and resurrected their voices to be heard, in some cases for the first time. One recurring aspect in all of these ethnographic experiences is ethnographic authority in terms of who holds the authority, observer or informant, and with whom does the ethnographic authority lie to write and speak on behalf of another (See Buzard, 2003 discussed at length in Chapter 7).

While questioning and examining the work of earlier Anthropologists, and locating them within socio-political moments, and identifying how they were recognised and positioned within the academy, researchers are conscious of their own position. In questioning her own position as a Chicano feminist representing the work of a Black South

American i.e. Zora Neale Hurston, Hernández reflects the considerations of many indigenous people and writers' view, of how they were scripted or represented. In setting about putting the record straight, these indigenous authors were disenfranchised, as if they had no right or position within the academy, leading them to doubt their own authenticity. Female researchers, who earnestly sought academic recognition, were constituted in certain ways. Hurston and her work are both historically significant, and highly relevant to contemporary anthropological and literary debates because of who she is and what she wrote. Of late, Hurston has now been acclaimed, and reclaimed by females. They not only see her research as invaluable from a literary feminist perspective, but also as heralding a new genre within Anthropology, self-reflective experiential ethnography, (*Auto*ethnography).

Reflection

On reflection, the work of Ella Car Deloria, Mourning Dove and Zora Neale Hurston consist of a number of themes closely aligned with *Auto*ethnography, its purpose and its challenges: what *Auto*ethnography is and what it does. Their work raises the question of the value of *Auto*ethnography, and consequently how a new process of analysis and appreciation is required.

These three authors were pioneers of *Auto*ethnography in their own right. They studied their own cultures to preserve their traditions and customs. They knew the ways of the people they represented intimately. More importantly, they defended their cultures against much malignment. They sought to create better understanding and set the record straight. As the reporting conventions of the time were too restrictive, they used the novel as a means of presenting their work. As Cohen (2015) describes it

> Deloria and Hurston were "cultural brokers", insiders/outsiders who were both "othered" and mentored by Anthropology and were required to 'other' their cultures of origin due to the confines of scientific writing (Cohen, 2015: Introduction).

Consequently, they were unaccepted in academia, and not afforded recognition deserved of serious academics. In effect, they highlight the place of marginalised work practices such as *Auto*ethnography, and the position of marginalised and coloured women, as authors, within literature and the academy. During their lifetime, these women's worth remained unacknowledged, and each of these women died in abject poverty. Today Deloria and Hurston's value is recognised and appreciated

Moving on from Category 1, Indigenous Ethnography, the next section examines Category 2 of *Auto*ethnography, the Study of One's Own Culture One Generation Removed,

or Second Generation *Auto*ethnography, or Ethnic Identity Ethnography. Here we examine the work of Barbara Myerhoff (1978), who worked from 'within' a community closely associated to her heritage.

Section 3: Exemplar of Category 2: Ethnic Identity Ethnography Or Second Generation *Auto*ethnography*:*

'New theoretical wine requires new presentational bottles' (Victor Turner, 1978).

Barbara Myerhoff

Introduction

Barbara Myerhoff presented a new vision and approach in Anthropology, where she was *Auto*ethnographer once removed, that is Myerhoff studied her own culture, a Jewish Community, from which she was separated by one generation. Second generation Jewish American, she, like many others, was ambivalent about her identity with no clear concept of her ethnic membership; 'confused and embarrassed about our backgrounds' she knew very little about the culture or how to engage with it (Myerhoff,1978:11). Myerhoff had no training, experience or understanding of what it was to be a Jew; her parents and family were non-practising. Like many others who fled to America her family were ashamed of being greenhorns (Myerhoff,1978:11). Religion was no longer the centre of life; rather survival, work and money were the central affairs (Myerhoff,1978:246). In her work Myerhoff uses self-narrative to present, a collection of *Auto*ethnographies/life stories which explain and describe being a member of a particular group or culture.

In the 1970s, Anthropologists were ceasing to investigate exotic remote preliterate societies. Such societies were becoming more obsolete, unavailable and inhospitable, with many ethnic groups no longer welcoming of outsiders and frequently suggesting Anthropologists should 'study their own kind' (Myerhoff,1978:12). At Southern California University Myerhoff's focus was Ethnicity and Aging, a fledgling project, as she felt little was known about what it was to be old and Jewish in America. Feeling the pressure to study your own Myerhoff focused on an aging elderly Jewish community in Venice, Southern California (Myerhoff, 1978:12). Her work introduces *Auto*ethnographies of the elderly people of this community and tries to convey how important their stories were to their survival:

> We are rarely presented with the views of old people about themselves and given the opportunity to hear how aging is experienced by them, 'from inside the native's head so to speak (Myerhoff,1978:251).

Along with her novel methodology to anthropological research, Myerhoff instigated and made popular 'Visual Anthropology', which emerged with the reflexive turn in ethnography. Her 'reflective' influences stem from Victor Turner and Barbara Babcock who considered 'reflexive anthropology' in 1977. The results of Myerhoff's work is presented in both text and film, the text was titled *Number Our Days* (1978), and later became a documentary. A subsequent documentary *In Her Own Time* (1985) catalogued Myerhoff's own re-conversion and illness. Victor Turner in the foreword to Myerhoff's text *Number Our Days* suggested that Myerhoff was part of a vanguard in anthropological theory; her use of a new, reflexive method meant Anthropology had come of age. Former barriers like the dichotomies between self/other, head/heart, conscious/unconscious and history/*Auto*biography were dissipating and a new method of expressing the vital interdependencies of these binaries was emerging. Turner referred to M.N. Srinivas (1916-1999), an Indian Anthropologist who spoke of the Brahmin belief about being twice born. So that his students might fully appreciate their discipline, Srinivas encouraged them to consider being 'thrice born'. The first birth is that of natal origin in a particular culture. The second is the move from the familiar to the strange, (fieldwork) whereupon familiarisation with the exotic assists understanding the rule of bizarre and 'other'; the third birth is when one is comfortable within the 'other' culture the Anthropologist (re)turns his/her gaze towards his/her own native land. In thus coming full circle, the Anthropologist understands themselves and others better (Turner,1978: ix). For Turner, few Anthropologists went the distance, feeling that they have achieved it all having processed the fieldwork of another culture.

Barbara Myerhoff was part of this new 'thrice born' breed engaging in a reflexivity of a culture, in this instance an ageing group of Jews located in the Aliyah Senior Citizens Centre, Venice, California. Myerhoff states that from the beginning the research affected her personally, in a way she never anticipated. The short documentary *In Her Own Time* (1986) details her experience of illness and is a resource for coming to understand the Jewish religion as she opened doors for people to witness. Unfortunately, she did not see this project come to fruition, as she died prematurely aged 49 in 1985 from cancer. Both the text and the documentary are wholly *Auto*ethnographical, as they use the personal experiences to examine and critique cultural experience. They are also purposeful commentaries on cultural practices. Both projects taught her many lessons not least about an alternative lifestyle antithetical to that esteemed by contemporary Americans.

In *Number Our Days* Myerhoff divides the text into a number of themes: the centrality of the Centre in these peoples' lives; their past and how it manifests itself in their present, and contributes to their identity, especially in the practice of their beliefs and traditions; how these beliefs and traditions contribute to their coping with old age; and finally

what she understood as part of her own inheritance and heritage, and her role as an Anthropologist. Myerhoff used the analogy of a quilt for the community made up of many pieces, sewn together out of necessity, to serve and to last:

> Cultures are, after all, untidy assemblages, authenticated by belief and agreement, focused only in crisis, systematised after the fact (Myerhoff,1978:10).

The Aliyah Centre

Myerhoff's informants, The Aliyah Centre group, included poor Eastern European peasant migrants from Yiddish speaking village shetls, like the Pale of Settlement in Czarist Russia. They had been impoverished, and often terrorised by anti-Semites in the late 1800s. During the reign of Czar Alexander II, life became unbearable with the 1881-82 pogroms and economic and legal restrictions. This group had two primary languages, Yiddish, was used daily and Hebrew was their language of prayer. The migrants who attended the centre were survivors twice over having survived (escaped) the Holocaust and as a result surviving their parents, peers and families. They frequently arrived in America poverty-stricken and needing to work extremely hard to survive and educate their children. Those children, who often became very successful and assimilated Americans, abandoned their parents and their heritage (Turner, 1978: x). This was in many ways an impressive achievement group as they bypassed the three generations it generally took immigrants to assimilate achieving it in one, earning the title 'the one generation proletariat' (Myerhoff,1978:17).

Not entirely of the group, Myerhoff relied on some primary informants one of which was Schmuel Goldman, the 'filosofe' and tailor. However, though Schmuel was an insider, he was also an outsider of sorts; a self-educated man he scorned the Centre members for not knowing their history or traditions correctly and the 'made up' way they executed their religion:

> How could they understand they haven't got the vie, so uneducated. The weight of Jewish History, Jewish thought, is too heavy for those people. They are too small to bear the Covenant (Myerhoff,1978:50).

When Myerhoff explained what Anthropology was, he asked, "So you want me to be your native?" He disclaimed he was 'not typical' and suggested she go elsewhere. Eventually, when she explained how she was drawn by his learning and philosophical approach he participated with enthusiasm. Myerhoff often consulted with Schmuel to get an alternative view. Both Schmuel and his wife Rebekah gave Myerhoff an insight to and an understanding of elderly people's thoughts and views in these circumstances. Both Schmuel and his wife

were without the usual identity markers of the elderly, dentures and heavy glasses and cared for their appearance. Their one son, who held a PhD and lived far away, was critical of them for not rearing him in the Jewish tradition as he was rearing his two children. Rebekah missed her grandchildren but Schmuel said it was 'a fact of life to be hurt by your children' (Myerhoff, 1978:46).

Myerhoff learned much from Schmuel: how the Jewish tailors brought the 'coat' to America; how they hid from anything that was Jewish to survive; how the Catholics and Jews lived alongside each other in Poland; and how Catholics saved them once by a bell. Rebekah reprimanded Schmuel for recounting terrible things, such as his experience of being stabbed in the neck. Schmuel however, believed, in order to appreciate the good, you must know also the bad (Myerhoff, 1978:56). He evidenced this by disclosing his involvement in a Polish boy's drowning, a deep secret he had carried for years. Schmuel felt if Myerhoff did not know the story, she did not know him. Myerhoff offered to erase the story but he questioned whether they were doing serious work or telling grandmother tales ('bobbe-myseh'). Schmuel distinguished between a life of shade and life of colour and promoted a positive outlook. He spoke of the importance of literacy and recalled how as children their only text was the Bible. As children, they played characters from the bible, which made a lasting impression on him:

> Sometimes I am really astonished to which extent it reached out to me, and this was completely without any studies...Those Bible stories taught us how to live (Myerhoff,1978:59).

Schmuel analogises the growth of the individual with religion and culture. He believed religion grew internally for the individual but culture is a close thing passed from mother to child. A strong element of that culture and identity is language, and Schmuel explained the emergence of a mother tongue, as part of their Jewish identity (Myerhoff,1978:60). The Jews possess three languages: Hebrew to speak with God, Yiddish to speak amongst themselves, and the local language of the society they lived in.

In appreciating Schmuel's position and perspective, placed Myerhoff better to understand the way of life of the Centre members. The Centre and Community was like a micro society within the locale and was central to their daily lives. Previously it had been a hub of activity where they reared their children, with many shops, bakeries and synagogues. The 300 members of the Centre paid dues of $6 a year, which also had the support of a Jewish Philanthropic organisation. Non-members also participated in some activities. There were hot meals daily and cultural programmes such as a Jewish History Class, films on Israel, Gerontology Class. However, with no government investment, it became dilapidated over time and the population declined from 10,000 to 4,000. In the 1950s the construction of a

marina and urban development programme threatened a '2nd holocaust', with displacement for many (Myerhoff, 1978:6). Equally, as an aging community, the Centre continually faced extinction with no new members. The Centre gave structure and meaning to its members' lives, providing them with a reason to get up and do something or be somewhere, otherwise they would sit at home alone. 'All of them, they sit in their little rooms all night and in the morning they come in here, like coming back into the world' (Myerhoff,1978:136). On the periphery, there were surfers, bathers and dogs, completely unaware of the co-existing community. By day, the scene was colourful and entertaining but by night dangerous, with the risk of intimidation, muggings, rape and occasionally murder. In effect, the community was almost a continuum or replica of their Eastern European past: small, intimate, cohesive, ethnocentric, politically impotent, physically insecure and surrounded by indifferent, even hostile, outsiders.

A prime location within the community was the boardwalk, similar to the village plaza. Myerhoff found information is gathered through non-verbal communication when studying elderly people and children. The bodily state being a large determinant of the wellbeing of a person. The elderly would make their way down to the boardwalk, their social centre, each day and take a seat on a bench facing outwards towards the sea or inwards towards the few shops and Centre. They approached the boardwalk with trepidation as a fall would/could mark disaster for them. Myerhoff tried to emulate old age by removing her glasses and wearing earplugs. A near fall taught her the feeling of terror. Myerhoff identified a form of 'bench behaviour', where the community divided into two groups; the men sat and discussed matters of ideological concerns such as politics, religion or economics; the women sat apart and discussed personal immediate matters such as children, family, food, health, neighbours, love affairs and scandals. This separation of the sexes came with them from their past and played out in all aspects of their lives; it is especially evident in the way they managed old age.

Myerhoff had to get past Abe the Centre Director to do her research. Abe acted as gatekeeper and looked out for the welfare of the closed community group. As a vulnerable community, they were distrusting, and wary of intrusions into their life. Therefore, not everyone could venture in to get information. Isolation in part, worked in their favour, as they were free to find their own way and indulge their passions without fear of stigma. Myerhoff felt Levi-Strauss' term 'bricolage' summed up their situation suitably with fragments of the past adapted, adopted, adjusted, improvised and appropriated. Abe suggested classes as a means of getting the members to participate in the research. Certainly, Myerhoff's Jewishness made access easier. Myerhoff valued and validated this form of research against others, because of the fact that she would be 'a little old Jewish lady' someday:

> Identifying with others is often an act of imagination, a means of discovering what one is not nor will ever be ... identifying with what one is now and will be in the future is a different process (Myerhoff,1978:18).

Coping with Displacement: Importance of Religion and Education

Adjusting to life in America, they had lost things over time, particularly their religion. In their former countries, there were three elements or components to being a Jew, some of which travelled with them and remerged at a later stage of their life. They were The Great Tradition, The Little Tradition and the meaning of Eretz Yisroel (Israel). Out of necessity a fourth element was established, namely Judaism of Modern America. The Great Tradition was largely a male domain, where the father took responsibility for the sons understanding and involvement in the following: Jewish Learning; formal Jewish Law; use of Hebrew; the experience of being One People despite geographical dispersion; Sabbath and studying of Torah. The Little Tradition, also known as Yiddishkeit, was the most influential and immediate source of the old people's identification with being a Jew. A form of 'Domestic Religion' it was transferred, maintained and sustained by the mothers through the way they taught their children about being in the world, rituals, protocols and manners (Myerhoff,1978:234/235). This grounding gave the children a sense of who they were but it diminished in the middle years especially due to adjusting to American life. Later the elderly people revived it. The meaning of Eretz Yisroel (Israel) was a personal and unifying dimension of Judaism, equated with their survival as a people and the survival of Israel. Many supported the Israeli cause as a matter of pride, by donating money and organising charity events, often going without themselves to the dismay of their children. Philanthropy for Jews was often seen as a religious and customary obligation, while others were against such efforts, claiming supported violence especially against the Palestinians, was not the way of the Torah (Myerhoff,1978:49). Currently Israel was not presenting an image of a Promised Land as anticipated, but one of a secular modern state. As such, the elderly were coming to terms with oppositions, such as beliefs in nationalism/internationalism, religious and cultural Judaism (Myerhoff,1978:219). Being a Jew in America was blurred and uneasy; it was seen as a bewildering, embarrassing condition, a social impediment that was never satisfactorily resolved and led to American Judaism which was problematic in the 'middle years'. American Judaism lacked firm roots and social supports and the Great Tradition was of little help. To compensate groups often established a Jewishness of their own; or some joined Yiddish political groups with small orthodox temples (Myerhoff,1978: 95-99).

For Aliyah Centre members' markers of success such as wealth, power, physical beauty, youth, mobility, security and social status were anathema. Having experienced hardship and poverty, resourcefulness was not a new phenomenon for the group. They devised a counter world, inventing their own version of a good life, built on veneration of

religious and cultural membership, full of meaning, intensity and consciousness, which emerged from their past experience. A passion for meaning, which appealed to Myerhoff, was valued above happiness or comfort.

Given their displacement, the group instituted order and structure through a highly ritualised life, to make sense of their world and give it meaning. Myerhoff noted how religious and social activities/events, what she labelled 'definitional ceremonies' (Myerhoff, 1978:150), gave meaning and identity to the group, even though the religious events had been somewhat tailored, (domesticated) to satisfy their new situation. For example, the Sabbath ritual was extended; instead of one lighting the candle there were now three allowing for greater participation; New Year's Eve was held a day and half early to enable the elderly be home before dark and because the hired musician was available at a cheaper rate. Many of the adapted religious events appeared boisterous, disorganised or chaotic with individuals vying for attention. Myerhoff's experience of these rituals tailored or otherwise showed her how they created meaning, unity, identity and security for the elderly group members. Victor Turner (1967) comments on rituals describing the opposing poles of ritual and sacred symbols, abstract, ideal, normative vs. concrete, physiological and affective. Myerhoff experienced the coalescing of these components, which brought enormous satisfaction and comfort to the practitioners:

> I remembered how often I had been utterly unmoved by beautiful temple services held in lavish halls... even though as a woman I had to stand outside I had never been to so religious a service, nor had I ever beheld an object so sacred as the covering on Sylvia's head (Myerhoff, 1978:261).

From the male Jewish perspective, Jews were dedicated to learning; it was central to their way of being, seen as a blessing but also as a way of opening one up to new possibilities (Myerhoff,1978:93). In the living history class, Myerhoff found that the elderly combined learning with reminiscing and storytelling. Myerhoff was attracted to the storytelling, as she recalled her Grandmother Sofie Mann, whose maiden name and past remained unknown, told stories and opened up a new world for her. In the living history class, the group presented notes, journals, poetry and reflections. Through engaging with their contributions, Myerhoff came to understand her own heritage better, while her participants came to gain greater meaning in their lives. Fearing invisibility or being forgotten, the group constructed an identity through stories and memories. These they shared enthusiastically, and enriched each other's lives (Myerhoff, 1978:33-39). Their enthusiasm often made the task of transcribing difficult, but soon they began to listen and appreciate the privilege of the disclosures among them. Encouraging the members to share their own stories was therapeutic for them. According to Myerhoff, numerous studies concurrent with her research, demonstrated the

therapeutic function and benefits of storytelling and Autobiographical work among the elderly. This suggested storytelling was/is a powerful and necessary human activity (Myerhoff,1978:276). Turner noted the value of the process:

> She uses this material to show us the very processes through which her subjects weave meaning and identity out of their memory and experiences (Turner, 1978: Foreword in Myerhoff,1978: xi).

Myerhoff noted endless arguing as a characteristic of the Jewish temperament, especially among the women, who were given to outbursts of emotion, arguing and disputing. Almost without exception at each group event, a row broke out, or someone said something inappropriate. The planning of decorous event often led to anxiety. At one point, Myerhoff noted she found the exchanges and constant complaining disturbing and disheartening, especially having witnessed the group's greediness at meal times (Myerhoff,1978:189). However, the energy exuded in the exchanges was deemed symbolic of affection, and better than ostracism or hard heartening. As Olga and Basha, Centre members, explained the arguing was essential: 'we fight to keep warm. That's how we survive' (Myerhoff,1978:188).

Aging was a constant concern for the group members. Myerhoff observed that women were better suited to aging than the men were. As they moved through the changing, unpredictable world of old age, the women's adaptability and flexibility to cope with so many demands like pragmatism, homemaking, caretaking of husbands and children, contributing to the household budget stood to them. By contrast, the men found aging much more difficult through its association with a series of losses: independence, freedom, money, relationships, strength, beauty, potency and possibilities. They enacted the shetl male role, idealised scholarly persona, dignified, remote, self-absorbed, and reflective, even grave (Myerhoff, 1978:232). Carol S. Holzberg's (1980) criticism of *Number Our Days* is that Myerhoff presents Centre culture through the males. However, in Myerhoff's portrayal the woman's life is well considered, and does much to dissuade against the opinion that the women were non-contributors to the survival of their community. Myerhoff points out how women were often underappreciated and unrecognised for their valuable contributions to the continuity of their society. The Centre showed how both sexes carved out a career in aging: the women began achieving in their own right, and doing things they wanted to do for themselves; while men became an accessory, a token of pride, which was left aside at the door of the Centre and collected on leaving (Myerhoff,1978: 246/350).

For the community, their biggest fears were hospitalisation, moving to a retirement home, or relocation to a big city with their children. They tried to maintain an independent existence where three key markers of success were: to be able to take care of themselves; to

stretch their monthly pensions; and to fill their days in ways that had meaning. One of the biggest challenges the group faced was dismantling or losing each other as highlighted by Basha, a group member who decided to move to a nursing home because living alone was too troublesome. Despite her stoicism, her fears echoed those of her cohorts: the packing and disposal of property; surrendering savings; losing or redirecting a pension; the onus on children to contribute. Fundamentally, they feared loss of independence and becoming dependent. Basha's friends advised her on strategies for coping and survival, and as Sonya, another group member pointed out the 'Jews were the world's best wanderers' and she was bound to meet some (Myerhoff, 1978:253). The ultimate loss was death, and Myerhoff experienced some within the community. Closely observing the ritual of death, burial and memorial she noticed how everyone seemed to know exactly what to do. At such times, they recollected what their mothers taught them. The deaths prompted discussion on the Angel of Death and the power of superstitions and beliefs on the community. Through Myerhoff's own experience of loss, having lost parents, grandparent and a close friend, Ruth Adams, she had come to accept the presence of the Angel of Death (Myerhoff,1978:231).

Survivors' Guilt and Researcher's Guilt

Guilt appears to be a prevailing emotion in Myerhoff's text on a number of levels. On the one hand, there was Survivor Guilt of the Centre people, because they had survived the Holocaust whereas many of their families had not. Some saw their move to America as brave, courageous and wise but those left behind perished. Faegl's story was typical; who having arrived in America scrimped and saved so her family could join her. However, when her sister refused to go to America her parents returned and all were lost in Auschwitz (Myerhoff,1978:24). Some see survivors as an embarrassment, wishing they would disappear as they are 'disturbers of peace', constant reminders, bearing witness to unbearable tales and unspeakable things unspoken. Research on Survival guilt has shown it to be irrational (Bettleheim,1976, cited in Myerhoff,1978:24) but for Myerhoff's informants it was very real. Myerhoff believed there is a slender thread between the survivor and the victim, where survivors' guilt is tormenting and crippling, but it is also the avenue through which survivor's discover their humanity.

On occasion, Myerhoff felt guilty and challenged by the research project on a number of levels, questioning her ability and experience. The Centre people often made her feel personally guilty about her own life; personal family matters, her clothes, her presence, her absence, the time she shared or didn't, how she combined family and career. While often they were proud and generous, occasionally they appeared resentful and ambivalent because it was not their own children interested in their lives. She often thought of quitting, feeling guilty about society's treatment of elderly people, and questioned if her time would be better served doing something practical. The research raised a number of insecurities for her on another

level, including the issues of objectivity, identification and the impact of the study. She was wholly familiar with the concept of participant observation and maintaining professional detachment to objectively observe and analyse, so she questioned her involvement, its purpose and researching a group so intimately. She highlights the contradiction of knowing others through oneself and knowing oneself through others. She queries how one could be insider and outsider simultaneously, as being insider she felt the closeness of the subject but being both insider and outsider could be equally troublesome and advantageous. Myerhoff's text demonstrates the experience of liminality and hybridity as explained by (Turner, 1969), (Homi Bhabha, 1994) and Denzin (2013). Myerhoff refers to Mehan and Woods (1975), discussion on the paradox of belonging and not belonging to an observed culture whereupon they lament 'methodological aloofness' as unacceptable as it prevents the fieldworker from effectively knowing people studied. They urge greater involvement:

> the researcher cannot hold back; the one who does in the name of objectivity never comes to respect (the) reality being studied or be respected by its practitioners (Mehan and Woods, 1975:227 cited in Myerhoff, 1978:275).

A practical dilemma for Myerhoff, similar to that experienced by many ethnographers and *Auto*ethnographers alike was how much is enough: what to include, what to exclude, when to cease, when to leave. Myerhoff was concerned also about privacy and anonymity. She took the usual precautions in protecting individuals' privacy to prevent the elderly from recognising themselves, or obvious embarrassment for themselves or their children, cause pain or jeopardise her relationship with them. However, some did not wish to remain anonymous. Towards the end of the research, the subject of privacy was contravened partially, in the production of a documentary film, directed by Lynne Littman. It won an Academy Award and unsolicited financial support for the Centre. The film, unlike the text, does not highlight the less flattering things Myerhoff observed. Although Myerhoff proclaims that her interpretation pertains to a particular people at a particular time, many of the conditions apply to all elderly people across a range of places and cultures. Similarly, how the upcoming generation appreciates or deals with them. Empathetically, Myerhoff acknowledged how modern society increasingly disengaged from the elderly, or vice versa. Myerhoff was unaware of accessible models for successful old age. She questions why young people dread old age and points to one advantage of the project: an opportunity to contemplate or anticipate the future. Myerhoff suggests, that old age it is often denied rather than faced or examined:

> In our culture today, we do not have this same natural attentiveness to and empathy with the elderly...we don't want to recognise the inevitability of our own future decline and dependence... Our anxiety about the future is guaranteed by our own behaviour, assuring that our worst unspoken, unspeakable fear will be realised: Our children will treat us as we treat our parents (Myerhoff,1978:19).

Reflection

Myerhoff was breaking new ground in *Number Our Days* as her research stretched to social and personal meaning, as in *Auto*ethnography. Her text is a combination of history, biography, *Auto*biography and *Auto*ethnography (though the term was relatively new at the time). Through this *Auto*ethnographic investigation, Myerhoff comes to comprehend her ancestry and part of her own culture. Prior to her research, she had not learned about her Grandparents' world as they had abandoned and suppressed all things Jewish for social and political reasons (Myerhoff, 1978:42).

Part of Myerhoff's intention was to find wisdom but she also found 'survivors' vitality' and 'survivor's guilt'. Myerhoff's method of research was allowing the group (participants, informants, homo narrans) tell, (narrate), their own story/tales through which she negotiates the human condition and notions of being and meaning reflecting *Auto*ethnography as a way of being in the world (Ellis et al, 2013). Wisdom emerged through their stories, and they exhibited their vitality in the dramas of their existence. Through the stories, reminiscences and experiences of the Group, Myerhoff and other readers can come to comprehend what happened and what it all meant to these immigrants. Recently survivors of the holocaust have become a major area of inquiry as an exotic community, as authors like Nancy K. Miller, Deborah Reed-Danahay, and Carolyn Ellis testify. Myerhoff was ahead of her time in that she could see the significance of *Auto*ethnography and storytelling and sharing as invaluable forces of investigation and research into culture. She also lowers the cultural veil uncovering the daily affairs of the aged. Myerhoff's testimony is relative today with so many people throughout the world displaced from their homes. The stories of the Aliyah centre members are symptomatic of the problems facing those victims of contemporary issues of migration and refugeeism.

The next chapter builds on Myerhoff's dilemmas as an Anthropologist being so intimately involved in her research. Here, we will examine both the third and fourth Autoethnographic categories: firstly, Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies, where Anthropologists focus on themselves in the research, especially how the process and outcome affects them, using the work Jean Briggs *Never In Anger* (1970) by way of example. Secondly, we will examine Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography, using the work of Carolyn Ellis, (1995), whereby through examining a personal experience of a social and cultural phenomenon, the researcher comes to understand both his and her own life, and society.

Chapter Four: Exemplars of *Auto*ethnography (II)

Categories Three and Four: Anthropologists' and Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnographies

Introduction

This chapter continues in the vein of providing examples of *Auto*ethnographies and their diversification, showing the ample distribution of the method. This chapter comprises two sections. The first will look at Category 3, Anthropologists *Auto*ethnographies, and section 2 will look at Category 4, Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography, where both use personal experience to explain a cultural phenomenon as a resource in *Auto*ethnography.

Section 1: Exemplar of Category 3: Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies:

Jean Briggs

The third category of *Auto*ethnography is *Auto*ethnographies from within the discipline of Anthropology, specifically the reflections of personal field experiences by Anthropologists. Here, the Anthropologist brings us inside the culture of Anthropological practice and recounts the impact of it. There are a number of examples to choose from, from Laura Bohannon aka Eleanore Bowen Smith (1954) *Return To Laughter*, Hortense Powdermaker (1966) *Stranger and Friend,* Paul Rabinow (1977) *Reflections of Fieldwork In Morocco*, Jean Briggs (1970) *Never In Anger,* Ruth Behar (1996) *The Vulnerable Observer*, and Manda Cesara (1982) *Reflections of a Woman Anthropologist: No Hiding Place*. However, these texts largely remained under the radar, were not readily present on course reading lists, or the focus of any particular interest. Undoubtedly, they contribute to an understanding of the discipline, its methodologies, the impact of research on the researcher and, an understanding and appreciation of how the researchers' perspective may clash with their subjects.

Here the focus is on the work of Jean Briggs (1970), an example of an Anthropologist putting themselves into the centre of the research, which began a new approach to/in ethnography. This example of *Auto*ethnography demonstrates how the *Auto*ethnographic method contributes to the discipline by: examining and critiquing both the cultural and personal experience; demonstrating vulnerability (a feature of *Auto*ethnography) and its appropriateness within the genre; and finally, in compelling an either negative or positive response, and evoking empathy it fits within *Auto*ethnographic criteria.

Jean Briggs is Professor Emerita of Memorial University, Canada. The text *Never in Anger* (1970) is the result of her first experience of fieldwork and the basis of her PhD research in ethnography. Over her career, she has carried out fieldwork with the Canadian Inuit, the Alaskan Inupiat and the Siberian Yupik. Currently, her research interests lie in interpersonal (social and emotional) relationships in Inuit families and the Inuit language. Of late she has been requested to write *Auto*biographical pieces about her thinking development and her method of 'doing anthropology'. *Never in Anger* is principally about an Eskimo community, the Utku, (abbreviation for Utkuhiksalingmiut) but equally about the ethnographer's, Briggs', place within the research. It is her attempt to offer an appreciation and understanding of the lives of the Utku Eskimos, in an extremely remote place near Chantrey Islands called Back River. Accessible only by sled or plane when weather permits; the area is in Canadian North West Territories, near Gjoa Haven, a town 150 miles south of Back River where the location formed part of a Tundra (Briggs, 1970: Introduction). Briggs began her participant observation in this remote place in 1963-65.

At this time, the Utku had minimal encounters with white people but Briggs intended to supplement other works on the Eskimos and the area. Brigg's project was unique, in that it was the first long term study of Eskimos, the first carried out by a woman and the first concerned with 'emotional behaviour'. In the introduction, she qualifies that her personal experience was part of the research data. Admittedly, the text is old (1970), yet it is a useful example of an Anthropologist's awareness and account of experience in the field where the 'self' appears. The work establishes the importance and relevance of the 'inside' story in the course of doing ethnography. It is *Auto*ethnographic in the sense that Briggs openly relates her personal perspective and issues within the experience. Until recently, reviews of her work did not examine her position within her research but focused rather on family structure, kinship, language and roles within the community. This text is not an *Auto*ethnography in the Pratt sense, in that, it is not 'a Study of One's Own Culture', nor is it an *Auto*ethnography in the sense that it is explaining a personal life situation, within one's own culture. It is *Auto*ethnographic in the Self-Ethnographic, *Auto*phenomenology, *Auto*phenomenographic mode, as it is about an Anthropologist's personal experience in the field. Describing personal

idiosyncrasies, which impinged on her research, accounts for the '*Auto*' in her ethnography. One could also term it *Auto*-bio-ethnography.

Negotiating the Field

To access the field Briggs flew in on a Government chartered plane, 'the school pick up trip', which travelled only four times a year (Briggs, 1970: Introduction). On arrival on site, the pure physicality and geography of the environment immediately struck fear in her. She wondered if she would survive the harsh terrain, the minus zero temperatures the remoteness of the location. These fears and anxiety were not unfounded and impacted greatly on her experience. She fretted about the suitability of her equipment and her poor language skills. Preliminary introductions were fragile, and Briggs noticed instantly the emotional restraint and reserve of the Eskimos: compounded by the existing language barrier

> But I was helpless, for the first of many times, in my ignorance of the language (Briggs,1970:19).

Originally, her research interest lay in shamanism, but she soon learned shamanism was abolished (Briggs, 1970:3). The majority of the community were now Anglicised or Christian, and the Utku feared discussion about shamanism, because a former discussant had committed suicide (Briggs, 1970:21). Changing the course of research is not uncommon among Anthropologists, for reasons such as this, or simply because a response to an inquiry shifts the focus. Initially, like many other Anthropologists, Briggs too was reticent in declaring her interests and motive. She used "wanting to learn how to live like an Eskimo" as her cover, though she really was studying them. Many Anthropologists experience such ethical dilemmas, which will later be examined in Chapter 6. Briggs was intrigued with the behaviour of the Utku Eskimos, who valued emotional control highly and vehemently distanced themselves from displaying emotion, most specifically anger. Thus, she decided to focus her research on 'the patterns of emotional expression': the way feelings were both channelled and communicated; the placidity of this community, and their antagonism towards anger (Briggs, 1970:4). Being a very private people, they did not like questions, which proved difficult for the incessant Anthropologist and a test to participation observation:

> Eskimos do not like to be asked questions; they have an extremely strong sense of privacy with regard to their thoughts, their feelings and motivations; and I feared to offend it (Briggs,1970:21).

However, Briggs' research took an ironic twist, as fundamental to the text came her place as a subject in her own research. She specifically concentrates on her place among the community; how she felt, failed, achieved, misread, misunderstood their Modus Operandi

and Vivendi; her fears, concerns, anticipations and rejections. Briggs is refreshingly open in her analysis of her observations, and frequently questioned and reflected many times on her perception of happenings/occurrences. She was conscious of readers who would not understand her perspective as a middle class, urban, Protestant New Englander (Briggs,1970:6). Briggs clarifies that her picture of the Utku is a still life, a particular situation at a particular moment in time, and she could never write the same book again.

The text itself consists of a number of chapters where Briggs tries to segregate different topics. It is typically ethnographic containing details of the Utku way of life including comments on kinship, religion, economics along with fundamentals of language and grammar. Brigg's focus is primarily on patterns of emotional behaviour, and she provides a glossary for the corresponding Eskimo terms for emotions, such as anger, greed, intimacy, temper, reason, loneliness, isolation, ostracism, and stinginess (Briggs,1970 :311-366). She offers a disclaimer early in the text acknowledging that the Utku did not label emotions as 'we' do, admitting to drawing on personal data and her awareness of the 'pitfalls of misperception'. An intrinsic part of her research situation was her reaction/response to her hosts' actions/feelings situations and their response to her. She mentions

> as in all cultures there are often discrepancies between what people say about themselves on the one hand and their observed behaviour on the other (Briggs,1970:5).

On Briggs arrival, choosing which family to stay with became a dilemma. By chance, the community leadership structure coincided with that of the localised Anglicanism structure whereby a family member acted as religious leader, in this case Inuttiag, who coincidently became Brigg's adoptive father. The real conferred head of the church was an Anglican missionary Nakliguhugktug. Nakliguhugktug and his wife Ikayugtug lived in Gjoa Haven and were close friends to Briggs, sustaining her in troubled times. Inuttiag was relied upon to hunt, travel and trade, and give example, as community leader. Briggs instantly owned up to reservations and suspicions about Inuttiag's behaviour, power and motive in the community, and was unsure if the community genuinely held him in admiration or feared him (Briggs,1970: Chapter 1). Reflecting upon this she questioned her feelings on the matter. She considered whether it was a clash of personalities or cultures or if she had brought her middle class American cultural traits to bear on situations, as suppression of volatility, anger, and outspokenness was anathema to her. Later, she remarks how her independent will and finances may have been an issue for Inuttiag (Briggs,1970: 45).

The daily routine of the Utku centred on basic survival: daily the men fished and seasonally hunted for caribou: the women lit fires, maintained the quagmag (tent) or iglu,

gathered fuel, cooked and made clothes. How the women 'ran after' their men and did all their bidding perturbed Briggs. It was not, however, problematic for them as they felt it was only right, listing the things men did for their families and communities including travelling, hunting and fishing; it was reciprocal and reciprocity was valued among the Utku. Eskimo life at that time was severe and living the 'seasonal nomadic cycle', they moved from one camp to another. They also adjusted living arrangements and accommodation from living in close proximity to each other in the winter to spreading out in the summer, from using igloos in the winter to quagmags (tents) in summer (Briggs,1970: Intro:V). Their diet changed also; in summer, it was fresh fish and berries, in winter-frozen fish. Little luxuries, such as tea and chocolate were missed, not least by Briggs, who missed 'the accoutrements of civilisation' (Briggs, 1970:17). The famine of 1958 made the Utku hypervigilant about food and care (Briggs, 1970:84). The severe weather meant there was always the danger of being cut off completely. Anthropologists donations were always welcome. Briggs experienced difficulty learning to be host and share without being over generous or mean. The Eskimos wanting to be thought well of, never refused as refusal was seen as unkind. For the same reason they did not like to ask for something for fear of refusal (Briggs, 1970:209).

Clash of Cultures

For their part, the Eskimos were always concerned about Briggs' welfare, took great care of her and made sure she was warm and fed. They operated out of a practical logistical mentality having a pragmatic approach to life. There appeared little reason for friction as everyone knew their responsibilities and went about their daily routines. Briggs reflected that she was often 'blind' to the Utku reasons for doing things. One such occasion was when she ordered a food drop in June. Although her intentions were good, her timing was completely off; only so much food could be carried on their long sled journeys and excess was cached in old oil drums and covered until the 'camp' returned from either up or down river depending on the season. In the summer months, moving camp was a pre-occupational hazard or 'a game' with them. Instead of setting up camp at a high level, away from the river they set it close to the river, and continually had to move each time the river came closer to the tents. This happened on numerous occasions to the frustration of Briggs because it interrupted her work:

> Still moves were a nuisance that disrupted my work... shifted my world as a kaleidoscope shifts its bits of glass... in retreating from the rising water, had I followed my own preference, I would have moved once and for all, the few hundred feet to the top of the hill and sat there securely (Briggs,1970:33).

However, the anticipation of seasonal moving broke the routine monotony for the Eskimos. Each new camp revived memories of the previous occasion there and they spent

long nights talking before establishing a regular routine again. Both Briggs and the Eskimos were objects of curiosity to each other. From time-to-time, a clash of both cultures and personalities could be detected (Briggs, 1970:262). Contradictions and conflict frequently appear in the text. Their reticence coincided with her concerns for privacy and solitude. Frequently, for peace, and to learn her 'new words', Briggs escaped to the Tundra. Often she lost sight of her purpose as an Anthropologist, her preoccupation with writing (typing) up her notes conflicted with and caused problems with her responsibilities as an Eskimo daughter (Briggs, 1970:253). Living arrangements also caused concern. An Anthropologist's tent is symbolic; it is a place of sanctuary. Malinowski (1922) is very clear in his description of this; how it is important to be close to subjects of study yet far enough away not to become 'nativised'. Briggs' obsession about her tent and belongings made enemies for her. She did not foresee the huge inconvenience of dragging belongings to each camp. Briggs angst over whether she should move in with the Eskimos for the winter out of convenience and to keep warm, but her preoccupation with writing placed her at a disadvantage 'I never knew what anthropologically interesting events I might be missing' (Briggs,1970:272). Her reservations were short lived, as on sharing accommodation she realised how much she missed company and had the advantage of observing family life up close. The following year, with relationships strained between her and the community, Briggs was isolated, felt hurt, and dejection. Prior to Briggs' work, it was unknown for ethnographers to disclose these difficulties of fieldwork.

Briggs's anthropological interests lay in family planning, pregnancy, childbirth but these occurred unremarked. For reasons previously explained in Deloria's account, such matters were not discussed openly. Unknown to Briggs her adoptive mother, Allaq, moved from one camp, set up another, and gave birth. With regard to family planning, Briggs observed the norm appeared to be a three-year gap; mothers could not understand how 'others' have them too quick as its too tiring (Briggs, 1970:136). Briggs noted the arrival of a new baby meant the displacement of the preceding sibling. In observing child rearing first hand among the Eskimos, Briggs was struck by, and highlighted, differences between Eskimos and middle class Americans, especially when it came to discipline. Allowances were made for bad or obstreperous behaviour in children on the grounds the child had 'no reason' (ihuma) yet. Various techniques bearing similarities to the 'western' way, were used to discipline, or placate children in varying circumstances. The principle was not to credit or acknowledge bad behaviour. When the child realised the futility of the behaviour it ceased. Rarely did the Parent/Adult become hostile or angry with a child (Briggs, 1970:140-144). An aspect of early discipline hinged on the child's use of reason *(Ihuma)*. Little 'cop on' was expected from them as they were still 'coming of age'.

> In the Utku view, growing up is very largely a process of acquiring Ihuma, since it is primarily the use of Ihuma that distinguishes mature, adult behaviour from that of a child, an idiot, a very sick or insane person (Briggs,1970:111. Emphasis in original).

While observing the emotional behaviour of the Utku, Briggs noticed how those who deviated from the ideal were dealt with. The Utku, not unlike other communities, were not enamoured with non-conformists who challenged the status quo. The Eskimos drew a distinct line between the effects of positive thinking and a happy mood, and negative thinking and sadness. Negativity could kill or cause illness; it was a sign of unhappiness. Happy thoughts brought safety, no threat, no ill will. Angry or negative people could not be trusted. A distinction was made between Kapluna (white stranger) and Eskimo temper, whereby the Kapluna would be angry in the morning and friends by midnight, an Eskimo's anger could last forever. In describing inappropriate behaviour, Briggs shows how people tried to control undesirable tendencies (Briggs,1970:7). Enduring anger was viewed as destructive and festering angry thoughts was seen as having the equivalent effect as a physical attack in the Eskimo's view (Briggs,1970:197). There were some exceptions to the Eskimos' non-expression of violence or anger. Briggs witnessed Eskimos venting anger through excessively hitting dogs, and how children beat piteously or 'killed unwanted puppies':

> All the Utku beat their dogs; they saw it as a necessary disciplinary measure...I saw the gleaming eyes and smiles of delight as dogs cowered and whined with bruises and bloody heads (Briggs,1970:46).

In Chapter 6: 'Kapluna Daughter' Briggs describes her own experience of ostracism. This chapter was the longest and most challenging to interpret; it is the most *Auto*ethnographic. We see how Briggs negotiated her place as a daughter, the Eskimos' treatment of her and her response to it. It wholly addresses the question of 'the vulnerable observer' (Ruth Behar,1996). The chapter's focus is not the Utku's modus operandi but Briggs place among them. She appears to have been very confused at this point and her vulnerabilities were exposed/disclosed. The opposing cultures came to the fore as months of concealed disharmony became apparent and suppressed tensions became open conflicts, which transferred throughout the community. Briggs felt she was treated as if she had not attained ihuma (reason). Frequently throughout the text contradictions emerged between her efforts to exert independence or alternatively remain dependent, as it suited. Poor communication skills and the language barrier clearly contributed to the disharmony.

Proficiency in linguistic skills is a requirement for the Anthropologist in the field as explained Charles Briggs (1984). For the *Auto*ethnographer studying their own culture this is not an issue. At times Briggs became despondent feeling she was making no progress with

either the language or the way of living. Her attempts often became somewhat of a joke, as the Utku frequently used laughter to get through difficult situations or to teach one not to take oneself too seriously (Briggs, 1970:228). Harmony and humour were essential for Eskimo survival. Basso in *Wisdom Sits in Places* (1996) gave us to understand if you understand a community's humour, you are more than half way to understanding their culture.

Briggs admitted despite trying to laugh off some situations it was stressful, and did not help her self-doubt. Briggs appeared to suffer anxiety, even severe depression and doubted her ability to fit in with the Eskimos. Over time Briggs' fears and anxieties increased becoming overly sensitive and vulnerable, out of her natural environment, far away from home and from the people with whom she could communicate easily. The infrequent receipt of post added to her dilemma (Briggs, 1970:277). Repeatedly she bit her tongue to keep in tears, not least because she had not witnessed anyone cry; sentiment was a sign of weakness and the exchange of affection was limited to children only. Ultimately, Briggs outspokenness was perceived as bad temper. Within her own culture, in speaking her mind and disagreeing, Briggs would not have been perceived as unduly volatile. However, by way of comparison the Eskimos saw her as extreme (Briggs, 1970:258). Briggs became aware of the Eskimos' resentment towards her on discovering a letter (Briggs, 1970:274/285). Initially, Briggs was slow to notice the ostracism building. Ostracism was the Eskimo way of dealing with unpleasantness. Their word for unpleasantness and such situations is *hujuujagnagtug* or *hujuujag*. When broken down it appears as a combination of *hujuujagnagtug = hu|juu|jag|nag|tug* = you have my nerves jagged, you are nagging me and you are tugging at my soul. Unpleasantness (*hujuujagnagtug)* appeared primarily as Briggs initially was unable to contain her emotions or frustrations when things went wrong.

Initially, Briggs set out with this text to do an 'ordinary' ethnography about Eskimos' emotional behaviour as part of her fieldwork to complete her thesis and gain academic accolade (Briggs,1970: ix). Her work is comparable to Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Pacific* (1984[1922]) and indeed his diary. Briggs gathered her material appropriately and scientifically especially with regard to her analysis of the language. Subsequently, she further researched analysis of the Inuit language, working to create a bipartite bilingual dictionary of the Utku dialect. Her work became *Auto*ethnographical when Briggs herself became part of the research data, and using introspection she examined and highlighted the difficulties for the Anthropologist. Briggs text is appealing because she is fully open about the fragile situations Anthropologists may find themselves in, or even Anthropologists' fragility. In ways, Briggs reverted 'the spy-glass of Anthropology' back on herself, and her position in the field, recognising she could not maintain the position of neutrality. Her writing style and attention to detail is accessible and vivid, particularly the setting in the first chapter. At times, the text was challenging to read, often repetitive with the same situation described at different

intervals or an outpouring of emotion, becoming chaotic and unruly as *Auto*ethnographies do (Pratt,1991: Berry, 2013). In addition, the book finishes rather abruptly, with her just leaving. The absent epilogue is yet another feature of *Auto*ethnography: open-endedness and rejection of finality and closure.

Perhaps comparable to Briggs work on her experience in the field is that of Manda Cesara, aka Karla Powie (1982) *Reflections Of A Woman Anthropologist: No Hiding Place,* which is an account of her personal field experience. She found herself comparing social and personal mores of western culture to those of Lenda, her research community. Cesara brings ethnography and *Auto*ethnography to another level. Rather than being an exercise in understanding another community to understand the self, Cesara reverses the process, using the self to highlight differences in beliefs, attitudes and behaviours, and how they work in different communities. She describes how the field experience affected and changed her, contributing to her personal growth. Cesara's field experience raised suppressed memories, which she admits was an existential exercise leading to self-evaluation, which is very much in line with Michael Jackson's ideas on Existential Anthropology (2005).

The main question of these particular texts is how the research affects the researcher. They are beneficial to up and coming Anthropologists who may have concerns or doubts about the field and their work. Cesara states her book is a plea for more honest and introspective social scientists (Cesara, 1982: vii). Fundamentally, the main resource for the text is her diary and letters home. Cesara acknowledges the loneliness of writing the text, and the great intellectual risk she took, as she may have jeopardised her career, hence the pseudonym. She acknowledges David Schneider's support, who could have 'viciously and unreflectively' destroyed it. For Cesara

> 'some social scientists are afraid to discover they are human, for to be human is also to be emotional and irrational, and that, for them, has no room in the icy coffin of their dead discipline'(Cesara,1982:viii).

Adding to Briggs and Cesara's revelations about the Anthropologist's field experience, the concluding section of this chapter will examine the fourth category, a classic example of Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography, New Wave *Auto*ethnography. The work of Carolyn Ellis (1995) *Final Negotiations* highlights ethnography's new direction, with the personal experience of a cultural phenomenon central to the study, in this case the long-term illness and eventual death of a life partner.

Section 2: Exemplar of Category 4: Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography

> Narrative is the best way to understand the human experience, because it is the way humans understand their own lives (Richardson,1990 cited in Ellis,1995:xx).

Carolyn Ellis

This section will look at the work of Carolyn Ellis, a major proponent of the genre of *Auto*ethnography. Ellis' work *Final Negotiations* (1995) is a classic original New Wave *Auto*ethnography and appropriately fits as an example of Self-Ethnography, *Auto*-bio-ethnography, experimental ethnography, experiential ethnography, *Auto*biography and narrative, and a most recent and prevalent version of *Auto*ethnography in modern Anthropology in that it is reflexive, experiential, confessional ethnography (Ellis, 1995:3/4).

Ellis found social science research methodology inadequate to facilitate her expressing or addressing personal social cultural topics. She was drawn to *Auto*ethnography because she felt many familiar and real experiences, as part of a critique of culture and society, were not being discussed or highlighted in academia. Ellis was influenced by the work of Erving Goffman (1959), who intended to 'open readers' eyes to the world'. She explains her choice of presentation, recording she was drawn to this type of research as Goffman examined how the self in the everyday could be presented, thus connecting research to reality (Ellis, 1995: 6). Ellis wanted to highlight the closeness of social science to literature with the intention of humanising and personalising sociology (Ellis, 1995:9). She sought to connect her work with the real life of the reader, because both the reader and the writer occupy the same world. Though everyone's experience is different, through *Auto*ethnography there is an opportunity to understand and empathise with that of another's:

> In *Auto*ethnographic work I look at validity in terms of what happens to readers, as well as research participants and a researcher ... Our work seeks verisimilitude (Ellis, 2004:124).

In *Final Negotiations* (1995), Ellis describes her personal experience, relationship and life as the primary caregiver to her first much older boyfriend, later spouse, Gene Weinstein, through a debilitating, eventually terminal illness. Her work examines the associated complications of both dealing with the illness and death of a partner. In her approach to a topic neglected by social science, Ellis goes to great lengths to explain her method of research

and representation. She further explains in applying the method the issues she had to overcome to justify her approach. In the end, her new partner Art Bochner's advice was

> Your writing is too defensive...Don't spend time talking about what others don't do. Or why what you do is valuable. Assume it is and convince your audience through your prose and exemplars (Ellis,1995: 307/308).

There are six sections in *Final Negotiations*, each of which deal with a process of negotiation of a particular juncture or experience in Ellis' life. The first section examines Ellis' dilemma with the discipline of sociology, and how she was dissatisfied with the research process. When she achieved the required necessary standards in academia, she chose to challenge the boundaries of what was considered legitimate research. In this way, she negotiated a new platform from which to exhibit her research. The second, third and fourth sections which she titles 'Negotiating Attachment', 'Negotiating Stability and Change', and 'Negotiating Loss', describe her and her partner's life, and their relationship combined with various processes of personal and social development namely: negotiation of attachment; deciding whether to be in or out; negotiation of stability; change; role reversal; and finally negotiating demise. The theme of 'negotiations' describes the process of contemplating and mediating through various personal issues and dilemmas. Several issues are covered in this work, all of which centre around Ellis' personal dilemmas: the issue of being in a relationship with her Professor, and the stigma attached to this; the fragility of said relationship, and the challenges of an open relationship; the challenge of dealing with step children; progress in an independent academic career; relocation to another university; the challenges of spouse illness, and managing/mismanaging same; health and medical facilities and their inadequacies. The text is a reflection rather than an analysis of her relationship and her personal stance within that relationship. At times, the text is very emotional, drawing on the reader's feelings. Highlighting stress and strain, fundamentally *Final Negotiations* raises a number of issues about relationships and emotions:

> How people get together and manage attachments or pull apart, and how they feel during these processes. This strategy moves closer to lived particulars of what happens in relationships (Ellis,1995:4).

In typical *Auto*ethnographic fashion, the text is as chaotic and messy as the situation. By telling the personal story, Ellis demonstrates societal, cultural attitudes and norms in a particular circumstance at a certain time, prompting the reader to self-reflect on personal circumstances. In this way, Ellis achieved her aim, to

> engage you in aspects of relationships that usually are neglected or overlooked in social science inquiry...[s]eeking to provide perspective for readers to analyse my experience and contemplate their own (Ellis,1995:4/10).

Ellis begins *Final Negotiations* by describing how she moved to New York to pursue a PhD in Sociology, after working for a year as a social worker. As part of her postgraduate research, she studied isolated fishing communities at Chesapeake Bay. Ellis (2009) Revision*: Autoethnographic Reflections on Life and Work* describes how her subjects were unimpressed with her work. Her preference is for participating and describing day-to-day life as opposed to library based secondary data analysis. Her ideas clashed with the expectations of the un-involved distant researcher as she found leaving her feelings out of a project difficult. She was criticised by professors for 'going native' and found the constraints of detached social research challenging:

> [t]heoretical concepts seemed as vague, subjective, and ethereal as emotional experience (Ellis, 1995:6).

She met Gene Weinstein at the beginning of the second year of her postgraduate studies through her interest in the social-psychological approach to human interaction. Weinstein appears to have pre-empted Ellis' trajectory in academia, as his goal was to 'bring emotion into our rational studies of human behaviour' (Ellis, 1995:7). Weinstein set himself a project on direct examination of emotion, and in 1980, both he and Ellis co-authored a paper on jealousy, which included their own experiences and those of friends. Initially due to lack of numerical data, the paper was rejected. Introspective data was rarely published, but after inserting some statistics in 1986, theirs was. Emotions as a research topic or resource were only just being accepted after an American Sociological Association event titled Sociology of Emotions (1985). However, Sociologists still skirted around gathering 'emotion' data by using traditional methods like surveys, interviews and observations, abstracting it from the lived experience. Ellis uses her own personal emotional experience as a resource to explain the cultural phenomenon that is relationships. Many of the relationship crises she describes are illustrative of what commonly occurs.

In her text, Ellis' describes how she and Weinstein negotiated their relationship at the outset and later her negotiating of the relationship. Weinstein's reputation as a womaniser preceded him and initially both he and Ellis had a brief encounter at a department party. Later, she was 'randomly' assigned as one of his teaching assistants. At first, he appeared to ignore her, but she could not dismiss or forget the experience. She then approached him directly and he gave her three reasons why a relationship could not happen:

> First, I'm seeing someone else in New York City every weekend. Second, I'm twenty years older than you... And third, I'm a Professor and you're a student and that's sure to make problems (Ellis,1995:17).

Ellis was dismissive of the complications and thus began a relationship that was passionately intense, tempestuous, and volatile with terms and conditions of an open relationship agreed; Ellis wrote of it, it 'began the most intense romance of my life, and most problematic one' (Ellis, 1995:17). Ellis goes on to describe how this became a burden for her as the emotional games began, employing jealousy, suspicion, anger, threats, avoidance, flirting and emotional blackmail. She began to negotiate how to avoid deep involvement and get on with her life. However, Weinstein's womanising and refusal to commit frustrated Ellis. Ellis distanced herself from the relationship through fieldwork. Weinstein acknowledged his feelings and proposed. Despite claims throughout the text to the opposite, we learn Ellis had the problem with monogamy. At first, she refused the marriage proposal, but conceded prior to Weinstein's death, compromising on a monogamous relationship in the intervening period.

When Ellis met Weinstein first, he was in the early stages of Emphysema. She witnessed him clearing (flushing) out his lungs early every morning. Her first impression was one of disgust. Emphysema is a plateau disease and as the illness progresses the patient deteriorates further. The text continues with the progression of the illness and highlights the impact it has on their lives and how they negotiated through it. She notes how they negotiated and found ways of hiding the illness to restrict its impact on Weinstein's work and identity maintenance, of coping with new medications and having to use oxygen at intervals, of accepting the illness and the definite outcome, of hospital and home care. She describes how restrictive the disease could be and how they had to alter their lifestyle to facilitate it, whether it be working, going for meals, holidaying or lovemaking. Along with chronicling the development of the disease, Ellis describes the impact it has on other individuals peripheral and marginal to their lives. She recounts their relationships with other people, those they could or could not tell, and those who would understand.

In parallel, Ellis discusses the impact of this lifestyle on her own ambitions: her embarrassment at times, her responsibility as carer and the need sometimes to get away, or to deal with the thoughts of running away and leaving it behind. At times the text and Ellis thoughts are disjointed: she wants/she does not want the relationship; the power is his then hers; dependency versus independency; they love each other/they hate each other; he's well/he's not well. The focus of the *Auto*ethnography is not simply a cultural phenomenon experienced by an individual but a 'personal cultural phenomenon' (self-ethnography). It is

not simply a map of Weinstein's journey with Emphysema but a map or graph of her experience of sharing that journey with him.

In the course of the text, Ellis often recounts the details of sexual intimacy between her and Weinstein, from having sex while he wore his oxygen tubes to her masturbating him to bring him some pleasure at the later stages of the disease. Likewise, she describes her dealing with her partner's consistent impacted bowel. The motivation behind the apparent necessity to disclose so much detail is interesting. While the compilation of *Auto*ethnographies is extremely intense emotionally, the reader often questions the relevancy of some content and information. Although Malinowski recommended we pay attention to the minutiae of the everyday, and Geertz advocated 'thick description' sometimes there is sometimes just a little bit too much of both and endless repetition in Ellis' text. This raises the question about how much is too much information: if the intention of *Auto*ethnography is to make life meaningful, or offer a better understanding the degree of detail is challenging. This replicates the question for Briggs and Myerhoff above: the reader is challenged to appreciate and comprehend everyone's point of view and position in the text.

As Weinstein's emphysema progressed to Chronic Emphysema, and he became more debilitated, his frustration at his lack of independency in washing, dressing, feeding, walking, decision making and control of his money became more and more magnified. Later his care became the joint responsibility of Ellis, his daughter Beth, and a barrage of nurses. Health insurance and its affordability also became an issue and repeatedly Ellis describes arguments over finances. It is difficult to comprehend Weinstein's dignity in it all. Slipping from delirium, confusion and lucidness caused different problems with others having to speak for him. His perspective on his situation is not clear in the text neither is it obvious whether Weinstein agreed to some of the disclosures. It is also difficult to discern if his resentment came from his illness, his anger with life and the cards he was dealt, or if he was genuinely resentful towards Ellis concerning her share of his pension and her academic achievement:

> What do you care? ... You're getting money from my pension. Why are you worried?... I made Carolyn. Without me, she would never have gotten her PhD (Ellis, 1995:261/333).

The *Auto*ethnographic section of the text ends quite abruptly, similar to Briggs above, leaving the text open-ended. Ellis does not describe the immediate aftermath of Weinstein's death other than it took her nine years to negotiate how she would present her story. Ten years after Weinstein's death the final book was published.

In the final two sections V and VI. Ellis locates the text within the context of academic writing. The text is a combination of both the theory of *Auto*ethnography and an exemplar. Ellis followed the procedure of ethnography keeping daily field notes yet her research went on to include her personal diary and experience. Ellis describes the difficulty to make a text out of her experience, consistently reworking the manuscript reducing it from over 700 to 300 pages. The longer it took to finish, the bigger the problem. Her concern was the 'book would not be good enough', if it were ever published. She made the analogy between her life and the book: if the book were published but left on a shelf, would it reflect her life being left on a shelf also (Ellis, 1995:334).

Ellis experienced many forms of criticism and rewrote the text, trying to shoehorn the text into a sociological framework. She was conscious of the repercussions her disclosures might have had ethically. The question of ethics is examined later in Chapter 6. Ellis stuck to her guns and rather than defend the method she fought strongly in favour of it. Eventually the text went to publication but Ellis concludes that even when something is written, it defies finality. One is left with the memories, the things unsaid and unwritten. In this regard, the feature of *Auto*ethnography: lack of closure and finality is exhibited. This text demonstrates a transition from science, to interpretation, to realist ethnography, to storytelling and evocation. Throughout the book, Ellis was renegotiating meaning and her own identity. She hoped

> the audience would identify with my plight and gain a heightened emotional sense of what it felt like to live this experience, as well as an intellectual understanding of the contradictions and dialectical processes that occurred... [it would] provide a point of comparison for your life story. And her goal was to 'humanise sociology, create a space for experimental texts and encourage writing stories that have meaning and make a difference in people's lives' (Ellis, 1995:335/336).

Later, Ellis continued to develop and open up the genre of *Auto*ethnography with her new life partner Art Bochner, co-creating an academic programme with *Auto*ethnography as a main component. They also compiled a number of texts on the main facets of the genre, either individually or collectively. Many of their students are prolific writers explaining and teaching the method or using it to tell their own story. Being a relatively 'new' genre made way for a new direction in writing. Like any new products, there was the potential to make money, and in some cases, this appears to have been capitalised on.

Conclusion

Both Chapters Three and Four work in tandem. They seek to create an understanding of the practice of *Auto*ethnography. This enables an appreciation of how *Auto*ethnographies diversified to fit four named categories. They are 'The Study of One's Own Culture' (Indigenous Ethnography), Second Generation *Auto*ethnography, (Ethnic Identity Ethnography); Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies; and finally New Wave Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography, as viable alternative methods of research and representation. There are a number of components to these two chapters: Initially we looked at *Auto*ethnography in its original format, attending to its original purpose to 'Study One's Own Culture'. Secondly, we looked at how a new emergent research approach examines and represents phenomena previously overlooked or unattended to. Collectively these categories contain elements, features and characteristics of *Auto*ethnography and the *Auto*ethnographic Method. These include breaking with normal tradition and describing one's own culture from within, thoroughly engaging with and putting oneself inside the research, adding to and building on previous cultural research and using alternative methods of presentation, in order to address the issue of 'something missing' as identified by Bochner (2013). We notice too, women write many Autoethnographies though certainly not exclusively. As we examine the separate categories common themes such as strong reflexivity, emotions and vulnerability appear to prevail, bringing the research to a deeper level of understanding of culture and human behaviour from the perspective of the researcher and their research community. We come to appreciate how 'the insider view' opens up considerations previously overlooked or unnoticed to create better understanding of ourselves and the people studied, and ways of being in the world. [Emphasis added].

In considering how *Auto*ethnographies may build on previous information, in the next chapter a comparison is made between *Outsiders',* Anthropologist ethnographies from Nancy Scheper-Hughes, John Messenger and Robin Flower, and *Insiders,* Tomás O'Crohán's and Péig Sayers classic *Auto*biographical ethnographies (*Auto*ethnographies) of rural places in Ireland. This is to demonstrate how *Auto*ethnography can supplement, complement, confirm or deny the contents of original ethnographies.

Chapter Five: *Auto*ethnography in an Irish Context

'Fulingeann fuil fuil I ngorta ach Ni Fhuilingeann fuil fuil a dortadh'

(A man can tolerate his own blood starving to death, but he won't tolerate his blood attacked by a stranger (Irish Proverb- cited in Scheper-Hughes, 2001: Epilogue)).

Introduction

Having looked at the four categories of *Auto*ethnography and how each author altered their approach to give an understanding of their own culture or a personal cultural phenomenon in the previous chapter, this chapter will demonstrate the different perspectives offered in comparing ethnographies with *Auto*ethnographies, focusing specifically on ethnographies of Ireland and Irish *Auto*ethnographies. It will show how *Auto*ethnographies complement, supplement, confirm or deny information within ethnographies. Though not strictly identified or recognised as such, these Irish *Auto*ethnographies contain components and elements pertaining to *Auto*ethnography in that they represent a culture from the inside, using personal experience, and narrative to comment and critique their culture.

This chapter comprises a number of sections. Having initially set the context, the first section will look at the *Auto*ethnographies of two Irish authors giving their perspective of Irish life. They use an uncomplicated 'storytelling' approach, describing their experience of life in Ireland with no specific agenda other than to tell it how it was. Subsequently, we will look at the work of professional Anthropologists describing Irish life from their perspective. There are two types of professional approaches here. On the one hand, we have Robin Flower who appears to have absorbed and been absorbed into Irish life. On the other hand, we have the work of professional Anthropologists John Messenger and Nancy Scheper-Hughes who followed specific criteria, and had a particular agenda in mind; to satisfy that aim they appear to overlook the sensitivities of the people they studied. In examining the outcome of their work, we can appreciate how it was lacking empathetically and ethically. Finally, the chapter's conclusions will show the desirability of the *Auto*ethnographic approach to supplement and complement ethnography.

Literary and Research Context

In the past, Ireland was perceived by some as an exotic primitive remote region of the world, and was the focus of Anthropologists attention. Robin Flower (1944) describes the remote coastal area of Ireland as 'The ultimate shore of the whole world, islands westernmost

of all the inhabited lands of Europe' (Flower, 1985[1944]:6). Places such as The Blaskets archipelago were ideal for 'salvage ethnography' capturing a way of life vanishing due to modernisation. In this chapter the works considered from the 'insiders' *Auto*ethnographic perspective and voice are Tomás O'Crohán's *An t-Oileanach* (1929), later translated as *The Islandman* by Robin Flower (1937) and Péig Sayers' *Péig, A Scéal Fein* (1936) later translated as *An Old Woman's Reflections* by Bryan Mc Mahon (1974). These insider texts are *Auto*ethnographic in the sense they are maps of one's own culture. Though the Irish texts mentioned are somewhat dated, and the Ireland written about is hugely different now, the argument presented is around how different views of and approaches to the same subject tell a very different story. From the 'outsiders' ethnographic perspective and voice, this chapter will explore the work of Robin Flower *The Western Island* (1985[1944]), John Messenger's *Inis Beag* (1969) and Nancy Scheper-Hughes *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics* (2001[1979]). There are other texts one could choose to illustrate this point, for example Conrad Arensberg, *The Irish Countryman* (1937) or Laurence Taylor *Occasions of Faith* (1995) but the discussion will be limited to the work of Flower, Messenger and Scheper-Hughes as their work pertains closely to that of both O'Crohán's and Sayers.

The five texts will show distinct differences of focus and approaches from the professional Anthropologist to the personal experience of the same culture. Anthropologists follow particular criteria seeking out knowledge on kinship, economics, religion, education etc. The insider writes/speaks from a soulful personal perspective and experience of these same elements. We discover misunderstandings because of different perspectives, purpose, ilk and psyche, and the researchers' unawareness of sensitivities and sensibilities of 'natives'. In Ireland or elsewhere Anthropologists were not always welcome. As recently as 2014 Michael Harding in his text *Hanging with the Elephant* recounts the unfavourable reception for Anthropologists on the Aran Islands:

> "Do you know any writers on the island?" I asked... "I do", he replied, and spat into the Atlantic. ... "There was a writer came to this island years ago...and he was here for a few years and then he went away and he wrote a book about everybody" ... "If he ever appeared on the mainland and was looking for a ferry, I would certainly take him. But he would never reach the island" ... He looked out again across the swell and spat once more and I could feel him breathing like a bull as he ruminated on the offence the writer had caused by writing about the people's privacy" (Harding, 2014: 206-207).

The Insider's View: Tomás O'Crohán agus Péig Sayers

Tomás O'Crohán and Péig Sayers were primary informants to many early researchers of the Irish islands including: Carl Marstrander (1883-1965) a Norwegian linguist known for his work on the Irish language; Fr. George Clune (1894) author of *Reilthíní Oir (Golden*

Stars) and Robin Flower. Immediately in this discussion a concern with the issue of language appears. The Irish are extremely sensitive of the word 'informant', as it is closely associated with those who 'informed' on their own to the British Government, particularly in times of the Civil War or The Troubles. As John Messenger says of it, 'a word so detested in Ireland that I have substituted respondent for informant in this book' (Messenger, 1969:60). O'Crohán's and Sayers' texts were part of a trilogy written by islanders, the third being Muiris O'Suilleabheain's (Maurice O'Sullivan) *Fiché Bliain Ag Fás* (*Twenty Years a Growing*). Messenger's personal preference was for O'Suilleabheain's over 'Péig' for

> depth and insight into Irish folk culture and personality ... the chief value of Sayers book is that it presents a 'woman's-eye view' of things Irish (Messenger, 1969:136).

Péig's text has had a life of its own for many years as compulsory reading on the curriculum of the Irish senior cycle examination, the Leaving Certificate. Many students found it to be utterly depressing; for those not fluent in Irish it may also have been a test of endurance. The purpose of this explanation is not to judge the literary merits of O'Crohán and Sayers texts but rather to establish their approach to understanding their own life and culture. O'Crohán was inspired to write his book *An t-Oileanach* (1929) after hearing Maxim Gorki's *Auto*biography. O'Crohán was also encouraged by Brian Kelly (Briain O'Ceallaigh) who recognised the emergence and popularity of this genre. Storytellers were a dying breed and there was an interest in preserving the old ways in narrative at least. The government also commissioned texts, such as O'Crohán's. O'Crohán began by writing a number of letters to Kelly (O'Ceallaigh). Robin Flower later translated O'Crohán's work in 1937, and being well acquainted with him could attest that his character shone through in his writings

> [t]he style is none the less unmistakably his own, and to those who have known the man his whole figure and character is implicit in the manner of his writings (Flower, 2000[1937]: ix).

In the foreword to *An t-Oileanach* (*The Islandman),* Flower testifies to the difficulties and dangers of translation and the risk of losing intention or meaning. He describes a 'literary dialect', a combination of both English and Irish languages. This idiom protected the great charm of the Irish (Gaelige) and was well received. However, Flower refrained from using this literary dialect as it would not capture the original colloquial simplicity and adopted instead 'a plain straightforward style, aiming at the language of ordinary men who narrate the common experiences of their life frankly and without any cultivated mannerism', which was more representative of O'Crohán himself. To use Flower's euphemism 'rouge is no substitute for a natural complexion' (Flower, 2000[1937]: Foreword in O'Crohán's *The Islandman*: x).

Flower recollects his first meeting with Tomás O'Crithin (O'Crohán) when he first visited the island:

> A new presence in the room. You look up and see, leaning against the wall almost with the air of being magically materialised out of nothing; a slight but confident figure…The face takes your attention at once and holds it. This face is dark and thin, and there look out of it two quick and living eyes, the vivid witnesses of self sufficing intelligence (Flower, 1985[1944]:12).

O'Crohán's book is *Auto*ethnographical in nature because it encapsulates the way of life, culture and lifestyle of the islanders in general rather than recounting his life specifically. In the time honoured fashion of Anthropology, to salvage what remains of a vanishing culture, and following in the vein of *Auto*ethnographer Zora Neale Hurston, O'Crohán's intention as told to Flower was,

> 'To set down the character of the people about me so that some record of us might live after us, for the like of us will never be again (Flower, (2000[1937]: Foreword in O'Crohán's *The Islandman*: vii),

And was later reiterated in Flower's own text

> 'it is a good thought of us to put down the songs and stories before they are lost from the world forever' (Flower, 1985[1944]:16).

O'Crohán overlooks many specific details like individuals' full names or place names of graveyards. Flower's and Messenger's texts fill in some of these details evidencing how *Auto*ethnographies can supplement and complement ethnographies. According to Flower, Tomás O'Crohán was a keen observer from his youth and was awake to the size and idiosyncrasies of each character on the island. O'Crohán, often ruthlessly opinionated, closely examined and commented on each individual's nature. As Flower recalls:

> All this necessary equipment of an islandman is raised to a higher power in Tomás by a natural critical faculty... he has always reflected on his own experience and watched his fellows with a certain aloofness... scornfully critical of the left-handed blunderings of the less expert among his fellows (Flower, 2000[1937]: Foreword in O'Crohán's *The Islandman*: viii).

Previously in Ireland, left-handed people (ciotógí) were associated with weakness or incapability; such an association was made immediately, if one was particularly useless at something. O'Crohán was no such person; rather he was a very adaptable person and could turn his hand to anything, as was expected on the island.

> Life on such an island, where there are no shops and no craftsmen at call, develops an all-round competence in the individual to which our specialised civilizations afford no parallel. The experience of these islanders is necessarily narrow in its range, but within that range it is absolute and complete (Flower, 2000[1937]: Foreword in O'Crohán's *The Islandman*: viii).

Along with describing what it was like growing up on the island and the change in responsibilities from being a happy- go- lucky boy to man of the house O'Crohán's focus was on men's work: fishing, saving turf, agriculture, fertilising with seaweed, animal husbandry or maintenance of property. Turf saving was imperative to keep warm, and food was stored to survive. O'Crohán's description of the household is dim. Houses varied in appearance with 'some handsomer than others'. In general, they built houses in close proximity to each other with many doors facing south. O'Crohán's faced north. Flower's description of the village plan was more detailed referring to how the houses were set into crevices for protection from the elements. O'Crohán's concerns re property was reflected in the limited insight he provides into the role of women, other than they cooked, spun yarn on their spinning wheel, those that could, and those that were not too lazy, and kept the home fires burning (O'Crohán, 2000[1937]:29).

In a chapter curiously titled *My Manhood* O'Crohán describes flirtations and distractions from the turf. Some girls came upon him and were 'messing' (teasing). He describes them quite crudely but does not openly admit that anything of a sexual nature occurred

> [t]hey set upon me, one of them pulling my ear, another snatching the spade out of my hands, others looking for a chance to tip me over on the flat of my back in the bog to have some fun with me. I knew perfectly well I'd cut my last sod of turf that day … for the gang of girls we had on the island in those days were next door to being half wild…I was pretty tired … sure it was they that finished me altogether…And no wonder- six girls just about beginning to ripen, running over with high spirits... Its easy baking when you have meal to hand…the worst they could do to me didn't vex me or worry me, be sure of that. For it was the wild spirit of youth that was driving them and sure I had a good right to have a spark of the same fire touching me up too, for there was many a young man of my own kind who'd rather have them playing their games with him than all of the turf on the hills (O'Crohán, 2000 [1937]:92).

Another time the same group of girls came along

> [t]hey spied me out. They were at me at once, throwing things at me and up to every mischief ...I promised myself that I would spend the rest of the evening having fun with them. There wasn't one of the six, if I hadn't given her the wink that wouldn't have gone with me ready and willing for the knot there's no untying…it would do me no harm to have a bit of fun with them and I had it all right. Its long I remember that afternoon; I remember it still…Says the poet 'Bothering with women never did any man any good!'… and that's just how it was with me, for they sent me astray from my work from that time out (O'Crohán, 2000[1937]:93).

O'Crohán blames the women for the distraction but in demonstrating the good natured aspect of the flirtations of a young group, he shows they were not averse to intimacy, which contrasts with Messenger's opinion as we shall see below. O'Crohán uses insider knowledge in a detailed fashion to illustrate life in Ireland at the time. The text sets out how the people got on with life, doing what they had to do to survive, enjoying the good times, despairing at the unfortunate ones but making the best of it.

Péig Sayers

Where O'Crohán describes island life from a male perspective Péig Sayers provides a female view of a similar world. Péig Sayers was encouraged by Maire Ni Chinnéide (Mary Kennedy) to tell her story. In the text, Péig is identified through her maiden name Sayers though she married Peats Guiheen. The original text, which offers an account of Péig's and other women's lives at the time, was written down by Péig's son Micheál. Péig herself was known as a seanachaí,

> 'who makes a speciality of local tales, family sagas, or genealogies, social-historical tradition...and can recount many a tale of a short realistic type about fairies, ghosts, and other supernatural beings',

as opposed to a scealaí

> 'who recounts myths and legends of the mythological, Ulster, Fenian, and historical cycles as well as ancient folktales' (Delargy, 1945: 6 cited in Messenger, 1969:113).

Péig's text is about her journey through life in Ireland and is similar to evocative *Auto*ethnography, mapping out Péig's sometimes emotional experience of her culture. She adopts a sentimental personal view of how women dealt with their limited choices and various experiences such as service, marriage or spinsterhood, motherhood, child loss and widowhood. Because of her marriage, Péig had to move from the mainland to the island which was so traumatic that she initially doubted her survival.

> How lonely I am on this island in the ocean with nothing to be heard forever more but the thunder of the waves hurling themselves on the beach (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans:153).

Despite initial concerns of remoteness, she frequently describes the reassurance and comfort she obtained from being close to nature

> I gave the breeze full permission to caress me for I always loved the wind that blows from the sea and at that moment I welcomed it ...is there a man in the world who wouldn't be moved by the sight that met my eyes ...the sea was majestic and the sunlight was painting the water gold...I was under a spell … (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans: 143).

The text maps her progress through life and distinguishes between herself as a carefree happy young girl and a thoughtful old woman

> You wouldn't see anywhere a merrier girl than I was till that time, for it is youth that has the light foot and the happy heart (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans:59).

When Flower met Sayers, he was impressed with her accepting attitude to life being "That is the way of the world as God made it" (Flowers, 1985 [1944]:57). She was very pragmatic in a way, seeing "there was no joy without sorrow to accompany it" (Sayers, 1974: 177). Sayers offers a realistic understanding of people's loneliness especially after a child's death. In times of trauma, the bereaved often 'took to the bed', which was their way of coping with sadness. For her part, Sayers felt the islanders were grossly misunderstood and maligned by those outside the islands:

> Many would imagine that the island people are wild and they should have horns growing out of their heads... the people in this island are pleasant, honest, generous, and hospitable and the stranger can experience friendship and kindness among them... The islanders were at the mercy of the world, a hard living with little pay with nothing but the workhouse or grave at the end of it (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans: 157/158/136).

Flower discussed with Péig Sayers the power of the Irish language and the demise of the wandering competitive storyteller, who made their speech apt and clever, by putting a 'gloss', (blás), on it. 'Glossing' is an attempt to build up the story makes it more interesting, witty or funny to keep the listener's attention to their tales, so they would be victorious over each other. Flower admired Péig greatly: "the dark expressive eyes that change with the changing humour of her talk". For him she was

> one of the finest speakers on the island; she has so clean and finished a style of speech that you can follow all the nicest articulations of the language on her lips without any effort; she is a natural orator with so keen a sense of *the turn of phrase* and the lifting of the rhythm appropriate to Irish that her words could be written down as they leave her lips and they would have the effect of literature with no savour of the artificiality of composition (Flower, 1985[1944]:49-50. Emphasis added).

Sayers' text is alive with proverbs and old Irish sayings which could be both compliment and insult, wishes and curses combined, some humorously, some angrily and some simply in the course of conversation. Péig distinguishes between a blessing and a curse for Flower after he inquired about the 'fine gift of cursing' the people of the island had

> 'We have,' she answered, 'but there's no sin in it. If the curses came from the heart, it would be a sin. But it is from the lips they come, and we use them only to give force to our speech, and they are a great relief to the heart'. He replied, "I make little of them, for if the blessings come from the heart I don't care where the curses come from" (Flower, 1985[1944]: 49).

Though Sayer's text is ultimately a printed one, Flower referred to 'the clash of two traditions', the oral and the printed where the latter is the lesser for not picking up on the emotions, the idiosyncrasies, the deep feelings and thoughts of the author. The old stable world that was preserved in the memory, was being obliterated by 'the fatal drip of the printer's ink'.

> the forgotten past.... What on that island has today been experience to me will tomorrow be history…We can preserve a little of that tradition in the ink that destroyed it. But the reality of the tradition is passing from us now, and I can only think that the world is poorer for its passing (Flower, 1985 [1944]:71).

A number of similar themes run through both O'Crohán's (1856-1937) and Sayers (1873-1958) text but both have a different focus. O'Crohán focuses on the practical side of life: work and survival where Sayers' focus is on sentimental things like family, love of mothers, separation, growing up and growing old. Both O'Crohán and Sayers were born the youngest describing themselves as the 'scrapings of the pot', a scathing Irish expression. For that reason, O'Crohán was not weaned from the breast for a number of years simply because it was an available inexpensive natural food source. He recognised himself as a spoiled child, but the responsibility of looking after the 'old folk', his parents was his, in later life. Sayers was equally spoiled; as her sister Maíre said 'She'll be as proud as a peacock... for the dear woman thinks it's out of your poll the sun rises!' (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans: 17). Both authors concern themselves with the 'saol crua', the hard life. In both cases, life was simple and based on the premise of survival. They both tell of life on the island long before modern inventions such as electricity or mechanical transport reached those remote parts. Each day was about getting enough to eat, keeping warm and preparing in advance for their needs to the best of their ability. Education and schooldays were very much a hit and miss experience despite both Sayers and O'Crohán being avid learners and anxious to know more; Sayers was fierce fond of her 'little bag of books' (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans:39).

Neither focus on religion to the degree outside researchers do, other than; it was part of their lives to be respected. On the Blasket islands though religion was not regimentally structured, as no priest was in residence, Péig certainly derived solace from it at times of trouble 'God's will and the way of the world and we must not complain' (Flower, 1985[1944]:59). Neither author delves deeply into intimate relationships, accepting flirtations, matchmaking, courtship and marriage as a natural transition. On a practical level matchmaking was the method used to instigate and arrange marriages in the interest of all concerned. Sometimes these marriages did not work out and people separated. O'Crohán attests to this which appears to contradict both Messenger's and Scheper-Hughes' views. Emigration was a double-edged sword to be endured. Parents, mothers particularly were

broken-hearted when their children left. Many young people emigrated for work and the money sent home greatly relieved the hardship for the family but families slowly disintegrated losing members to foreign soils. For O'Crohán personally emigration was never an issue, but Sayers flirted with the idea often but she never accumulated the passage fare.

For all the sorrows there were good times as well, celebrating births, marriages and even death. Singsongs, storytelling, and leisurely socialising were their source of entertainment throughout both their lives. O'Crohán recounts many fishing expeditions, ships, drowning and death. Both of them, as do Flower and Messenger, refer to the poet Dunlevy and his way with words for capturing every event. Dunlevy's talent was testament to the wit and intelligence of the people often underestimated by others. Whether the occasion be happy, sad, a marriage, a wake, a funeral, a birth, a returned émigré, alcohol played a major part in their lives. Flower suggests 'being caught up in the alcohol' broke the monotony of their otherwise mundane lives. O'Crohán resented time lost to alcohol whereas Sayers saw the value of it for lifting people's spirits and 'washing away their sorrows':

> My mother was the finest singer that ever sang a verse of a song. Although she was in poor health she relished company, and now she had a little drop on board Muiris asked her to sing (Sayers, 1974[1937] Mc Mahon trans:59).

A strong similarity between both these insider texts is the love of the language. Both O'Crohán and Sayers use expressions handed down from generation to generation. It is through their adeptness with language that both authors convey certain perhaps taboo topics without openly mentioning them. One such example is the area of mental health. While neither writer expressly used the word depression or melancholia in their text, its presence is palpable, and can be appreciated having considered a number of contributory factors: the loneliness and isolation on the island and mainland; the weather greatly regulating their way of life; emigration (as mentioned above); infant mortality; death of loved ones; illness and sickness; old age; worry about hunger and heat; recovery from famine and later wars, land wars and evictions, with hauntings of each 'the tide bringing the wreckage of ships and the quiet forms of the dead to the island beaches' (Flower, 1985[1944]:11). Constant daily repetition eventually wore people down and depression must have been a reality. This may be said of any community, particularly an isolated one. Flower reflects this melancholic feeling a number of times in his text, particularly when he describes his visit to Inishvickilaun while Scheper-Hughes focused openly on the theme of schizophrenia (examined below).

Both O'Crohán's and Sayers' texts offer an uncomplicated insider's perspective of life in Ireland at a certain time. They neither accentuate the positive nor eliminate the negative but simply tell it as it was from the heart. This next section will examine the

perspectives of 'outsiders' on similar places. By comparing the insider and outsider approach, differences may be observed as to what and how *Auto*ethnography can and does supplement Ethnography.

The Outsider's View: Robin Flower, John Messenger, Nancy Scheper-Hughes

Robin Flower

Robin Flower's (also named Blaithín, the Gaelic for flower) text *The Western Island* (1944) was published seven years after O'Crohán's. Flower's approach to life on the Blaskets is different to that of Messenger and Scheper-Hughes because Flower is enthralled by the island experience. His research is one of appreciation rather than stern academic inquiry. Opening his text with in-depth description of the surrounding area he quotes O'Crohán

> If you were to walk all Ireland around it would come hard to you to find another place so beautiful as this (Flower, 1985[1944]:23).

Flower is overwhelmed by the very nature of the place, which at times results in forms of sentimentality. However, hand-in-hand with his awe at the place's beauty was an awareness of how the natural surroundings and environment contributed to the people's living conditions and temperament. As Flower travelled on the boats between the mainland and the islands, he was not unaware of the dangers of island life. Being cut off from the mainland by treacherous weather did not escape his appreciation either. He acknowledged the constant requirement to work hard to keep the belly full and the body warm, and recognised the melancholia derived from both the beauty and treachery of the place. He was conscious of the willingness of the locals to teach him the language and to share their stories and more besides with him.

The remoteness and sanctity of the island accounts for the presence of the island's previous inhabitants, religious men or hermits: 'the dark and strange people before the coming of the Celts who left vast shells as their memorial' (Flower, 1985[1944]:31). In describing the Dún at the summit of the main island, and the church remnants on smaller islands, he describes how closeness to nature brings feelings of calm, peace and tranquillity, reflecting how life on the island moved at a relatively slow pace 'up through the village we climbed at the slow island pace. For nobody ever hurries there…' (Flower, 1985[1944]: xx).

The physical and otherwise distance of the island from the rest of the world comes sharply into focus for Flower on one occasion when he arrived at the island, and was plunged into its remoteness, in stark contrast to what he had left as war in Europe had broken out. Flower finds himself asking deep challenging questions of life and its purpose. Flower's intense and challenging appreciation of life on the islands contrasts radically with John Messenger account, which offers a quantitative ethnographic research.

John Messenger

Messenger's (1969) *Inis Beag* (a fictitious name), is an anthropological study of an Aran Island off the west coast of Ireland, later identified as Inisheer. Over a ten-year period between 1955 and 1966, both he and his wife resided and researched Irish history and the island. Messenger's work is a culture presented by strangers as opposed to the 'native's point of view'. Messenger's ethnography followed the established trained observer strict criteria focusing on typical designated areas of life and culture within a society: subsistence, social organisation, social control, material culture, values and religion. Their 'research was directed towards documenting contemporary culture of Inis Beag', (Messenger,1969: 2)', and addressing previous images of the Irish people embedded in contexts of nativism, that is, the policy of protecting the interests of native born established inhabitants against those of immigrants, emphasising traditional and local customs (Messenger, 1969: 4-6).

According to Lewis' (1960:1) Anthropological definition Inis Beag islanders qualify as 'folk people': they have maintained a population for over 200 years; there is a strong bond between the peasant and the land; agriculture production is the main source of livelihood using simple technology a digging stick, spade and scythe (Messenger,1969*:*2). The matter of identity was a major concern to the Irish in general, but the people of Inis Beag and such areas were singled out, having satisfied the criteria of the nativist stereotype, as Gaelic speakers, pious Catholics and direct lineal descent. The islanders shunned the term peasant as others shunned the word primitive. Such behaviours like matchmaking, beliefs in fairies, ghosts and witches were discouraged as they played into the notion of peasantry. In opposition to the notion of peasantry was the notion of superiority, where the Irish were a pure Celtic race, possessing racially rooted psychological and behavioural traits including racial memory. The Irish saw themselves as predating the Greek and Roman civilizations and being more advanced than other European societies. The character of the people embodied traits of ancient origin held high in the esteem of nativists such as independence, self-reliance, industriousness, strength, courage, spirituality, imaginativeness, sanity and emotional stability (Messenger, 1969:4). The last two qualities have been questioned over time, (as we see below) and even today, there is deep sensitivity over mental health issues.

Messenger anticipated his text would raise controversy especially among those of a nativistic persuasion. Messenger distinguishes between a nativistic and primitavist perspective:

> a nativistic movement is a conscious organised attempt by the members of a society to revive or perpetuate certain elements of its indigenous culture under conditions of acculturation with dominance.... central to the primitavist position is a belief that civilization has dehumanised man, undermined his valued institutions, caused social bonds to disintegrate, fostered immorality and created mental illness on a vast scale (Messenger, 1969: 3-5).

Nativist ideals greatly influenced Irish government policy in relation to the islands in an effort to preserve these communities. Nativistic movements such as the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA), and Gaelic League, operated in two ways: firstly, reviving elements of indigenous culture, and secondly, perpetuating them. Nativists can be selective in their choice of cultural elements. Nativistic movements such as the GAA and the Gaelic League were a response to colonialism in trying to regain national identity through nurturing positive aspects, re-instating Irish street names, focusing on national heritage like language, customs, traditional sport like Gaelic football and hurling, songs and dances. The Irish Literary Revival sought to 'cultivate a national literature of the highest aesthetic quality' and recognised the

> Symbolic importance of the Irish Language which contains the soul of the Irish people... [the] Distinctive Celtic personality can be expressed through indigenous language (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:129).

The Irish language was seen as a more authentic language, which mirrored the distinctive Irish/Celtic personality, spirit, and soul through which one achieves national identity, unity and greatness. The Irish literary tradition was deemed richer and greater aesthetically and the Irish sought to ring-fence their recovery from outside intruders. As Thomas Davis said of the language: 't'is a surer barrier and more important than a fortress or a river' (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:130).

Messenger begins his work with a brief historical insight and ends anticipating the islands' future. The historical insight proves useful for comparison with many changes both Ireland and the island experienced before and after his survey. Like other ethnographies, these places are now hardly recognisable. Messenger deviated from the general orthodox research technique whereupon he wrote a 62-verse ballad in the nature of a number of incidents in ensuing months and shipwreck experiences, similar to previously mentioned Dunlevy. He requested one dozen islanders to read it and other texts portraying Inis Beag

culture, recording and analysing their responses. Reactions and alterations to the ballad provided insight into the personalities of the island.

Perhaps the most infamous element of Messenger's research was his analysis of Puritanism, not the Protestant type, but a Catholic Puritanism, and how he saw it affected life, on the island. Messenger saw this Puritanism as a form of social control preached from the pulpit with the curate heavily involved in the social activities of the community or family. Messenger writes of, and appears to be obsessed with the repressed sexuality of the islanders as he sees it. He disguised this chapter under the title 'religion and personality' but it is essentially a consideration of the sexual mores of the islanders. He presents the islanders as moráns (fools) suggesting they were ignorant of male/female attraction and unaware of the intimacies and delicacies of sex. The islanders did not discuss such matters openly partly because of shyness, partly because they assumed it to be too personal, no one's business and partly because they worried about gossip and their reputations. As a result, any deviant behaviour that would bring shame on the family was curtailed. Messenger questions the practice of privacy in urinating and defecating as if to suggest seeking privacy was abnormal.

As in many other societies, a girl's reputation was her destiny. The island dwellers were also members of the Catholic Church where the virtue of virginity and the sanctity of marriage were prized. Public displays of affection were not the norm even among married couples perhaps in deference to the comfort of onlookers. Neither does he allow for the stigma of unmarried motherhood or illegitimacy. Only recently has Ireland and indeed England come to terms with past treatment of young unmarried mothers and their children, many of whom were confined to mother and baby homes with the children being put up for adoption. Máire Ni Ghrada covered this topic in-depth in her play *An Trial* (1960), which one might call a performative *Auto*ethnography. In the play, a young girl who falls pregnant by the local married schoolteacher, is shunned by her family and finds herself working in Dublin. She later commits infanticide and suicide.

Messenger is derogatory (to use the playwright Sean O'Casey's expression) of the people. His representation of the Islanders particularly in this regard made him forever more an unwelcome guest. In fact, in all these matters Messenger does not appear to have understood the islanders or their ways very well. Neither does he appear to have interrogated his own conclusions, given that the island population was only 350, and everyone knew or was related in some way, to each other. Messenger does not appear to have worked the islanders' behaviour to any reasonable conclusions preferring to be offhand and at times insulting about it.

Nancy Scheper-Hughes

Some twenty years after John Messenger, Nancy Scheper-Hughes a young Anthropologist and mother of three arrived to Ireland in the 1970s to a place called An Clochán, Co. Kerry, which she called Ballybran, hoping to research and address the topic/problem of Irish sexuality: 'the problem of Irish sexuality seemed most compelling', (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:23). A serendipitous meeting with David Dunne, a director of a psychiatric unit in Cork, and a view of recent Irish psychiatric reports changed Scheper-Hughes' focus towards the correlation between a psychiatric disorder and sexual repression and social factors among young adults, culminating in a text titled *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics*. It was Dunne's view that the American researchers needed to focus on something other than the sexual mores of the Irish people

> 'You Americans are so obsessed with sex. Why not take a crack at this puzzle instead?'(Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:24).

In fact, Scheper-Hughes' focus was meant to be on social and personal relationships, family structure, marriage, childbirth, child rearing, property inheritance, emigration, personality disorders and death. She was obviously sensitive to the reception of her research in the research setting and was somewhat vague in her description as to its exact nature when pressed.

> To this just enough demand I replied: 'Interpersonal Relations in a Rural Irish Community'... the community relaxed somewhat (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:68/69).

The research later centred on mothers, children and adolescents. Although not a clinical psychologist, Scheper-Hughes' research method involved using TAT cards (Thematic Apperception Tests) a prevailing method at the time. She situates herself within the tradition of the Anthropological 'culture and personality studies' of Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead and Hortense Powdermaker, coming from an anthropological psychological social structural background, looking at rural Ireland through the emotions of disappointment, sadness, anger and madness. The few informants she researched with mental illness (schizophrenia, her word) were disillusioned with life and factors such as marital status, celibacy, age patterns contributed to their condition. In her opinion, admission to psychiatric units and hospitalisation for the smallest of ailments happened all too casually but the facility appeared to be unused for the desired purpose and was available. In many instances, the psychiatric unit became the residential care for the elderly, really in affect respite, something that still happens to day. Some of these unfortunate 'victims' could not return home due to lack of

home care, or due to stigmatisation where families were unwilling to absorb them back into the community at the time.

Coinciding with Scheper-Hughes' research, Ireland was in a period of social and economic transition and adaptation with many old ways being replaced. The country was in the process of joining the European Common Market and modern technology was more prevalent. Many traditions such as 'cabin hunting', that is, visiting different houses of an evening for the chat and sing song, were being slowly eroded and replaced by new ones. According to Scheper-Hughes, the death knell was being sounded for rural Ireland. Modernisation brought anxieties about the future for many. The collapse of many traditions brought loneliness but rather than crediting it as loneliness, Scheper stigmatises it as schizophrenia. The loneliness and disorders may have occurred due to late onset identity crisis, emotional social immaturity and anxieties about the future. The transient period from adolescence to adulthood, emotionally and socially maturing, brings depths of depression for many and is comparable with adolescents everywhere. Scheper-Hughes draws the comparison between the American and the Irish. Child development and Developmental Theories has been the research focus for many psychological and role theorists such as Erikson, Piaget and Bowlby.

> Each individual is subject to continual biological and environmental changes and hence to subsequent personality adjustments and to external adaptations to new roles (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1997]: 225).

In the research, setting Schepher-Hughes observed that some people in the community failed to secure lasting relationships. For this Scheper-Hughes held parents, the Catholic Church and social control partly responsible. Like many other societies in Ireland during the 60s, 70s and 80s there was a clash of the sexes. Mothers encouraged their daughters to look for a better easier life than their own and many women decided to move away to better their lives. Those left behind were not quite willingly to 'marry-in' to another household and be beholding to a mother-in-law. Eligible bachelors not entitled to inherit farms set their sights on greener pastures and emigrated. Others chose not to get married out of loyalty to their family or parents. Those who eventually decided they might get married often left it too late and remained childless. In Scheper-Hughes' work childlessness was also stigmatised as were the people who had 'too many' children. In her writing, there is the allusion that childlessness was due to ignorance of sexuality but the numbers of large families are testimony to some sort of conjugal relations occurring. Scheper-Hughes also criticised childrearing practices, where children were often portrayed as being ignored or neglected. This must surely have been due in part to the number of children and indeed, it was expected that women attended to many manual farm tasks. Usually the older sibling cared for the younger ones as admitted

by O'Crohán but the vast majority of children were born into self-sustaining farms and seldom went hungry. In addition, in many cases these farmers managed to put their children through a second level fee paying education before 'free-education' was introduced (1957).

The influences of the Catholic Church on social and personal mores was seriously criticised and much maligned in both Messenger's and Scheper-Hughes' texts, both of whom suggested it subjugated relationships. Scheper-Hughes gives credit to a Fr. Leary for his progressive views and assistance to the community to survive. There is no doubt Churches exercises some influence. In this case, 'Catholic Guilt' was blamed for psychological disorders. Admittedly, some of the clergy within the Catholic Church were totally unsuited to dealing with the human condition. Scheper-Hughes frequently refers to Honor Tracy's *The Straight and Narrow Path* (1956) and her ideas of the 'straight and narrow'. This may be associated with how the priest and church tried to keep people on the straight and narrow in order to save them from themselves. For others, different forms of religion bring comfort and solace and it is a way of life to them as in vocations for example.

Both Messenger and Scheper-Hughes suggest that celibacy within these communities is something to be ashamed of but they do so without weighing up the negative outcomes of promiscuity. In both texts, the word 'celibacy' is bandied around as though it were some kind of social disease. It is suggested that celibacy was enforced rather than a matter of choice. There is no mention of asexuality among the people. The suggestion prevails that celibacy is undignified and marriage should have been the natural decision for everyone. Yet, choice of partner was limited because of intermarriage and interrelatedness. If restricted sex was a form of social control, it also existed as disease prevention, and to prevent abnormalities in offspring. Similarly, in the matter of mental health, both Messenger and Scheper-Hughes present a superficial account, which appears to lack empathy or sensitivity or even consider the contributory factors to it.

Scheper-Hughes' awareness of the stigma attached to psychiatric illness begs the question why she chose the title for her text. She claimed the title was misleading and the 'book was about the state of rural Ireland in the 70s, not schizophrenia' (Scheper- Hughes, 2001[1979]:33). It was most unfortunate despite her claim it was "impolitic but apt" (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:41) simply because the Irish feel much maligned by the label of madness. Her colleague David Dunne gave her advance warning that the word schizophrenia was inapt but she continued to use it despite her understanding of the condition and its lack of accuracy concerning the reality:

> Dunne suspected social factors contributed to the over production of young adults in severe distress whose very real problems in living were too readily diagnosed as

> schizophrenia (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:24) [and she concurs] ... Many psychiatrists concede that schizophrenia is a crude diagnostic label to describe a cluster of symptoms (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:145).

Scheper-Hughes realised early in the research she was 'up against it' and the Anthropologist was a 'sitting duck' in Ballybran (An Clochán). She quickly became aware of: the various ways she was being subtly manipulated, by the local people including: the 'cuteness of the Kerry people'; the difference between the 'Mischievous informants' as against 'gifted informant', and how they had to be 'weeded out'; how if they did not want to share information with you, they would use the tricks like the blás (skill with words), blarney and codding; they could employ a propensity to 'lie', or answer a question with a question. She was conscious of the defensive posture people took in her presence. She was subject to numerous caustic remarks in the wake of John Messenger's ethnography

> a book that incurred the wrath of several Irish social scientists...Anthropologists are peeping Toms who write that the Irish take only the 'missionary position'...the 'anthropologist' was only interested in the villagers' sex practices and that (I) would write a book that would convert "people into numbers" and that I would ultimately degrade the Irish way of life (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:69).

To safeguard against the resistance of the locals Scheper-Hughes tried to get to know the villagers well, but moments of tension are highlighted, when she realised

> the perhaps apocryphal days of yesteryear when the Anthropologist was accepted and adopted as 'hero' into the local kinship of an innocent and guileless people, are over ...as once isolated villages and small communities throughout the world become enlightened as to the uses and abuses of Anthropology (Scheper-Hughes,2001[1979]:70)

A Change of Heart

In the aftermath of *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics* and her Irish experience Nancy Scheper-Hughes realised changes were afoot and were necessary in Anthropology, when she found herself 'revisiting questions about anthropological ethics and the politics and poetics of 'writing culture' (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1977]: xiii). She acknowledged new considerations required to be addressed, in the production of ethnographies. Her work pre-empted that of Clifford and Marcus in *Writing Culture* (1986). In the preface to the 1982 paperback edition of *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics* Scheper-Hughes notes

> one source of ethnographic data frequently absent in anthropological analysis is the response of the people studied to the ethnographer's description and interpretation of the meaning of their lives (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]: xv).

In postmodern Anthropology/*Auto*ethnography this is the 'something missing' from academic research – 'the interpretation of the meaning of their lives'- as espoused by Ellis and Bochner (2013). The norm in anthropological research had been that the 'natives' never knew what was written or said about them, possibly because the write up was in a language unknown to the studied group. In some cases, out of professional courtesy, the Anthropologist might send a copy to the village headman. In many circumstances, however, the research remained invisible. Not so for Scheper-Hughes and the 'most literate and self reflexive people, the rural Irish' (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1977]: xv). Nancy Scheper-Hughes experienced a huge degree of backlash. Her ethnography was received with utter disdain, which she experienced in no uncertain terms, from people she thought of as friends, on a return visit in 1999:

> Who made *you* such an authority? You weren't such a grand person when you and your family came to live in our bungalow. You could hardly control your own children. Why don't you go home and write about your own troubles. God knows you've got plenty of them, with school children shooting each other and U.S. planes bombing hospitals in Kosovo. Why pick on us?... You'll know how it feels to have your whole family history spilled out for the whole world to see when it's been done to yourselves (Scheper-Hughes, 2011[1979]: xvi/311. Emphasis in original).

Another lengthy criticism directed at Scheper-Hughes reads:

> Sure, nobody's perfect, nobody's a saint. We all have our weaknesses. But you never wrote about our strengths. You never said what a beautiful and safe place our village is. You never wrote about the vast sweep of the eye that the village offers over the sea and Conor Pass. You said nothing about our fine musicians and poets, and our step dancers who move through the air with the grace of a silk thread. And we are not such a backwater today. There are many educated people among us. You wrote about our troubles alright but not about our strengths. What about the friendliness of the neighbours? What about our love for Mother Ireland and our proud work of defending it... Look, girl the fact is that ya *just didn't give us credit* (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]: 311. Emphasis in original).

Responding to the negative reception of her ethnography Scheper-Hughes tried to explain how her attempt to write against 'violence' had a violence of its own: 'I was unable to anticipate the effect my words would have' (Scheper-Hughes, 2001:46). Later she found out the statistics she used had been invalidated (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1977]:40). In subsequent introductions and epilogues of reprints of the book Scheper-Hughes apologises to the people of An Clochán (Ballybran) who easily identified themselves in the text. She refrains from finishing the title sticking to *Saints and Scholars,* indicating her own sensitivity to the somewhat debunked word. Scheper-Hughes says of the text herself

> *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics* was written from a particular perspective, at a particular moment in time, by a particular sort of anthropologist-ethnographer (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:13).

Yeats expression 'Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold' (W.B. Yeats, 1919, *The Second Coming*) is easily applicable to Anthropology, as some of the stalwart methodological practices, such as anonymity and pseudonyms were no longer holding:

> I have come to see that the time honoured practice of bestowing anonymity on our communities and informants fools few and protects none – save perhaps the Anthropologist ...the practices makes rogues of us all... too free with our pens, with the government of our tongues loose translations and interpretations of village life ... anonymity makes us forget that we owe our Anthropological subjects the same degree of courtesy, empathy, and friendship in writing that we generally extend to them face to face (Scheper-Hughes,2001[1977]:12-13).

She blushes at her naiveté realising the Anthropologist can:

> no longer approach the field as a private laboratory of human behaviour to test scientific hypotheses - the Anthropologist is a skilful pathologist of the human condition (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1977]:20-21).

There is little doubt that in any circumstances it is extremely difficult to embark on ethnographic study of sensitive subjects such as mental illness. Scheper-Hughes' work is a useful, worthwhile and beneficial exercise in itself but its impact is disconcerting and appears tactless in some areas, as did Messenger's. In both cases, they appear to exclude or overlook the expression of sentiment from the informants. The ideas presented in the texts are views of the Irish in a particular location, but are evidently biased, perhaps due to attitudes or the influence of texts read before arriving in Ireland. Scheper-Hughes revisited her text a number of times acknowledging that the outsider's view was over-simplistic, academic, anti-social, and insensitive.

It is difficult to coalesce the ideas of O'Crohán, Sayers and Flower with Schepher-Hughes and Messenger despite the fact they were writing of similar areas. Neither O'Crohán, Sayers or Flower denied the presence of melancholia or depression though they were labels they did not use. The areas had seen many changes since the time but still survived and indeed the area still survives to this day though probably very different. For all of Scheper-Hughes fears she states: '...one of the outstanding characteristics of rural Irish culture is its ability to survive through compromise and syncretisation' (Scheper-Hughes, 2001[1979]:81).

Conclusion

In looking at and comparing both insiders' and outsiders' perspectives and approaches to reflecting and examining a culture in some instances the 'outsider' fared badly; they were hugely criticised and appear to have no grasp of the ethos and/or the spirit of the community.

Certainly, in the ethnographic examples mentioned here the Irish were very angry about the manner in which they were represented. The difficulty with the ethnographic approach, as opposed to the *Auto*ethnographic approach is around a lack of empathy and an inability to understand completely the psyche of the communities studied. The purpose of the research from the differing perspectives is highly relevant here, indicating that both the processes and approaches have to be (re)considered. *Auto*ethnography is an alternative approach, which takes into consideration the insiders' perspective and how experiences whether emotional, social, political or religious reflect the experiences of the community in general. Many other Anthropologists suffered the fate of Messenger and Scheper-Hughes including for example Ruth Behar (1996) and Carolyn Ellis (2009), further discussed in Chapter 7. It is perhaps no coincidence that both Behar and Ellis are proponents of the *Auto*ethnographic method.

This chapter has sought to compare ethnographies and *Auto*ethnographies from a similar place, Ireland. In showing the different perspectives, that of the professional Anthropologist and the *Auto*ethnographer we can identify both had different aims and purposes. The *Auto*ethnographer, giving an inside view, wrote from an angle 'to show a scheme of life that worked' to quote Ella Cara Deloria (1944) and use personal experience to comment and critique cultural experience, a feature of *Auto*ethnography. The professional Anthropologist had strict criteria to follow: to garner information for a specific purpose, which may have influenced their perspective. The impact of these works gave rise to the consideration of ethics. It is timely to end on this topic, as the next two chapters will examine both Ethics and the Resistance and Criticism of *Auto*ethnography.

Chapter Six: Ethics in the Realm of *Auto*ethnography

"No man is an island" (Donne, 1624: Meditation XVII).

Introduction

As noted in Chapter 5, the aftermath of publication of ethnography can result in scathing criticism of the researchers. It would appear that many ethnographers failed to anticipate or prepare for the response or considerations of their study group. A greater focus on the ethics of the work from the outset might have prevented the catastrophic reaction from the locals. Such considerations were addressed by, Guilleman and Gillam (2004) who in an essay titled 'Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research' distinguished between two dimensions of ethics in research; 'procedural ethics' and 'ethics in practice'. 'Procedural ethics' are those implied by the bureaucracy of the institution. 'Ethics in practice' should be considered when a situation potentially has adverse consequences or when a researcher has to 'think on their feet' about possible outcomes of research and is required to protect identities and vulnerabilities during the research process (Guilleman and Gillam, 2004: 264-265).

This chapter will examine the ethical question, as it is relevant on three fronts for the *Auto*ethnographer. Firstly, it will take a briefly look at the history of Bureaucratic Ethics as they apply to social sciences in general, Anthropology specifically. Secondly, this chapter will recount experiences of individual researchers and how consequences of their work gave rise to ethical concerns. Thirdly, it we will look at ethical considerations and dilemmas as they apply specifically to the *Auto*ethnographer with suggested resolutions.

History of Bureaucratic Ethics

Ethics are the moral principles, which govern, or influence conduct based on the ethos of a particular culture, era or community. Luke Eric Lassiter (2005) in *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography* recounts how ethics have long been a consideration for Anthropologists and describes how in 1948 the Society for Applied Anthropology instituted a Professional Code of Ethics. Subsequently, The American Anthropologist Association (AAA) first statement of ethics namely *The Statement of Problems of Anthropological Research and Ethics,* (1967) emerged in response to the 1960s 'Project Camelot', which is explained as:

> the U.S. Military proposed to use Anthropologists and other social scientists to carry out research on revolutionary movements.... Although the project was aborted before it officially began, broad media coverage highlighted a growing concern in Anthropology and social science in general, and among the public at large about the ability of social scientists to carry out research with their subjects best interests in mind (Horowitz, 1967 cited in Lassiter, 2005:84-85).

Subsequently, in 1971, the *Principles of Professional Responsibility* were adopted, and later revised in 1990 and 1998 (Fluehr-Lobban, 2002). The American Anthropological Association (AAA) updated their *Principles of Professional Responsibility* in November 2012. They are: 1) Do No Harm; 2) Be Open and Honest Regarding Your Work; 3) Obtain Informed Consent and Necessary Permissions; 4) Weigh Competing Obligations Due Collaborators and Affected Parties; 5) Make Results Accessible; 6) Protect and Preserve Your Records; 7) Maintain Respectful and Ethical Professional Relationships (AAA, 2012). As such, they are the set of moral principles that guide and influence an Anthropologist /Autoethnographer's attitude and aspirations, towards their research and work produced. Adams and colleagues (2013) point out the strong dimensions of ethics in *Auto*ethnography, for who 'relational ethics' are of major concern:

> the ethical dimensions of *Auto*ethnography is not static and continues to expand to include not only relational ethics, but moral ethics, ethical mindfulness, an ethic of trust, an ethic of care, and an ethic to look out for the well-being of ourselves as well as the 'other' as we engage in emotionally laden journeys (Adams et al., 2013: 99).

The language surrounding ethics in Anthropology and the dialogic nature of fieldwork contains words associated with their principles such as anonymity, authority, confidentiality, credibility, discernment, empathy, fairness in representation, harm, honesty, objectivity, obligations social/legal/personal, professional integrity, reciprocity, risk, responsibility, sensitivity and vulnerability. The ethical questions for the Anthropologist/*Auto*ethnographer centre on these and related words, before, during and after field work. Again, the question to whom are the Anthropologist/*Auto*ethnographer ultimately responsible influences certain decisions made during the process and production of research: is it to oneself, the institution or the co-respondent? This question along with considerations of language identified here cements what it is to be an ethical Anthropologist.

Outside of Anthropology, ethical guidelines were being established within the medical profession, a brief synopsis of which is offered here. These later had consequences for those doing research in the humanities. In 1964, Declaration Helsinki established a set of universalistic ethical principles in response to revelations concerning Nazi medical experimentation, including informed consent, confidentiality, and protection from harm,

which were integrated into national funding-agency research ethics codes (Lederman, 2006: 478). Henry Beecher's 1966 disclosure of 'horrifying U.S. medical research abuses' led to the National Institute of Health (NIH) to develop policies for the protection of humans. In 1972, media exposure of the Public Health Services Tuskegee syphilis study led to the 1974 National Research Act which established the National Commission (i.e. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research) to develop policy and procedures. Funders' main motives for establishing Ethic Codes and Guidelines were in response to biomedical research risk in the context of global inequalities.

In 1979, a defining moment in US policy occurred when the National Commission published a statement entitled *The Belmont Report*, which outlined the principles of 'justice', 'beneficence' and 'respect for the persons' with regards research. These still guide the Federal System and inform Internal Review Boards procedures i.e. the scrutiny of research subject selection, harm-benefit calculi, informed consent and provision for preserving confidentiality (Lederman, 2006: 479). Subsequently, in 1991, the Federal Regulation code 45CFR46, known as the Common Rule was introduced for agencies that fund human-subjects research, obligating institutions to establish Institutional (or Internal) Review Boards (IRBs) and a more formal review process for the purpose of assessing research proposals to ensure transparency, fairness and clarity around criteria.

In the recent climate of litigation, academic and research institutions are required to be vigilant in consenting to and financing research projects. Though the Common Rule ethics criteria are particularly suited to biomedical research, the same 'evaluation criteria' were applied to 'all' types of research proposals from the humanities to the sciences, until recently it was highlighted that, 'one size does not fit all'. In Britain, a fraught situation existed between Universities and Research Bodies as reductive accountability standards, modelled on financial audits, were continually accommodated or resisted, i.e. a more 'business like' approach was adopted, later labelled 'audit creep' by Marilyn Strathern (2006), which did not always accommodate/facilitate various types of social science research.

As an example to all, in 2004 Canada published 'exemplary' work in the *Tri Council Policy Statement*, which governs the practices of three main funding agencies. This work acknowledges the 'spectrum' of disciplinary research methodologies and ethical frameworks, and resists paradigmatic, positivist, experimentalist assumptions. In being sensitive to the needs of the field, and recognising the importance and requirement for academic freedom, it appears more flexible in its approach (Lederman, 2006:478). The National Bioethics Advisory Committee, (NABC), 2001, issued a 'final policy' (?) for overhaul of the Federal System, until a series of university medical research tragedies provoked reactive regulatory hypervigilance and expansion of regulatory 'oversight', (overview), known colloquially as

'IRB mission creep' where Federal hypervigilance transferred to local Internal Review Boards. This in effect led to a major rethink of the legal basis of the regulatory system. The ambiguity of Federal Regulations, labelled bureaucratic 'mission creep' drove 'anxious uncertainty', which was based on a 'better safe than sorry logic' (Lederman, 2006:482). The historical development and application of ethical policies and ethical criteria in academia, and Anthropology specifically had consequences for social science research, which consequently transferred to *Auto*ethnographic work.

Implications of Bureaucratic Ethics on the Social Sciences

In 2006, the journal, *American Ethnologist*, convened a forum entitled American Ethnologists A.E. Forum: IRB's, Bureaucratic Regulation and Academic Freedom. It's intention was to examine: ethical legislation with regard to academic research; the institution and emergence, function, and role of Internal Review Boards; the influence of State Regulation on Internal Review Boards; the impact on Social Science Research, specifically for Anthropology, Ethnography (and Autoethnography). The Forum offered a platform to individual researchers to express their views on: a) the bureaucratisation of ethical review, and b) how engagement with Internal Review Boards affects research. Rena Lederman led the contributions of twelve researchers in the humanities, offering international perspectives including that of Marilyn Strathern (Britain), Didier Fassin (France), Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (Brazil) and Nandini Sundar (Delphi/India). Collectively the contributors had similar concerns, specifically how the criteria for biomedical research was applied to social science research, how fieldwork, time and consent within various projects are indeterminate and misunderstood, how the label 'subject' is dubious or unsavoury within social science and finally how Anthropology, Ethnography (and *Auto*ethnography) cannot be shoehorned to fit specific criteria. What is interesting and important about these individual accounts is the various ways bureaucracy impinged on their research. One commonality between them all is the involvement of people (aka as humans or subjects) which requires considerable appreciation.

Lederman was a member of an Internal Review Board, and noted that rather than apply discipline specific codes Internal Review Boards worked from one broad spectrum. She also noted IRB members involved with 'precise research' did not grasp 'long term open ended participation', 'observation based "fieldwork"' and saw 'something shady, or disreputable about "ethnographer's magic", as expressed in: inefficiency of time frames; vagueness with regards research protocols; qualms about consent forms etc. Marilyn Strathern (2006) explained that fieldwork was about embeddedness. She concluded that in the field research and daily life are inextricably linked, and cannot be easily separated.

Interaction with interlocutors is negotiable, time is unbounded, 'beginnings' cannot be clearly demarcated: and 'endings' can be limitless, therefore consent takes on a new meaning every time. The timeliness or timelessness of ethnography did not fit Internal Review Board criteria:

> [T]ime introduces an informality into interaction through the simple fact of biological disclosure...Relationships always have a touch of informality about them (Strathern, 2006:532).

Lederman discovered Internal Review Board guidelines were specifically designed and directed towards Biomedics. The stringent nature and restrictions of biomedical guidelines for those who work in a clearly demarcated controlled research environment was a 'misfit' for other sciences. The guidelines posed challenges for the malleable nature of Anthropologists'/*Auto*ethnographers' research who live where they research or embed themselves in their informants' environment; indeed, in some cases, *Auto*ethnographers 'are' the research. For Fassin (2006), the medical science method is:

> ...ill adapted to suit requirements of Social Sciences, especially ethnography. It leads to substantial useless restriction not only on academic freedom but quality of research and outcome (Fassin, 2006:524)

(*Auto*)Ethnographers are also antipathetic to the title 'human subjects' or 'informant'. Anthropologists/*Auto*ethnographers have experienced difficulty in labelling (another dubious word)/naming those who shares their knowledge and experiences with them not least because they see informants as consultants/collaborators/correspondents/clients or co–respondents. Worth noting here is Luis Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira's (2004) worthy distinction between research in human beings, and research *with* human beings, as highlighted by Riberio (Ribeiro, 2006:529). Strathern too noted the shift in register between 'persons' and 'relations' vs. 'human subjects', and declares herself to be an outlaw for 'To talk about human subjects instead of persons seems like torture' (Strathern, 2006:532). The clinical definition of 'human subject' is distinct from survey researchers' respondents and Anthropologists' informants:

> *human subject* means a living individual about whom an investigator (professional or student) conducting research obtains i) data through intervention/interaction with the individual or ii) identifiable private information (DHHS: 2005:102[f] cited in Lederman,2006: 487. Emphasis in original).

When it comes to methodology, Fassin (2006) sees ethnography as bearing the brunt or collateral damage of ethical regulation making the distinction between clinical and social circumstances:

> Ethnography is not about human subjects in clinical experiments –it is about social beings in historical circumstances (Fassin,2006:524).

Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (2006) notes that institutional oversight (overview) is a form of political power, and that state involvement in Universities is only beginning. He suggests that, this approach will jeopardise in time the ideology of academic freedom, begging the question who or what shapes a university's ethos.

There is also a disconnection between Internal Review Board Protocols for Informed Consent, Anthropological Field Ethics and Data Protection. The issue of Informed Consent is an ongoing problem for Anthropologists/*Auto*ethnographers. Nandini Sundar (2006) looks at the issue of consent in different circumstances, from the perspective of both the Anthropologist and the co-respondent. She suggests the preoccupation with procuring consent obscures wider ethical issues or the focus of the project such as: how *informed* informed consent is; accepting the 'subject's right to be informed about the goals of the research project(s); the levels of research people consent to and if on a continuum, has consent to be renegotiated intermittently. In drawing an analogy between prior consent and participatory management, (which she says is loved by developing agencies, as the terms of participation are pre-determined), this is an unsatisfactory arrangement especially in circumstances of illiteracy where vulnerable people may be signing rights away. She also queries the procuring of consent with regard to research with criminals. Sundar also highlighted that the rules need to be rewritten for different methodologies, having become aware of 'federal mission creep' and intervention in non-federal funded projects.

Strathern (2006) too analogises the complexities of box ticking in Internal Review Boards forms, with an auditing process and/or financial assessment, which she aptly labelled 'audit creep', whereby research is reduced to a productivity deal. Here, researchers and graduate students become items on a production belt, processed through a system and off the books quickly, while staying within budgetary targets, demonstrated to the authorities. Strathern was unable to imagine a correlation between an administrative system that talks about the oppressive nature of protocols and best practice regulation. For Strathern the 'audit creep' is about institutional protection against costly reprisals 'immunizing against litigation' and not about the 'subjects' (Strathern, 2006:533). For Strathern (2006), Anthropological fieldwork teaches ethics. Anthropologists take responsibility for the social life of another, as a social person. In other words, ethics is rooted in the Anthropologist (Strathern, 2006: 532). This is particularly true of the *Auto*ethnographer who is closely/personally associated to the subject of study. Strathern believes ethnography is a responsible job, and

> 'one way of taking care is through acknowledging other people's dignity'... [for] 'It is through their relationships with others that Anthropologists understand relationships' (Strathern, 2006:532).

This section has examined the implications of bureaucratic ethics on social science research, and how institutionalised guidelines and regulations influence, and sometimes hamper research, as recounted by individual Anthropologists. In contrast, we will now examine the consequences for those who overlooked ethical considerations in their research.

Work Consequences which give rise to Ethical Considerations

The Irish in An Clochán were unimpressed with Scheper-Hughes' presentation of them and, despite her efforts to disguise them, they easily identified and recognized themselves. As a consequence of her experience of the response to her Irish ethnography, (as demonstrated in Chapter 5), Scheper-Hughes found herself reflecting on anthropological ethics (Scheper-Hughes: 2001[1979]: xiii). In an article titled, 'The Ire in Ireland' Scheper-Hughes (2000) recounts her return to the village, and how she was literally ran out of it. As previously noted, (see Chapter 5) her friends/informants were disappointed that she did not focus on their strengths, or give them 'any credit'. Scheper-Hughes is unrelenting and puts the mistake down to her lack of experience, and being a 'young somewhat brash Anthropologist' abroad (Scheper-Hughes, 2000:120). However, in examining her own ethical stance she notes

> I have come to see that the time-honoured practice of bestowing anonymity on 'our' communities and informants fools few and protects no one-save, perhaps, the anthropologist's own skin (Scheper-Hughes, 2000:128).

Experiences such as those of Scheper-Hughes are not unknown among Anthropologists, and Ruth Behar (1995), Carolyn Ellis (2009,1995), Jean Briggs (1970), and Luke Lassiter (2005) confess to similar accusations or allegations, when they returned to their research villages. In 'Writing in my Father's Name: A Diary of Translated Woman's First Year' Behar (1995) describes her father's fury for dragging his name into infamy and disclosing family stories in her text *Translated Woman* (1993), which led to long term animosity and a strained father/daughter relationship. In the same essay, Behar also recounts her return visit to her primary informant Esperanza in Mexico. That visit was tense with an undercurrent of indebtedness and exploitation:

> I'm giving it (a money order) back so we won't be in your debt. We're so sold out to you the best we can do is give you one of us to take back with you... I already know my *historia*...And besides, this is in English. My children can't read it ... No *comadre*, you take it back. Sell it. So it won't be sitting there gathering dust. You worked hard on it. You should make some money... She says she will accept a copy in Spanish. And she'll know how to handle any criticisms, from her husband, her neighbours, from anyone. She's not afraid anymore of being called a witch (Behar, 1995:65-77. Emphasis in original).

In 1987, Marilyn Strathern critiqued types of exploitation almost pre-empting the experiences of the authors above. She reflects on a student revolt in Papua New Guinea over the misappropriation of information, *their information* (Strathern, 1987:20). She distinguishes between the academic domain and academic discourse, unequal power relations, pointing out the origins of the information is often overshadowed. There are those who feel used, usurped by Anthropologists. One important question is the purpose for which the information is used: is it for the benefit of the community or the prestige of the researcher. For Strathern it is not about the information but the value conversion. In reflecting her own research experience in Mount Hagen she explains how her informant gained nothing from sharing with her, but she gained academic credence coupled with the assumption of the informants that "one would make vast sums of money in one's own world" (Strathern, 1987:22).

Carolyn Ellis suffered a similar fate to Scheper-Hughes with her text *Fisher Folk: Two Communities on Chesapeake Bay* (1986) published from her dissertation. The work was a comparison of the people of Fishneck with those of Crab Reek, in Chesapeake Bay. Initially, Ellis did not send the community a copy of the book, but when a competitor publishing about the same area did, she was concerned how they would react to 'some of the private and unflattering things she had written about them' (Ellis, 2009: 69). The book was not well received, angering some of her informants, and losing her their friendship. She too, like Nancy Scheper-Hughes, claimed that she did not identify the community or individuals but they recognised themselves and others. Ellis' community also claimed she only wrote the book to make money:

> You said ten year olds were having sex...The island people, you said. Made us sound like whores. I never did it till I was 21. I'm not a whore... I'm sorry, I reply sadly, head hanging...I understand what you're saying. I shouldn't have said some of those things. If I could do it over, I wouldn't say them. Can I make it up to you? ...You just saw the chance to make money off us and you took it (Ellis, 2009:73-75).

It was not in the aftermath but during the research that Briggs (1970) experienced the contempt of her adoptive family when she (inadvertently?) read letters sent to her hosts. They felt Briggs was unhappy among them and portrayed and criticised her as a moody, selfish, non-contributing family member (Briggs, 1970:285-288). Briggs' lesson is the inverse of her

colleagues, in that she offers an insight into how one might feel, when they are written negatively about.

The unforgiving nature of the informants having read what was written about them, made the authors Scheper-Hughes, Ellis, Briggs and Behar aware of the impact their writing had on individuals. The outcome challenged their concerns about research ethics. Ellis suggests how the stories would have been different had she indulged her intellectual strengths including: those concerning emotionality, lived experience, close relationships, sense making and creating a meaningful life which are features of *Auto*ethnography, and had been true to herself rather than satisfying academic criteria (Ellis, 2009: 73-75). I refer to these experiences solely to demonstrate the need for ethical considerations within research whether it be ethnography or *Auto*ethnography. Below we consider ethical considerations as they specifically apply to *Auto*ethnographers.

Ethics Appropriate to *Auto*ethnography

Having looked at the ethics procedural process and the difficulties faced by social scientists in general, this next segment will examine a series of dilemmas and ethical difficulties facing the Anthropologist and *Auto*ethnographer in general and later those specifically related to the *Auto*ethnographer. G.N. Appell's (1978) *Ethical Dilemmas in Anthropological Inquiry: A Case Book,* comprehensively poses a series of challenges facing the Anthropologist, and by extension the *Auto*ethnographer. It addresses some concerns , such as: the reason for the research whether its personal, self/or academic professional development; their openness about the research; their relationship with informants and those implicated in the research; whether there is government intervention; the dilemma of considering abandoning the project in the interest of an individual, or a community; the presentation of results; the outcome and aftermath of the research; what happens on leaving the field; do traces remain with you (the researcher) for one's lifetime, or does one just shut down and walk away; control of field notes, whether to archive, or to whom do they belong; and finally controlling the contents for publication. These dilemmas are perhaps more intense and more challenging for the *Auto*ethnographer as her/his field is more immediate, personalised and emotional.

In its original format the criteria for research, as laid out by Malinowski (1922), where the focus of research was on the social, economic, religious and political structure of a society or group, using statistical analysis and tables to explain kinships, rituals, etc.,

informants were obscure and unlikely to be aware or affected by the results of the research. In 'ordinary', ethnographic circumstances the researcher considers the Principles of Professional Practice and comprehensively understands what is ethically correct as demonstrated in ethnographic practice classes. How these principles may be applied can be down to discernment. Ethical consequences for an *Auto*ethnographer are more complicated than that.

*Auto*ethnography may be deemed 'person-specific' research. Due to its malleable and fluid nature and blurred boundaries, it does not fit one specific category as a research method. Nonetheless, it is not excluded from being accountable for or to others implicated in the text and as such all work of this nature requires due consideration of ethical concerns. Ethical guidelines are important to *Auto*ethnographers, and their academic counterparts, all of whom face a number of ethical challenges and responsibilities in their endeavours to produce work that is true, honest, relevant and responsible. Guidelines help to ensure the researchers' accountability and protect those associated with the research. *Auto*ethnographers are tripartially bound with ethics. On the one hand, they have a responsibility to those involved in their research; on the other, they have a responsibility to their academic institution, and thirdly a responsibility to themselves.

Normally by the very nature of their research, Anthropologists are rarely judicial but rather make observations through which they present findings and initiate conversations. Many researchers having collected their data, never return to the field or face their participants/informants again. Anthropological field exercises are not normally replicated for the sake of comparison. 'Doing ethnography', writing the results of research, is an important analysis using consciousness and sensibility, linking the accumulated material to produce a persuasive analysis and understanding of who and what has been observed and studied. This does not hold for the 'field' of *Auto*ethnographic inquiry that is based on more intimate, collaborative research. In *Auto*ethnography (study of one's own culture), or self-ethnography (study of a personal experience/dilemma as a phenomenon within one's own culture), ethical considerations are not confined to bureaucratic responsibility but include personal responsibility also. An *Auto*ethnographer, using personal experience to explain a cultural phenomenon, does not work in isolation (Ellis et al.,2011:28). The dynamic research environment of the *Auto*ethnographer is contextual, contingent and primarily relational.

Ethical Issues and Responsibilities of Autoethnographer

In *Auto*ethnography, particularly when the 'self' is the focus of the research, the *Auto*ethnographer draws on and uses personal experiences to write about culture using personal documents, manuscripts, private thoughts and feelings which become a permanent record that cannot be rolled back. The researcher lives with the research outcome eternally.

The researcher is not only tied to their text but tied to the people who contributed to the experience: close family, parents, siblings, intimates, partners, relations, friends, colleagues, cohorts, social networks, and in some cases universities, research faculties and even enemies. In *Auto*ethnography while conducting and writing *Auto*ethnographic research, 'informants' are no longer impersonal subjects mined for data (Ellis et al., 2011:30). They are implicated in the research project, and outcome, and cannot simply be ticked, boxed and labelled. If an *Auto*ethnographer's focus of research is describing unethical behaviour directed towards them such as homophobia, abuse or violence, affiliated friendships and ethical issues are important. Ethical issues around disclosure also occur when dealing with self-reflecting personal narrative. The researcher needs to be continually conscious of how much is 'too much information', and the effects disclosure may have not only on the subject of study, the self or the local environment, but also on other individuals, remotely or closely connected, interconnected or associated with the topic of inquiry. If the research is about an individual's survival of a social cultural dilemma, then the likelihood is that the informants will access the results. *Auto*ethnographers are obliged to show work to others implicated in the text. They provide for response, acknowledging others' feelings about what is written, and permit 'talk back'. Therefore, Anthropological *Auto*ethnographers are required to consider the personal, social, political and ethical consequences of using personal experiences as primary sources for research data. Hence, we can appreciate why ethics, diligence and efficiency in all research are necessary for researchers to protect both themselves and their 'informants'.

In addressing the question of who needs protection, the answer is those closely associated with the project. Concern for relational ethics are forefront in the mind of the researcher as the research process evolves, during the write up or even after the work. Relational ethics are deeply complicated as *Auto*ethnographies maintain and value interpersonal ties (Ellis et al., 2011:30). In addition, *Auto*ethnographers may have to provide protection as in traditional ethnographies. Here, procedures need to be adopted, and adapted to protect informants, such as altering identifying characteristics, circumstances, topics discussed, characteristics such as race, gender, name, place or appearance. The intention to protect 'informants' in *Auto*ethnography is not always possible, because when *Auto*ethnographers are the 'subject' of the research and use their own name or credentials, relatives will be easily identifiable. For example, if a husband refers to his wife in the research, the wife is implicated and cannot be masked, without altering the meaning and purpose of story (Ellis et al., 2011:28). This applies to identifiable community members also. *Auto*ethnographers need to be conscious of how protective devices may influence the integrity of the research, along with how work is interpreted and understood. Some argue that the essence and meaningfulness of the account/narrative is more important than precise recount of detail (Ellis et al, 2011:31). In an *Auto*ethnography the emphasis remains on the

ethnography, the mapping of a culture or a cultural phenomenon from a particular stance, that of the Anthropologist.

Due to lack of awareness, or no guidelines, early *Auto*ethnographers appear to have overlooked or have been unconcerned with the ethical implications of their work. In her classic *Auto*ethnography *Final Negotiations* (1995), Carolyn Ellis gives no indication that she received 'informed consent' from her husband Gene Weinstein about his inclusion in the text. Though Weinstein was deceased when the book was published, and Ellis claims the book is about 'her' experience, Weinstein is mentioned on at least every other page. This hardly excludes him from reference, positing another problem for *Auto*ethnographers. Some efforts to establish ethical guidelines for authoring *Auto*ethnography have been made, as *Auto*ethnography evolved and further developed, and due to ethical complexities.

Ethical Guidelines for Autoethnographers

Martin Tolich (2010) became concerned for the lack of ethical guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers, and highlighted the issues and challenges of the situation in his essay, 'A Critique of Current Practices: Ten Foundational Guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers'. Tolich, in anticipation of and to counteract some ethical dilemmas faced by *Auto*ethnographers, laid down guidelines. Tolich is concerned with the age-old issue of consent, and how and when it is acquired. In a four-part article, he considers i) 'retrospective consent'; ii) *Auto*ethnographers' justifications for not gaining informed consent; iii) sources available to *Auto*ethnographers 'including ethical issues present when researchers use *Auto*ethnography to heal themselves, violating internal confidentiality of relational others'; iv) questions of whether if *Auto*ethnography, like journalism, is exempt from formal ethical review. He differentiates between informed consent, passive consent, active consent, process consent, retrospective informed consent and anticipatory ethics and situated ethics. What he takes most issue with is 'passive' consent, consent which is based on an assumption consent was received (Tolich, 2010).

Tolich's first area of concern was retrospective informed consent. As an example, he focuses on Barbara Jago's *Auto*ethnographic article 'Chronicling an Academic Depression' (2002) which is a description of her depression and the anguish it brought. Jago named twenty-three participants in her article, but does not appear to have acquired consent prior to publication. Tolich was concerned for those whose names appeared without consent, and the fact that Jago did not use pseudonyms to protect the identity of any of her participants, highlighting how no precaution with regards anticipatory ethics was taken. Where an ethical consideration and question did occur, it was only addressed in the review stage. Tolich's interest lies in the rights of those people mentioned in *Auto*ethnographies, and is concerned

with the vulnerability of those named. He refers to Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) pertinent questions as to ownership of stories (Tolich, 2010:1599). He considers:

> whether genuine consent can be obtained retrospectively without creating a conflict of interest weighted in favour of the author rather than the research subject... and how seeking consent after writing an article is problematic and potentially coercive, placing undue obligation on research 'subjects' to volunteer (Tolich, 2010:1600).

According to Tolich, practitioners of Creative Analytical Practices (CAP) and *Auto*ethnography have endemic problems when it comes to ethics. His belief is *Auto*ethnographers have an ethical responsibility to a community made up of the researcher, the Internal Review Board, journal editors and their reviewers, graduate students taught by *Auto*ethnographers, participants and readers. He refers to the fact that since 2005 the International Congresses of Qualitative Inquiry began to develop research precautions to protect participants in *Auto*ethnography (or CAP projects). In 2007 'The Position Statement on Qualitative Research and IRBs', an eight-point Position Statement to promote standards in conducting human subject research was published. This code supersedes the Common Rule (1991) because it takes

> ownership for protection of human subjects by a proactive articulation of standards that better fit qualitative research practices (Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, 2007) and provides a boundary for those employing evocative, emotionally engaging, and more subjective *Auto*ethnography (Tolich, 2010:1602).

> The Common Rule (protection of Human Research Subjects, 2009): An Investigator *shall seek such consent* only under circumstances that provide the prospective subject or the representative sufficient opportunity to consider whether or not to participate and that minimise the possibility of coercion or undue influence (Tolich, 2010:1601. Emphasis added).

Tolich notes distinctions between what *Auto*ethnographers say and what they do. Using the work of three authors, Richardson (2007), Rambo (2007) and Ellis (1996), he shows how those who do not work within the Position Statement show little respect for their participants' *Auto*nomy or the voluntary nature of their participation. Laurel Richardson's (2007) *Last Writes* encapsulates the last days of a friend dying of cancer. Richardson collected the information for her text through phone calls and was not in the presence of her informant. A brief discussion explaining the ethical considerations in the afterword of the text is in Tolich's opinion an afterthought (Tolich, 2010:1603). In the case of Rambo's (2007) essay titled, 'Handing IRB an Unloaded Gun' she explains how the Internal Review Board refused permission for the publication of an article. However, Tolich sees the Internal Review Board as being justified in their decision.

With regards Carolyn Ellis (1996) essay 'Maternal Connections', in a presentation Ellis made at the Fourth Conference of Qualitative Inquiry, she quoted excerpts from the text and admitting she had kept some of the information from her mother, her participant. Although Ellis admitted this haunted her, Tolich sees it as deception and a poor example to novice *Auto*ethnographers. Tolich is also critical of Ellis' vague advice on ethics to novice *Auto*ethnographers, and of the fact, she does/did not practice what she preaches.

> I tell them they don't own their story. That their story is also other people's stories.
> I tell them they don't have an inalienable right to tell the stories of others.
> I tell them they should let their participants and those they write about read their work.
> I tell them to ask questions and talk about their research with others, constantly reflecting critically on ethical practices every step of the way (Ellis, 2007:25).

Tolich was also critical of Ellis' use of 'pseudo consent' i.e. consent by implication, that is, where the participant is a relative or friend consent is presumed, suggesting this was particularly evident and relevant in her text *Final Negotiations* (1995b). Ellis' deceased husband, Weinstein's colleagues believed the *Auto*ethnography was demeaning (Tolich, 2010:1604) and Ellis herself admitted

> I doubt Gene had much idea about the depth and form of my writing (Ellis, 2007: 15).

In Tolich's opinion, none of these three authors established a position or worked within the ethos of the Common Rule or the Position Statement. He is critical that these authors do not show evidence of anticipatory ethics, evidence of prior, processual, or informed consent. For her part, Ellis (2007) in an article 'Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives, Relational Ethics in Research With Intimate Others' and in subsequent articles has since sought to address the issue of ethics. At the close of his article, Tolich tries to redress the situation by offering Ten Foundational Guidelines for novice *Auto*ethnographers under three separate headings, Consent, Consultation and Vulnerability, as quoted in full here.

Ten Foundational Autoethnographic Ethical Guidelines

> Consent
>
> 1) Respect Participant's *Auto*nomy and the voluntary nature of participation, and document the informed consent processes that are foundational to qualitative inquiry (Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, 2007).
>
> 2) Practice "process consent", checking at each stage to make sure participants still want to be in the project (Ellis, 2007).
>
> 3) Recognise the conflict of interest or coercive influence when seeking informed consent after writing the manuscript (see Jago, 2002; Rambo, 2007).
>
> Consultation
>
> 4) Consult with others, like an IRB (Chang, 2008; Congress of Qualitative Inquiry).
>
> 5) *Auto*ethnographers should not publish anything they would not show the persons mentioned in the text (Medford, 2006).
>
> Vulnerability
>
> 6) Beware of internal confidentiality: the relationship at risk is not with the researcher exposing confidences to outsiders, but confidences exposed among the participants or family members themselves (Tolich, 2004).
>
> 7) Treat any ethnography as an inked tattoo by anticipating the author's future vulnerability.
>
> 8) Photo voice anticipatory ethics claims that no photo is worth harming others. In a similar way, no story should harm others, and if harm is unavoidable, take steps to minimise harm.
>
> 9) Those unable to minimise risk to self or others should use a nom de plume (Morese, 2002) as the default.
>
> 10) Assume all people mentioned in the text will read it one day (see Ellis, 1995a), (Tolich, 2010: 1607-8).

These guidelines were compiled to address issues highlighted in Tolich's article, and include other authors' considerations on the subject of ethics. Since Tolich's work, ethics appears to have caught the imagination of *Auto*ethnographers and many have written extensively on the subject. Kathy-Ann C. Hernandez and Faith Wambura Ngunjiri (2013) echo Tolich's concerns in their essay 'Relationships and Communities in *Auto*ethnography':

> unanticipated and unavoidable ethical concerns arise in the course of doing *Auto*ethnographic work, and these considerations require us to make critical choices about how to include others in our work (Hernandez and Ngunjiri,2013:269).

While Anderson and Glass-Coffin offer a sense of caution to intending *Auto*etnographers:

> if it is important to be vulnerable in field notes and recollections, it may nonetheless be wise to be judicious and self protective to some degree in published work...but when it comes to publishing from *Auto*ethnographic work, one could use more personal discretion and professional judgement (Anderson and Glass-Coffin, 2013: 6).

As though in response to Tolich, Jillian A. Tullis (2013), in her essay 'Self and Others, Ethics In *Auto*ethnographic Research', comprehensively and specifically explains and addresses the context of ethical dilemmas, for the *Auto*ethnographer. Tullis suggests as the 'self' is very often the focus of the research within *Auto*ethnography, there was a broad assumption that ethical overview or review was not required, and as a consequence rather than be grinded down by an Internal Review Board many opted to do *Auto*ethnography. She notes however, that using the self as the primary focus of research may lead to even more complex ethical dilemmas:

> deciding to write about own experiences as a way to understand certain aspects of culture does not eliminate, erode or resolve ethical issues (Tullis,2013:244).

Tullis too, offers a number of strategies for confidentiality, emulating and replicating her predecessors, including: keeping data secure by de-identifying it, using pseudonyms or changing demographic data (age, race, sex); creating composite characters by collapsing several people into one (Ellis, 2007); fictionalising narrative or names of places and time in order to build distance between facts and events (Ellis, 2004); or using postmodern writing techniques such as poetry (Holman-Jones, 2005; Boylorn, 2006; Poulos, 2008); (Tullis, 2013:250-1). Adding to previous contributions by Adams, 2008, Ellis, 2009,2004; Tolich, 2010 and Wyatt, 2006, Tullis also offers Guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers. These strategies include:

> 1) Do no harm to self or others 2) Consult your IRB 3) Get Informed Consent 4) Practice Process Consent and explore ethics of consequence 5) Do a member check 6) Do not present publicly or publish anything you would not show the person's mentioned in the text 7) Do not underestimate the afterlife of a published narrative (Tullis,2013: 256-7).

Both Tolich and Tullis conclude their guidelines with a reminder that the text may be read by others someday, have an afterlife or a life of its own. Consequences of neglecting ethical considerations and not receiving informed consent often lead to undesirable unhappy experiences. In the context of Postcolonial *Auto*ethnography, Archana Pathak (2013) reconfigures Maria Cristina Gonzales' (2003:83-85) four ethics of ethnography, namely Accountability, Context, Truthfulness and Community, as a cautionary measure for the postcolonial writer who in accessing publication should not be discounted on premises such as reliability and validity.

Conclusion

In an effort to produce ethically sound work in any circumstances, and avoid reputational damage of both the researcher and informant, and to preserve their integrity, one can see the indispensible value of ethical grounding. The earlier examples of ethical dilemmas demonstrate how the affect and outcome of ethnographies and *Auto*ethnographies can never be underestimated. This chapter has sought to describe ethical concerns at both bureaucratic and specifically *Auto*ethnographic level with a view to highlighting considerations for the *Auto*ethnographer. In negotiating ethical grounds, it is not always easy to apply ethical criteria; Art Bochner (2014) suggested ethics were like a jigsaw puzzle that has to be worked out in context but to use Luke Lassiter words it "is an ongoing and negotiated process" as is Anthropology, as is *Auto*ethnography (Lassiter,2005:97). However, the lack of due ethical regard can bring *Auto*ethnography into disrepute, as examined in the next chapter, which considers resistance to and criticisms of *Auto*ethnography.

Chapter Seven: Critiques of and Resistance to *Auto*ethnography

> I believe it is our continuing task to create new criteria and new criteria for choosing criteria. I believe in holding all ethnography to high and difficult standards (Richardson,2000: 254).

Introduction

In the previous chapter, we considered how ethical responsibility is important for *Auto*ethnographers within their research and how the lack of due ethical regard is a criticism of *Auto*ethnography. However, it is not only within the realm of ethics that *Auto*ethnography experiences resistance and criticism. *Auto*ethnography has been criticised for numerous reasons, not least because it is identified as narcisstic, self-indulgent, solipsistic, non-rigorous research. Academics make the distinction between Anthropology at Home or The Study of One's Own Culture (Indigenous Ethnography), and New Wave *Auto*ethnography, the study of a personal experience, which is also a cultural phenomenon. Both these research patterns require different research approaches and methods of presentation, and while both are closely aligned; they will be separated at junctures in this chapter.

This chapter of two parts will examine firstly, critiques of Anthropology at Home and *Auto*ethnography and secondly, the resistance to the practice of *Auto*ethnography. Resistance, in this instance, is understood as a reluctance to practice Anthropology at Home and/or *Auto*ethnography. Criticism reflects the attitudes pertaining to Anthropology at Home and/or *Auto*ethnography as a method of research and presentation within Anthropology. Criticism is both positive and negative, as this chapter will demonstrate. Criticisms of, and resistance to *Auto*ethnography are close associates and through an exploration of each we can come to appreciate both disdain and applause for the method.

Part One: Critique/Opposition to Anthrop. at Home and *Auto*ethnography

This part of the chapter contains a number of segments. In the first segment we will look at the work of James Buzard (2003) who encapsulates various academic concerns, reservations, critiques and oppositions made against both Anthropology at Home and *Auto*ethnography from inside the academy. Secondly, we will examine the concerns of Anthropologists particularly with regards the practice of Anthropology at Home. Thirdly, we will specifically look at critiques of New Wave *Auto*ethnography and most notably the debate that emerged, both in the media and academia about self-reflection in writing (nouveau solipsism) evidenced in the rise of the memoir as a mode of representation in the US. Finally, we will examine why there is a reluctance to practice *Auto*ethnography.

James Buzard and *Auto*ethnography

James Buzard's (2003) seminal essay, 'On *Auto*ethnographic Authority', provides a comprehensive analysis of the pros and cons of *Auto*ethnography. Comparing *Auto*ethnography with ethnography Buzard challenges its 'authority', encapsulating much of the commentary from other critics, and indicating the many issues found with *Auto*ethnography. His criticism falls under a number of themes and headings, such as: the definition of *Auto*ethnography, the concept of culture, the position of the researcher, the bona fide indigenous researcher, objectivity and the challenge of authenticity, consequences of Anthropology at Home, textual mannerisms or strategies of writing and representations, self-consciousness and reflexivity, the memoir boom, historical background to Anthropology at Home and giving voice to the marginalised and silenced. Buzard defines *Auto*ethnography as 'the study, representation or knowledge of culture by one or more of its members' (Buzard, 2003:61).

Adapting Clifford's (1983) essay title 'On Ethnographic Authority' Buzard's essay retraces the origins of the emergence of *Auto*ethnography asserting that the notion of *Auto*ethnography is not new to the discipline and was originally muted by Malinowski, who spoke of the Home Coming of Anthropology (1938) as an 'intended and inevitable consequence' thus anticipating the emergence of *Auto*ethnography (Buzard, 2003:66/79). Buzard compares the old Anthropological way of doing things, which was the Anthropologist going to the field and observing another culture, and the new way, which is the native offering a perspective of their own culture. Buzard instantly takes issue with three

concerns: 1) essentialism and identity politics 2) the lack of equipment to assess *Auto*ethnographers practice 3) the blurred boundaries with regard to established metaphors for conceptualising culture (Buzard, 2003:61-62). Reflecting on Clifford's (1992) consideration of culture in his essay on Mary Louise Pratt's (1992) *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation,* Buzard debates the valubility of the notion and word 'culture' and its demise within the discipline, but later concedes its necessity for researchers to hang assumptions on (Buzard, 2003:65-70). The term 'Culture', along with the term 'home', [see below] are of a fluid nature and no longer static. Both terms cannot be confined to one assumption, definition or notion, given the emergence of globalisation, pluralism and cosmopolitanism. Buzard contemplates the fluidity of the concept of culture and questions who has the authoritative voice to speak about a culture.

Buzard vs Pratt

Buzard takes issue with Pratt's (1992) definition of *Auto*ethnography and doubts her claim of Guaman Poma de Ayala's writing as a 'canonical instance of *Auto*ethnographic representation' (Pratt, 1992:7) because Poma has inherited the cultural traits of the coloniser and uses those to express his view, thus casting doubt on his authenticity. Buzard also has difficulty with the words authentic and *Auto*chthonous as they apply to *Auto*ethnography, questioning who can reliably offer an account of a society; who has the authority to speak about a culture. Buzard suggests that no one voice has that authority because, citing Hastrup, (1993) 'no single member of a culture automatically commanded a view of every part or could understand every role performed in that culture "from within"' (Buzard, 2003:67). As Buzard sees it, when the 'native' becomes the explorer/researcher, he/she is restricted by the totality of a personal mental cultural space, a shared mentality of culture (Buzard, 2003:63). One of Buzard's concerns with *Auto*ethnography, citing Hayano (1979) and Kuper (1994) is 'that "an insider's position is not necessarily an unchallengeable 'true' picture"' (Buzard, 2003:67). He also reflects Clifford's (1998) view that 'no one can be an insider to all sectors of a community' (Buzard, 2003:71). Similarly, one outsider's view cannot encapsulate a whole culture. In effect, what Buzard is saying is that there cannot be one authoritative voice and each ethnography and *Auto*ethnography is but one perspective of a cultural phenomenon, personal or social.

Autoethnography Undertheorised

Buzard states *Auto*ethnography challenges Anthropology because it is weaved 'in an uneven and undertheorised manner' and not theoretically intact (Buzard, 2003:61). *Auto*ethnography challenges both the status quo and established metaphors like going to the 'field', being objective, remaining impartial and substantiating evidence with qualitative and

quantitative research. He asserts that there are no defined rules of engagement or gauges to measure *Auto*ethnographic authorial knowledge, because the boundaries are now blurred. Objective ethnography, the view from outside the box provided 'an effective guard against insider complacency' (Buzard, 2003:72). However, the outsider's view usually spoke on the native's behalf, or silenced the native's voice. According to Buzard, *Auto*ethnography answered Clifford's call for multivocal ethnography (Buzard, 2003:65). *Auto*ethnography gives voice to the native, reflecting an essential feature of both Anthropology at Home and *Auto*ethnography.

Autoethnographer as Thrice Born Anthropologist

Buzard argues for the 'thrice born' Anthropologist, posited by M.V. Srivinas, and highlighted by Turner in Myerhoff (1978), using the analogy of a box, whereby to offer a clear understanding of their (one's own) culture the ethnographer would have had to remove themselves from that environment (box) and then return with their anthropological research skills to carry out reliable research. He cites Zora Neale Hurston's *Mules and Men* (1935), 'as a very good example of this insider view' where she acquired the 'spyglass of Anthropology' and used it to describe her culture. Buzard demonstrates frailties within Hurston's work by offering alternative views and aspects from Hurston's critics, citing Lynn Domina (1997) who suggests Hurston was 'compromised by her 'Barnardese'' (Domina, 1997, cited in Buzard, 2003:74) and the position of liminality occupied by all *Auto*ethnographers, as highlighted by Lionnet (1990) in her work on Hurston (Lionnet, 1990, cited in Buzard, 2003:75). According to Buzard, Hurston attests to another version of *Auto*ethnography, the combination of *Auto*biography and ethnography as an alternative to conventional *Auto*biography and native silencing ethnography, where the personal experience gives expression to the cultural experience (Buzard, 2003:73). *Auto*ethnographies depend on readers who are interested in the individual and how s/he functions, behaves, operates, and copes within society. However, in order for the research study to work there has to be someone who stays at home.

Disdain for New Wave Autoethnography

Buzard's disdain for modern (New Wave) *Auto*ethnography is evident in his derisive opinion of Deborah Reed-Danahay's definition of *Auto*ethnography as 'a form of self narrative that places self within social context'. He decries this as a definition 'so ecumenical as to court analytical uselessness' (Buzard, 2003:73). It is evident that Buzard is not enamoured with the self-consciousness required by the researcher in *Auto*ethnography, suggesting 'one has to often embarrassingly evince or expose a level of self consciousness' (Buzard, 2003:75). Buzard is also critical of the mode of *Auto*ethnographic writing,

highlighting what he labels as 'hallmarks of the writing' by *Auto*ethnographers. He encapsulates the process in a number of steps: having eschewed objectivity, the writers, already critically aware of accusations of self-obsession begin with 'prefatory hesitations' where they express a distaste and disinclination towards the self revelatory chore, then follow with the revelatory chore and conclude with the subject matter. For Buzard, this is very frustrating. His preference is skip steps one and two, and the work move straight to the subject matter (Buzard, 2003:75).

Buzard establishes a spectrum that measures the extent of self obsession in *Auto*ethnographic writings putting Pnina Motzafi-Haller (1997) who wrote about her experiences as she returned to Israel, having been an 'academic exile' for seventeen years at one end, and Carolyn Ellis (1995) at the other (the lower). The distinction is clear; Ellis' topic was highly emotional disclosing close intimate details. According to Buzard, his essay is an attempt to nudge towards a measure of respect, given that there is no one singular correct view of culture, but that certain criteria and understandings remain attached to it. Along with his reservations on who should comment on culture, he appears to extend the view that prestige and elitism should be maintained (Buzard, 2003:85).

Buzard suggests that with their training, Anthropologists can carry out an *Auto*ethnography effectively. Subsequently, Buzard researched how novels of the 19th century, such as those by Charles Dickens, George Eliot and the Brontes offer a deep insight into British culture evidencing that the messages can be in the medium and that we can learn about any culture through their literary presentations. Some of Buzard's critical themes echo those of others which will be aligned below.

Difficulties with Anthropology at Home:

This section will focus on two individual Anthropological perspectives of Anthropology at Home, namely that of Marilyn Strathern (1987) and Moslih Kanaaneh (1997). Strathern speaks from a British perspective and outlines general concerns for Anthropology at Home, which existed amongst some Anthropologists, demonstrating the reserved attitude and a reluctance to practice Anthropology at Home and by extension *Auto*ethnography. Kanaaneh represents the Non-Western Anthropological view of Anthropology at Home and distinguishes some of the pros and cons from that perspective.

Marilyn Strathern 'Limits of Auto-Anthropology'

Marilyn Strathern (1987) pre-empted Buzard's essay where she highlighted Anthropologists concerns about doing Anthropology at Home and *Auto*-anthropology in her essay titled 'The limits of *Auto*-anthropology'. She identifies *Auto*-anthropology as "anthropology carried out in the social context which produced it" (Strathern, 1987:17) and expresses her doubts and reservations of the viability of such research. Strathern moves from the term *Auto*-anthropology to Anthropology at Home, without making any clear distinction between them, other than to suggest that each requires a separate method, which becomes evident as the essay progresses. Firstly, Strathern queries the notion of 'home' using Judith Okely's (1987) work on travellers (as in Romanies) by way of example (Strathern 1987:16, Buzard, 2003:81). In this work, Okely admits to and highlights a number of difficulties in studying 'home'. In the context of these travellers the notion of 'home' is fluid because their world is constantly shifting and various groups experience difficulties with moving, facing different problems in different locations. An added difficulty for Okely was that while working with their sponsors, a local council, the researchers were confused with 'civil servants' and expected to work to the clock creating a restrictive research working environment, not always conducive and sometimes wholly unsuitable to an ethnographer. The local council did not understand and did not value the method or the research. The research was shelved because there was no willingness to take suggestions on board.

Strathern poses various positions and views on Anthropology at Home/*Auto*-anthropology. On the one hand, she suggests the Anthropologist at Home does not have to surmount language barriers, and that it will achieve/provide 'greater understanding', but on the other hand 'the contrived systematising anthropological enterprise will be exposed, not revealing anything not already known' and will be demystified (Strathern, 1987:17). Strathern was also dubious of 'joint projects', authorial and ethnographic authority, and the position of the Anthropologist in Anthropology at Home. She concedes that Anthropology at Home ignites greater reflexivity, which is encouraging, as the goal is enhanced critical awareness. However, she distinguishes between various forms of self-reflexivity and her concerns with each. On the one hand, there is reflexive Anthropology which examines one's own culture and one's own practice, and on the other the tendency to equate reflexivity with self-awareness, self-examination, as a personal virtue or heightened self-consciousness.

Strathern is concerned about how the Anthropologist's account operates on different levels. To facilitate different audiences the account is altered, because it is not merely rendered back to oneself or community, but applies to ethnography and anthropological analysis. She distinguishes between the Anthropologist's analytical framework for understanding a community, and the indigenous community's understandings or

expectations of the outcome, as found in the Elmdon project. Elmdon is a village in Essex, in the U.K., which was the subject of a social anthropological survey in the 1960s. In making the account accessible to the audience (educating the audience anthropologically), the traditional ethnographic genre was abandoned, and an imaginative effort in the act of representation was used to communicate the text.

Strathern distinguishes between an author and a writer using Rabinow's (1984) reflections on the subject (Strathern, 1987:25). Fundamentally, the difference is when the ethnographer, as exogenous observer, is relied upon to 'author' the account of the information supplied by informants, compared to the indigenous ethnographic observer, the Anthropologist at Home, who 'writes' the account on numerous levels, for the audience and for his colleagues. This highlights the need for new writing strategies and 'representational strategies or textual mannerisms' as mentioned by Buzard, (2003:75).

Strathern distinguishes between ethnographies of a particular people at a particular time, and 'these books' which are a mixed genre with ethnographic, anthropological community accounts. Either way, the final accounts should contribute to the ultimate goal of Anthropology (and *Auto*ethnography), which is to contribute to knowledge and self-knowledge. Strathern specifies knowledge is an instrumental element, and it is not simply self-knowledge in the individual sense, but self-knowledge as of that of the community being studied, and other 'cultures' who learn from the experience of others. She also specifies that just as one culture learns from another, so too do disciplines in sharing the knowledge (Strathern, 1987:27-30). One regret she has of the Elmdon project is, that the research students passed themselves off as history students to get the people to concur, whereas they might have seen their society as a worthy object of study (Strathern, 1987:31). Strathern further highlighted some difficulties and conflicts that need addressing in pursuing Anthropology at Home, for example, whether the dilemma is from within Anthropology, the Anthropologist him/her self, academia or the community studied or whether the process has to be altered to facilitate the research.

Moslih Kanaaneh 'The Logicality of Autoethnography': A Non-Western Perspective of Autoethnography

Taking up and extending these points, and speaking from the perspective of a non-Western Anthropologists Moslih Kanaaneh (1997) identifies difficulties of Anthropology at Home and acknowledged its relevance. In an essay titled 'The "Anthropologicality" of Indigenous Anthropology' Kanaaneh (1997) discusses tensions or contradictions between *being indigenous* and being *anthropologist* (Author's emphasis) using *Auto*ethnography to

explain their experience of Anthropology, and doing Anthropology at Home (Kanaaneh, 1997:1). The title of Kanaaneh's essay succinctly describes the essence of his essay: the logicality, the logic and the logistics of Indigenous Ethnography and the challenges of it. Kanaaneh challenges the Western ethnocentrism of Anthropology describing how Anthropology was taught, and how students internalised teachers' "'sceptical' view of objectivity, "scientificity", and "Anthropologicality"' (Kanaaneh, 1997:1). Locating himself as part of a 'rising *Arab radical criticism*' (emphasis in original), Kanaaneh speaks for 'Third World' Anthropologists (Kanaaneh,1997:19). His view is

> the aim of Third World Indigenous anthropologists is making anthropology less prejudiced against Third World peoples by making it less ethnocentric in its use of language and paradigms (Kanaaneh, 1997:1).

Kanaaneh reflects on the reservations, issues and pitfalls raised about Indigenous Anthropology such as objectivity, distance, non-involvement, the dangers of becoming subjective, less scientific, bias and impartiality. Rather than asserting that as a researcher one 'did not go native', in this post-positivist era researchers are more open and honest about factors that affect the anthropological process. In reflecting on works of other writers such as Choong Soon Kim (1977) from Korea, Abu-Lughod (1991) an Arab American, Sharif Kanaana (1976) a Palestinian-Arab and Emiko-Ohnuki-Tierney (1984) from Japan, Kanaaneh writes how all of these researchers had to fight against their subjectivity and inhabit an objective stance to prove their worthiness as Anthropologists:

> the criterion for objectivity in such cases is not political neutrality but the trustworthiness of the researcher and the reliability of his work (Kanaaneh, 1997:6).

For Kanaaneh there is no denying that Anthropologists bring something of themselves to the project. A Palestinian-Arab minority, Kanaaneh does not deny his passion and emotional involvement in his research (Kanaaneh,1997:5). The object for many Anthropologists in similar circumstances is to help others understand his community by acting as 'the messenger' (Kanaaneh,1997:16). The pressure is on to make 'them' understand 'us'. Admitting to being on a side Kanaaneh suggests does not make you biased. Quoting Choong Soon Kim (1977) he says:

> subjectivity in studying one's own society is inescapable especially if the field work deals with issues that are emotionally charged (Kim,1977:196 cited in Kanaaneh, 1997).

Kanaaneh distinguishes between the indigenous anthropologist in his own society, and the classic anthropologist in the field (Kanaaneh,1997:10). The Indigenous Anthropologist is expected to know his/her place; will reluctantly be taken into confidence; and is not seen as

exotic or as interesting as the American or European Anthropologist. The Indigenous Anthropologist will experience some difficulty particularly asking questions, as there is an assumption one should already know the answer. There are allowances made for the stranger, who is presumed to be ignorant of some things (Kanaaneh, 1997:13). In his own society, a non-western Third World Anthropologist is considered Western, because of being an Anthropologist. The Western essence of Anthropology restricts the Indigenous Anthropologist from reconstructing their world and therefore some Third World Anthropologists are questioning the premise of their scholarship (Kanaaneh, 1997:18). Ultimately, Kanaaneh is arguing for an 'Arab Anthropology', a turn towards independent interpretation and scholarship (Kanaaneh, 1997:17-19).

Having looked at the pros and cons of Anthropology At Home from the perspective of a 'neutral' professional 'insider' (Strathern) and an indigenous perspective (Kanaaneh) we will now specifically examine critiques of New Wave *Auto*ethnography.

Critiques of New Wave *Auto*ethnography

The reservations and divisions about Anthropology at Home are applicable to *Auto*ethnography. More specifically reservations about the role of New Wave *Auto*ethnography centre on three main concerns: 1) the role of the 'self' within research 2) the lack of theoretical emphasis and criteria for evaluating and analysing *Auto*ethnography and 3) Academic departments concerns with the manner in which knowledge and information is presented. These directly contrast with the characteristics, features and purposes of *Auto*ethnography, which in sum are: to disrupt norms of research practice and presentation in order to make work accessible; the use of the personal to examine and critique cultural experience; working from insider knowledge to illustrate personal hidden nuances; emphasising the self in research and make contributions to existing research. *Auto*ethnography's deviation from the traditional literary ethnographic style collides with those who resist tampering, deviation or breaking with conventions. James Clifford (1983) created a new awareness of the consequences of anthropology's established literary conventions, approving contemporary efforts to 'break up monologic authority', asserting

> anthropologists will have to share their texts, and sometimes their title pages, with those indigenous collaborators for whom the term informant is no longer adequate, if it ever was (Clifford, 1988:24).

Criticisms of Autoethnography and the Autoethnographical Method

Here, we will examine some critiques specific to New Wave *Auto*ethnography. Carolyn Ellis, Tony E. Adams and Arthur P. Bochner (2011) offer a very comprehensive overview of both *Auto*ethnography and the criticisms and responses to it. Criticisms of *Auto*ethnography and the *Auto*ethnographical method resurrects the arts, humanities and science debate that does not allow for compromise or combination of both, where one could supplement or complement the other. Ellis et al., (2011) list the criticisms of *Auto*ethnography citing herself and other critics of *Auto*ethnography such as Ellis, 2009; Hooks, 1994; Keller, 1995; Buzard, 2003; Fine, 2003; Delamont, 2009; Anderson, 2006; Atkinson, 1997; Gans, 1999. *Auto*ethnography has been criticised for being: 'too artful and not scientific enough' or 'too scientific and not artful enough'; not rational Anthropological research; not scientific or objective enough; containing too little field work; not containable and/or messy and chaotic; insufficiently rigorous, theoretical or analytical; too aesthetic, emotional, therapeutic and inclusive of personal social phenomena (Ellis et al, 2011: paragraph 37).

Other criticisms launched against *Auto*ethnography are: it does not maintain the accepted three degrees of separation of the researcher from the subject of study, as suggested in Anthropology (King-O'Riain, 2013); and as such has been seen as Omphaloskepsis (a navel gazing exercise); Self-indulgent or Nouveau Solipsism (Buzard, 2003: Anderson, 2006: Patai, 1994). Fiske (1990: 90) suggests "to open up the realm of the interior and the personal can open up the *Auto*ethnographer to charges of narcisstic self-indulgence" an opinion echoed by Noah Porter (2004) a practitioner of, Computer Mediated Anthropology (CMA) who experienced negativity with regards his interest in cybernetics, anthropology and *Auto*ethnography:

> Some criticise this form of writing as sentimental, unscientific and the product of the excesses of postmodernism (Porter, 2004: CMA Methodology: *Auto*ethnography).

Heretofore, *Auto*ethnographies are accountable and assessed through criteria normally applicable to traditional ethnographies, or Autobiographies. With regard to the navel gazing, narcissistic, self-indulgent accusation there is no denying that within some *Auto*ethnographies there is an over display of ego, which detracts from the central message of the text. However, many of these works contain a contemplativeness, whereby one considers their place in the world, and the world around them, their mortality and humanity, thus contributing to an existentialism, which, according to Buzard, Anthropologists had long outgrown (Buzard, 2003:1) but not Michael Jackson (2005) who exemplifies existential anthropology in his numerous texts.

Another fundamental criticism with regard *Auto*ethnography is the question of research bias and the objective/subjective polarity in collecting, interpreting and reporting information (Hayano,1979). In New Wave *Auto*ethnography, the writer's subjective experience contributes to the final analysis; he/she becomes the primary participant and the subjective position of the researcher is both acknowledged and fore fronted. This personal telling is partly responsible for the exclusion of *Auto*ethnography or the *Auto*ethnographic Method from social research on the grounds 'that there are more relevant and pressing issues to research' (Douglas and Carless, 2013:101).

The Question of Integrity of Autoethnnography

The question of context, integrity, reliability, validity and credibility frequently arises with regard to *Auto*ethnography (Ellis et al., 2011: paragraphs 32-33). When working ethically *Auto*ethnographers do not compromise their intellectual credentials or integrity by publishing something that is false or has no bearing on the understanding of human behaviour. Recognition and accreditation are preferred over infamy or accusations of immorality or misconduct. It is possible to verify the information against factual evidence. *Auto*ethnographers must recognise 'truth changes', or the importance of contingency, that is, how the truth may change in different circumstances or if the 'same' account/narrative is being told from a different viewpoint, for example in the debate between Margaret Mead's (1928) work and the subsequent work of Derek Freeman (1983). These 'truth changes' are altered and questioned when applied to *Auto*ethnography, because *Auto*ethnographers value narrative truth, where the narrative is based on the experience the account/narrative reveals, how it is used, understood and responded to by both the writer and others, such as participants, audience and humans. *Auto*ethnography is not simply writing about oneself but also writing about intimate others with whom there is a relationship (Ellis, 2009:307). Perhaps it is worth noting:

> that 'cultural realities' and interpretation of events among individuals in the same group are often highly variable, changing or contradictory. Thus, an insider's position is not necessarily an un-challengeable 'tru' picture; it represents one possible perspective (Hayano, 1979:102).

Literary Textuality in Autoethnography

A recurring criticism of *Auto*ethnography is that of the 'literary' quality of *Auto*ethnography, the question of 'literary license' and the aesthetics value and presentation of the work: as part Autobiography, it is accepted, as *Auto*ethnography, it is doubted (Ellis et

al., 2011: paragraphs 4-10). Previously ethnographies lacked command of expression or style or editing. The matter of self-reflective ethnography, confessional tales and memoirs irritated some members of academia. In producing well-written presentable manuscripts, there is no compromising important knowledge underlying comprehension of cultural phenomena, or the content, validity and value of a work. Readers expect the element of truth, whether packaged in anecdote or fiction, but which carries an important underlying meaning. Validation comes when the reader compares the life experience with their own, and considers differences and similarities, understands the reasons why, and is informed. In Evocative *Auto*ethnography, many *Auto*ethnographers write deeply revelatory uncomfortable stories. Some have managed to protect their intimates from scrutiny by pursuing *Auto*ethnography in a guarded manner, using methods to protect oneself e.g. Nom de plume or fictional writing, as explained in the previous chapter on ethics. *Auto*ethnographers recognise the need to write and represent research in evocative aesthetic ways.

> You can write aesthetically compelling ways without citing fiction, or being educated as literary/performance scholar (Ellis et al., 2011: paragraph 39).

Autoethnography and The Memoir Debate

As with all texts the purpose and intention requires consideration. *Auto*ethnography is a different perspective on a particular subject matter of social science and Anthropological research. There is a close alliance between *Auto*ethnography and memoir with both of them reflecting a personal experience albeit in a different context. There was much debate about the memoir as a form of research and a means to understanding human experience, which largely encapsulates the debate about *Auto*ethnography. Such writings were labelled 'Autocritiography' in a literary critical context, akin perhaps to *Auto*ethnography. Autocritiography is a term a term coined by Henry Louis Gates Jnr. and developed by Michael Awkward (1999) in *Scenes of Instruction*. Autocritiography is deemed:

> an account of individual, social, and institutional concerns that help to produce a scholar and hence his or her professional concerns (Awkward, 1999:7 cited in Miller, 2000: footnote 3).

In her essay ''Sick and tired of Scholars' Nouveau Solipsism' (1994), Daphne Patai criticised the deference paid to post-modernist self-reflexivity, particularly on the part of white feminist academics. She questions the self-critical stance once spurned by feminist academic circles, which had become the rage, and argues that instead of interest in her research on Brazilian women, she was plagued by questions on ethical dilemmas she faced. While the ethical questions were important, she felt methodological angst missed the point. Patai did not consider the authors' position in the research important, and directly criticised

Nancy Miller's (1991) *Getting Personal* and Ruth Behar's (1993) *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's story,* who inserted themselves within their texts. She associated the practice with nouveau solipsism, egocentricity and suggested that everyone should move on once the lessons were learned:

> I doubt if I am the only one who is weary of the nouveau solipsism - all this individual and collective breast beating, grandstanding, and plain old ego centricity... scholarly works do not descend from heaven but are written by human beings... and should be evaluated by distinguishing facts from interpretation, sound arguments from hollow claims... hyperbole from straight talk... acknowledge we have learned something from the sensitivity training...- and get on with our work (Patai, 1994: *Chronicle of Higher Education*).

This snippet of a debate, which unfolded within the media and academia concerning the validity of memoirs as a tool of representation, and by association *Auto*ethnography, expanded between some critics. Patrick Smith (1998) writing for *The Nation* in an article titled 'What Memoir Forgets' argues against the memoir genre and flayed practitioners:

> The memoir trend is not just a publishing ruse to get more people to buy more books. It's an intellectual fraud, a cultural fraud, a fraud perpetrated by us, in the end upon ourselves and our past... We arrive at a curious, unexpected truth that the purely personal is not the stuff of memoir but its enemy. Once this is understood, it becomes clear that the memoir does not have to be a symptom of our cultural decline, or our withdrawal, or our fading ability to imagine and create and then give form to our creations…. the trick is to embrace history, not oneself (Smith, 1998: *The Nation*).

Carolyn Heilbrun (1999) in an article titled 'Contemporary Memoirs or*, who Cares Who did What To Whom?*' [Emphasis in original], contributed to the debate explaining the necessity of the memoir, while admonishing Smith in the process:

> Many current women's memoirs deal with questions that society has preferred to leave unexamined, some of these memoirs shock us, and, becoming best sellers, provoke male disgust and impatience (Heilbrun, 1999: 41).

Defending the Memoir

Nancy Miller (2000) was perhaps the most defensive about the memoir and quite vociferously responded to Patai in her essay titled 'But enough about me, what do you think of my memoir?'. Miller argued in favour of the memoir, personal reflection and confession as an invaluable way to understand the world and find meaning. Miller found Patai's accusation of 'nouveau solipsism' to be a poison arrow. Responding directly to Patai's comments Miller points out the 'popularity of what was sometimes labelled "confessional criticism" was matched only by a *high-minded resistance* to it that often took the form of rather *personalised*

attacks' (Miller, 2000:421. Emphasis added). In her essay, Miller addressed what is at stake in self-writing, focusing on less specialised audiences, that is, memoir readers and not academic critics of writing design:

> My goals are two: first, to offer a defense against the charges of navel-gazing regularly levelled against the genre; and second, to suggest that however solitary, memoir reading, like memoir writing, participates in an important form of collective memorialisation, providing building blocks to a more fully shared nation narrative (Miller, 2000:424).

The memoir was symptomatic of the 90s Clinton era when within both society and academia the private subject going public was in vogue (Tedlock, 1990: 2000: 2007). Miller suggests the 90s will be remembered:

> [N]ot just for the halcyon days of an endlessly touted national prosperity and the birth of dot-com culture, but also for a *paroxysm of personal exposure*: making the private public to a degree startling even in a climate of over-the-top self-revelation (Miller, 2000:421. Emphasis added).

Postmodern fiction, feminist writing, confessional poetry, *Auto*ethnography and the memoir when written by women were subject to rhetorical abuse. According to Miller, 'the predominance of women in the memoir bizz may also have something to do with the genre's disrepute' (Miller, 2000:431). Miller's personal memoir *Bequest and Betrayal: Memoirs of a Parent's Death* (1996) highlights a reconnection to a life that existed and will no longer exist. Her research on the genre of personal criticism convinced her:

> The genre of the memoir is not about terminal "moi-ism" (as it's been called) … but rather a rendezvous, as it were with the Other ... In the world of memorialisation … (the) relational model binding self to Other historically has shaped the narrative of most *Auto*biographical experience... (Miller, 2000:422).

Connecting with the Reader

Many of Miller's points echo those of Carolyn Ellis. In particular how memoir is a 'reconnection' with childhood, and how relationships change over time. Like Ellis (Ellis et al., 2011: paragraph 28) Miller emphasises that it takes two, the writer and the reader to make an Autobiography (*Auto*ethnography), and considers how 'relational' bonds and desires connect readers to the memoir 'which may well be the most important narrative mode of our contemporary culture – written in English at least' (Miller, 2000:423). Miller refers to Paul de Man and Derrida as objectors to *Auto*biography as a distinct genre but counter claim that:

> *Auto*biography …is not a genre or a mode but a figure of reading or of understanding that occurs, to some degree in all texts. The *Auto*biographical moment happens as an alignment between the two subjects involved in the process of reading in which they determine each other by mutual reflexive substitution (Miller, 2000:434).

The relational act between reader and memoir creates identifications, dis-identifications and cross identification, whether consciously or unconsciously (Miller, 2000: 429). This can be said also of reading most prose narrative or *Auto*ethnographies. The reader either engages or does not, and if not, why not is relevant too. Wolfgang Iser's (1978) canonically known 'Reader Response Criticism' debates this at length. Applying the criteria for memoir to *Auto*ethnographies, neither are they simply 'moi-ism', but a reflection on a person's experience within a society at a particular time. Hence, they meet the basic criteria of what Anthropology is about, 'understanding human behaviour' and giving insight into the prevailing culture and people's behaviour. Similarly, Porter citing Ellis and Bochner (2000), advocates *Auto*ethnography on the grounds of the positive value of 'telling emotion–laden stories that will elicit a similar emotional reaction out of the reader' (Porter, 2004). The readers test each text, and they determine if an account or narrative speaks to them about their own experiences, or others they know. That is not to say that some *Auto*ethnographies are not intensely personal. Nonetheless, there is something to be learned from reading them. Miller makes the claim, including disclaimer 'not quite provable', that readers go to the biography and Autobiography section in a bookstore out of a sense of 'heightened process of identification' (Miller, 2000:423). This may not apply to every reader but the assumption is not without merit. At a lecture at Cambridge University, in which Miller explained and defended this genre, a colleague suggested that 'perhaps being personal was in fact being American' (Miller, 2000:434: footnote 6). Miller disputes whether memoir and narcissism should be put in the same sentence. Memory (ies) are not simply about individual narcissism, or a 'culture of narcissism', as identified by Christopher Lasch (1978). *Auto*ethnographers allow for the fallibility of memory because it is difficult to recall events exactly, how they were lived and felt and to represent them in language.

Autoethnography, Memoir, Cultural Hybridity, The Holocaust and Empathy

In combination with the question of memory is the question of cultural hybridity, as explicated by Miller. Memoirs on being of two nationalities, for example, Chinese American, Irish American, Jewish American and so forth examine this. Maxine Hong Kingston's text *The Woman Warrior* (1976), now taught on most American campuses, examines life as a Chinese American asking questions like what is it to be Chinese? Miller herself asked these questions growing up a Jewish American in New York. This theme repeatedly finds itself in

Anthropological works, such as that of Ruth Behar, Lila Abu-Lughod and Barbara Myerhoff. Miller recollects Susan Suleiman's work *Risking who I am* (1994), which addresses the question of the 'Autobiographical imperative', a strong reading experience that inspires *Auto*biographical writing. Suleiman came to this understanding having read memoirs of Second World War veterans. This experience came close to her own; she did not lose a parent, but recognised the stories all too well.

> Like the movies, other people's memories sometimes overwhelm your own—if you're not careful to remember the differences (Miller, 2000:423).

In a related work Alison Landsberg (1997) in her text *America, The Holocaust and the Mass Culture of Memory: Towards a Radical Politics of Empathy* develops the notion of 'prosthetic memories' and argues for an experiential model of approaching memorialisation of the Holocaust. She is interested in promoting mass cultural technologies of memory 'sites of production of feeling', to produce bodily memory for those who have not lived through it so they might have a greater understanding of the Holocaust. Recently, there has emerged a large number of memoirs written by Holocaust survivors in this vein and indeed Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnographers. This has led to the inception of 'Innovative Ethnographies' using new digital technology which interacts with weblinks, Google, videos, audio files, drawings along with the traditional print ethnography for example, Alisse Waterston's *My Fathers War* (2014) another text on the theme of discovering who one is or one's identity through understanding parents' lives. The benefit for people closely associated with survivors of the Holocaust is that they obtained a sense of identity and history, which answered so many questions and provided relief and understanding as to how they came to be in their current situation. Something of your life may be lost or obscure but reading a memoir can give back life or fill the gap. As Miller suggests:

> Memoir is the record of an experience in search of a community, of a collective framework in which to protect the fragility of singularity in the post-modern world (Miller, 2000:432).

Miller's essay closes by asking, "Why do so many people write and read memoirs today?" and responds with already familiar answers, which she finds unsatisfactory:

> it's the well-worn culture of 'me', given an expansive new currency by the infamous baby boomers who can think of nothing else; it's the desire for story killed by postmodern fiction; it's the only literary form that appears to give access to the truth; it's a democratic form, giving voice to minority experience in an anti-élite decade; it's a desire to assert agency and subjectivity after several decades of insisting loudly on the fragmentation of identity and the death of the author. It's voyeurism for a declining imperial narcissism. It's the market (Miller, 2000: 431).

As recent as 2014, the debate about memoir goes on. In an essay titled 'What is the Contemporary Memoir? Karen Propp (2014) examines the memoir craze in America. She distinguishes the memoir from Autobiography and biography as one, which deals with a specific event in a life rather than the 'whole' story, similar to the epiphany in *Auto*ethnography. She quotes William Zinsser (1998) who sees memoir as a 'window to life' and considers how Philip Lopate (2013) used memory to show how the world came to him. Deciding what to tell and how it is told, make the memoir distinguishable. Propp like Miller agrees that the memoir has become popular because society is more open, but also has reservations as to how much sharing is necessary. For Propp echoing Carolyn Heilbrun (1999) the guiding question is who cares? Two other guiding principles she mentions are whether the story has some universal meaning and if it is entertaining.

Further New Alternative Trends in Academia

Shifting academic trends are observable in Personal Criticism as the "'new Belletrism': a mode of writing keyed to a 'reconfiguration of audience and audience expectation'. 'Belletrism' has more to do with educating and informing through personal experiences rather than just aesthetics. However, it contained overtones of stylish self-indulgence, 'a journalisation of academic criticism produced by a Post Theory generation of cultural critics' (William, *The New Belletrism,* 1999 cited in Miller, 2000:4). Simultaneously with the development of Personal Criticism, a field of *Auto*biographical studies emerged within the MLA (Modern Language Association) specially designating a division on *Auto*biography, Biography and Life Writing, which legitimised this form of writing within universities and generated a huge amount of critical literature. Literary Critical theory was changing and the author was no longer dead. The way was opening up to a new perspective and approach to study in many disciplines with mixed reactions; some applauded; others mourned the 'loss of literary standards, critical objectivity and philosophical rigor' (Miller, 2000:422). The reaction notwithstanding, the place of the 'self' within writing, be it literature, memoir or *Auto*ethnography, appears to have emerged in strength during the 1990s. In the context of these changes on the question of Degrees of Separation within *Auto*ethnography Nancy Miller (2000) succinctly responds to the criticism:

> The six degrees of separation that mark the distance from your life to another's are really as it turns out, degrees of connection. And *my memoir* is about *you*" (Nancy Miller, 2000: 433.Emphasis added).

In light of the change and the development of these genres questions for the *Auto*ethnographer remain including who reads the work, how they are affected by it, does it keeping conversation going, what use can be made of the account and what purposes can it serve. *Auto*ethnography/Memoir tests peoples' sensitivities, emotions and empathy. Some are resistant to it because they fear their own vulnerabilities. However, this methodology surely has a place in Anthropology's quest to understand human behaviour, and give meaning to life despite ongoing resistance to practice it, which will be discussed now.

Part Two: Resistance to the Practice of *Auto*ethnography

In light of all the criticism it is hardly surprising there is a reluctance to practice *Auto*ethnography among academics. One distinct reason for resisting practicing *Auto*ethnography comes from those who fear the negative consequences within Academia, where the methodology was seen as unacceptable in the canon of scientific based research. Students seeking to pursue *Auto*ethnographical research in theses and dissertations towards academic achievement have also experienced conflict within departments, institutions and academia. Deborah Reed-Danahay (1997) in the introduction to *Auto/Ethnography Rewriting the Self and the Social* remarks, how at the 1995 AAA Conference, attendees empathised with a student who asked how she might convince her thesis committee that doing work on personal narrative was a worthwhile pursuit. They knew few would take her on, refusing the work as not proper academic research (Reed-Danahay, 1997: viii). Similarly, Caroline Brettel notes Sally Cole's description of her negative experience when discussing her interest in life history with graduate school professors. Life history as a method of research and mode of writing was found to be 'too individual, idiosyncratic, subjective and anecdotal' (Cole, 1992:117 cited in Brettel, 1997:246). Hernandez and Ngunjiri (2013) in their essay 'Relationships and Communities in *Auto*ethnography' also highlight the challenges and negative experiences for some *Auto*ethnographers. Similarly with Sally Mc Millan and Margaret Price (2009), who through their essay, 'Through the Looking Glass: Our *Auto*ethnographic Journey Through Research Mind-Fields' discuss their use of the genre of fiction to explain their predicament, which was to teach in an *Auto*ethnographic fashion while being stymied by their superiors within their department. In contrast, Tony Adams (2013) notes that initially he steered clear of *Auto*ethnography because he was anxious to please traditional scholars and the possibility of an academic career was at risk. He states:

> I initially steered clear of *Auto*ethnography as the primary research method for my dissertation. I thought that the method would thwart the possibility of having an academic career. I worried about pleasing (imagined) traditional scholars at other schools... I could not let such ignorance and hate proceed unchallenged ... I turned to writing stories ...bringing my

> emotions and experience into the research process...that others could use in times of relational distress (Adams, 2013:20-21).

In the text, *Contemporary British Autoethnography* (2013) edited by Nigel Short, Lydia Turner and Alec Grant there is a plethora of *Auto*ethnographies from educators', researchers', and students' perspectives describing the situation within the British Academy. Some of these address another reason why there is reluctance to practice *Auto*ethnography, and that is the un-willingness to take personal risk, and expose one's vulnerable side to various audiences: academic peers, close friends, family, the general public and enemies. Vulnerability is one of the key features of *Auto*ethnography for both the researcher and the researched, and it requires strength of character and commitment to address sensitive emotional issues. Ruth Behar (1996) makes the distinction between tender and tough-minded Anthropologists.

Breaking the Mold

Some students have the benefit of having learned the skills and philosophy of the *Auto*ethnographic approach from experienced proponents. Stacy Holman-Jones (2013), for example, did not see *Auto*ethnography as a professional risk, though she was aware that personal stories as research carry personal, relational and ethical risks. She sees such risks not only as necessary for research but important for living full lives and being human, as 'writing stories offers us a powerful form for theorising the daily workings of culture' (Holman-Jones, 2013:18-19). Most *Auto*ethnographers waited until they were tenured before choosing to research and write about the personally sensitive cultural issues that made up their world and which they felt needed recognition and addressing. In an essay 'Accommodating an *Auto*ethnographic PhD: The Tale of the Thesis, the Viva Voce, and the Traditional Business School', Clair Doloriert and Sally Sambrook (2011) student and supervisor explain how they negotiated the terrain of a textual *Auto*ethnographic PhD and how it was accommodated by a traditional business school, highlighting changing attitudes.

*Auto*ethnographers have had to publish work in diverse forums because *Auto*ethnography remains a marginalised method used by marginalised people within academia and society. Yet, some authors have sought to address these charges in journals and conferences such as *Qualitative Inquiry*, the *International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry* in the US, *Contemporary Ethnography Across the Disciplines [CEAD],* Hui, New Zealand, and the *Arts Based Educational Research Conference* in Europe. Through these outlets, non-mainstream methods are shared, explored, nurtured and developed.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have examined some of the reservations, objections and cautionary tales in relation to *Auto*ethnography and Anthropology at Home. This includes both challenging the merits of the method, and a consideration of reluctance to use *Auto*ethnography, and the potential value of *Auto*ethnography for Anthropology as a complementary method. For a large part, *Auto*ethnographers have had to justify their contribution to the field. Some practitioners of *Auto*ethnography stuck to their guns and persisted with the method and appear to have taken the laissez-faire view, it is either for you or not. The concerns over *Auto*ethnography are not 'issues to be resolved but rather differences to be lived with' (Rorty, 1982:197 cited in Bochner, 2013:54). In other words, there is room for everyone. The negative attitude directed towards *Auto*ethnography has denied it a recognisable place within academia until recently. For some *Auto*ethnographers the method, research and writing are viewed as 'socially just acts' which are not wholly preoccupied with accuracy (Holman-Jones,2005:764). *Auto*ethnographers are aware that their work has the potential to receive either extremely positive or negative responses. For David Carless

> an individual's response perhaps tells us more about that individual - about his/her assumptions, beliefs, orientations - than it does about the quality, contribution, or value of the research itself (Carless and Douglas, 2013:101).

It is timely then that in the next chapter, we look to the future of *Auto*ethnography and how it is/has opened new frontiers for research within Anthropology.

Chapter Eight: 'Reflecting on the journey; Resisting Finality'

> no social study that does not come back to the problems of biography, of history, and of their intersections within a society has completed its intellectual journey (C. Wright Mills (1959:6), cited in Denzin, 2014: ix).

Introduction

Thus far, in this thesis we have traced the emergence of *Auto*ethnography from its original concept through to its recognisable components and diversification in the New Millennium. In doing so, we identified *Auto*ethnography applicability to four specific categories, distinguished how it compares with and complements ethnographies of a same culture and society and highlighted ethical concerns. We also considered how and why within the academy *Auto*ethnography has been resisted, and criticised.

Here in this penultimate chapter of two sections we will firstly reflect on the findings of this thesis and subsequently look to the future of *Auto*ethnography and its New Frontiers and the potential value of *Auto*ethnography for Anthropology as a complementary method.

Part One: Thesis Development Thus Far

In the past, the principle aim of Anthropology was to examine other cultures, to understand our own better. However, from a once regarded and understood world, cultures and societies began to change rapidly and any understanding began to dissipate due to the influence and fluid nature of modernisation, economisation, globalisation and ultimately immigration and emigration. People's experience of cultural phenomena, or the impact of cultural phenomena, was greatly diluted and customary traditions, which enabled sense of self, also began to diminish.

New Dynamics in Anthropology

Over time, the discipline of Anthropology itself witnessed many diverse crises and was particularly vulnerable. Though it sought to establish itself as a *tour de force*, ethnography as the tool for Anthropological research and analysis of social and cultural

behaviour was failing to connect to a particular dimension of cultural critique, namely the impact of cultural phenomenon on the individual. Ruminations and anticipations concerning alternative research and writing mechanisms in cultural critique began with the two classic texts of Marcus and Clifford, *Writing Culture, The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (1986), and Marcus and Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique, An Experimental Moment in the Social Sciences* (1986). As the thirtieth anniversary of these texts approaches, we can see Anthropology is too cosmopolitan, to be confined to one approach (Rabinow, 1986). With the challenges and changes society faced in the New Millennium, there arose a constant need for further cultural analysing, towards clarifying, explaining and evaluating, as described by Fischer (1986).

Social scientists felt frustrated that their work was not reflecting or connecting to society. Three elements constantly evaded from ethnographic assessment were the self, the emotions, and the introspective interpretive approach. The inimitable 'something missing' became the catalyst and dynamism for Ellis, Bochner and their cohorts; encompassed within the Walnut Creek Group. This group of researchers were interested in pursuing social research, which reflected the everyday (sometimes very personal) experience of the individual.

Emergence of Autoethnography

Enter *Auto*ethnography. *Auto*ethnography emerged as a means of addressing the call to find the 'something missing' in either research method, presentation and/or outcome. *Auto*ethnography, as cultural critique, has assumed many different modes including narrative text, poetry, paintings, drama, electronic multimedia, etc. with the medium frequently being the message.

The term *Auto*ethnography was dissembled under different appellations such as 'the native's point of view', 'indigenous ethnography' 'repatriation of Anthropology', 'Anthropology at Home' 'domestic anthropology', or the emic view with the emphasis on the Study of One's Own Culture from within. New Millennia *Auto*ethnography, (New Wave *Auto*ethnography), developed the concept further to include *a search for meaning and a way of making life better* [Emphasis added]. The self was centrally located within the research, representation, interpretation and presentation of cultural phenomena. In this capacity, *Auto*ethnography opened the research gates into personal elements of life that were/are very much part of the everyday and which reflect how cultures and people behave(d) within society; these had been habitually sublimated, overlooked or hidden in research. In contrast, 'the self' was celebrated through public mass media, with the emphasis on celebrities who received much of the attention while undercurrents in society were being neglected.

*Auto*ethnography served to address the need for an alternative method of research, which examined these personal cultural phenomena.

Factors Contributing to Emergence of Autoethnography

As recalled, four interrelated contributory factors subscribed to the emergence of New Wave *Auto*ethnography. They were: the realisation and acceptance of the limits of scientific knowledge, which is attendant upon the science versus humanities, quantitative over qualitative, subjective versus objective research debate; the deep concern about ethics and the politics of research; a greater acknowledgment and appreciation for literary and aesthetic narrative, emotions, and the body as sources of research and expression of same; and the increased importance of social and personal identities and identity politics. Combining these factors, a new realm of research emerges, where it is not simply a matter of understanding culture and human behaviour on a superficial practical level. *Auto*ethnographic research strives for a deep thorough investigation of the role and place of the self within culture and society, and the place of others too; similarly, there is a clear quest to find meaning.

Autoethnographer's Dilemmas

*Auto*ethnographers faced the dilemma as trained empiricists to change from quantitative to qualitative research, the conscientious change of focus, and the use of the introspective interpretive approach, making the research part of the researcher's being. Researchers who pursue *Auto*ethnography as a method of research and presentation have taken a position on the assemblage of elements such as self-reflection, self-awareness, emotions, empathy, introspection, contemplation and sharing experiences that are significant in their research. Some *Auto*ethnographers address issues not previously attended to or openly addressed with such intimacy in academia. These include: personal relationships; father/son relationships; mother/daughter relationships; looking after elderly parents or ill relatives; adoption; domestic abuse; homophobia; eating disorders and other silent or quiet under recognised, under acknowledged, heretofore inadmissible, unattended to cultural phenomena.

Features, Characteristics and Purpose of Autoethnography

The Walnut Creek Group called attention to defining characteristics and features of New Wave *Auto*ethnography. In examining reasons, features and characteristics of *Auto*ethnography there is considerable overlapping, intertwining and interdependency as all of the elements are contingent upon each other. The main characteristic binding all *Auto*ethnographers is the use of personal experience to examine cultural experience and

phenomena, and subsequently purposefully comment and critique culture and cultural practices. Other characteristics of *Auto*ethnography and modes of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry include: Visibility of Self, Strong Reflexivity, Engagement; the embracing of vulnerability with purpose; contributing to existing research; creating a reciprocal relationship with the audience, compelling a response; open-endedness; rejecting finality and closure.

As the main feature of New Wave *Auto*ethnography, the self is totally absorbed within the confines of the research i.e. the research is a part of the researcher or he/she is a part of it, comprising dialogue about or beyond self, which is reflexively analysed and presented within narrative where the self is wholly visible. This examination consequently contributes to cultural critique and theoretical analysis where the aim is to produce meaningful, accessible and evocative research that not only acknowledges but values personal experience. A key feature of New Wave *Auto*ethnography is its methodological openness, which is not confined to a strict regime or criteria, but unconventional and flexible in many ways. *Auto*ethnography is alternatively presented through narrative, poetry, drama and art.

The Walnut Creek group also noted the purposes of *Auto*ethnography as: 1) to disrupt norms of research practices and representation, 2) to work from insider knowledge illustrating hidden personal nuances to answer questions by obtaining information hardly achievable via traditional methods, 3) to manoeuvre through pain, confusion, anger and uncertainty towards making life better, for the researcher, reader and society, 4) to break silences, reclaim voice, write to right, and finally 5) to make work accessible.

Autoethnography at Work, Categories of Autoethnography

These features, characteristics and purpose of *Auto*ethnography are recognisable in the four *Auto*ethnographical categories identified: The Study of One's Own Culture from within, Second Generation or Ethnic Identity *Auto*ethnography, Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies and Self-Reflexive Experiential Ethnography. The intention of Deloria, Quintasket and Hurston whose work falls into the first category (also known as salvage or Indigenous Ethnography) was to preserve a culture so that it would be better understood, and also 'writing to right', addressing the misconceptions of 'a scheme of life that worked'. These authors resorted to the realist novel modem to extrapolate or convey their insider knowledge, and they broke with or disrupted restrictive conventional ethnographic norms. Both Hurston and Deloria relate how informants readily disclosed that which is known to insiders, but not necessarily to 'outsiders', which illustrated hidden nuances. As Hurston explained, by being from inside she had a 'feel' for the culture. By Hurston, Quintasket and Deloria not excluding their emotions from the research, the reader understands, appreciates and empathises with these communities better.

Barbara Myerhoff, whose work fits into the second category, Second Generation *Auto*ethnography (or Ethnic Identity Ethnography), encapsulated many of the features and characteristics of *Auto*ethnography. Firstly, she is wholly visible in the text, explaining the impact the research had on her. As part of the process she familiarised herself with her own identity and identity politics and divulged a search for personal ethnicity, addressing 'ethnic anxiety' as described by Fischer (1986). She also manoeuvred through pain, suffering, confusion and anger on behalf of herself and her informants. As an aging community and victims of the Holocaust, the community carried the pain and confusion of being uprooted from their homes and having to start life in a sometimes difficult and hostile environment. They also disclosed their vulnerability about their past, as survivors, and insecurities about the future. Myerhoff expanded this theme of vulnerability questioning her own role as a researcher, the impact her research was having, if it was purposeful and if it would improve or benefit her informants' lives. In addressing and resolving some of these issues, she gives meaning to both her own and her informants' experiences and lives.

Jean Briggs, in the third category Anthropologists' *Auto*ethnographies builds on this theme of vulnerability and emotions within Anthropology, as criteria for cultural critique. Briggs' text works on two levels. Firstly, there is the perspective of the Anthropologist in the field and its entailed difficulties, such as homesickness, vulnerability and misunderstandings. Secondly, she focuses on something new to Anthropology, the impact of emotions on the social and cultural environment. Briggs aptly differentiated how differently emotions are perceived within different communities, and how they are testament to structural and cultural behaviour, echoing the work of Clifford Geertz (1974). She clearly indicates how control of the emotions contributes to survival in the close quarters of the Eskimo camps. Briggs' text alludes to personality clashes and the presence of psychodynamics within research. Including herself in her research, Briggs broke with protocol, which accounts for the text's maligning when initially published. Currently within Anthropology, many reviews of the roles of emotions as a focus of research cite the text. The text's honesty and openness appeals to the reader, who wishes to be more informed of the humanity, vulnerability and reflexivity of both the researcher and the researched. Noticeably, within academia, research including emotion was restricted to specific disciplines. Including emotions in *Auto*ethnography brings research to another deeper level. Emotion is often central to *Auto*ethnography and *Auto*ethnography is central to emotion interpretation. Within *Auto*ethnography, the role of emotions as part of the individual's position and performance in society is noted.

Carolyn Ellis' text as exemplar of the fourth category, Self-Reflexive Experiential ethnography or *Auto*phenomenography emphasises these themes. Ellis, also wholly visible in her research, encapsulates all the criteria, elements and characteristics of *Auto*ethnography

fulfilling its aim and purpose. Ellis touched upon personal relationship dilemmas that had consequences in the broader social and cultural arena. While illustrating nuances through descriptions of emotional and physical pain and confusion, after much reflexivity and in a very accessible way, she gives voice to many silences around the components of relationships, both positive and negative. In this way, she gets to a very core of human existence, one's relationships with others, and how one copes with personal experiences, which are ultimately indicative of cultural phenomena, and one's sense of being. This theme is further elaborated by Michael Jackson in his perspective on Existential Anthropology (2005) discussed further below.

Ultimately, the writings in these four different categories of *Auto*ethnography share the same goal: describing a scheme of life (that worked either well or poorly) so that it could be better understood, for the benefit of both the researchers and others, in order to find a better way of being. As Lisa Starr (2010b) remarks *Auto*ethnography has the capacity to initiate positive change and the potential to be transformative and catalytic.

Comparing the Emic with the Etic

The juxtapositioning of the outsider view (etic) and the insider view (emic) in Chapter Five, *Auto*ethnography in an Irish Context, highlights oversights and undermining from the outsider perspective; it amplifies how different both perspectives are. In addition, it identifies how preconceived notions may hamper an understanding and appreciation of cultural dynamics. O'Crohán and Sayers, as indigenous authors, ably and aptly describe their lives from childhood to old age, covering all aspects of living and various cultural phenomena: how the individual, the family and the larger community exist and function, from a viable form of sustenance and survival to its demise, despite the arrival of modernisation. They carry out their own cultural critique in that they explain, clarify and evaluate what it is like to live on these Irish islands.

In contradistinction Robin Flower, John C. Messenger and Nancy Scheper-Hughes carry out an etic cultural critique. Of the three, Flower's aesthetic perspective and approach is perhaps kindest, which reflects how he readily absorbed the atmosphere and loved the culture. By contrast, Scheper-Hughes and Messenger, trained Anthropologists on an Anthropological mission with a fixed agenda, carried out their work in scientific fashion, and either because of naivety and/or ignorance, failed to capture the sensitivities of the Irish people. They did not include many of the positive sides to the Irish character, nor did they make allowances for the uniqueness of Irish culture, comparing it unjustly to that of their own.

As Brigid Edwards (1996) pointed out, the primary interest of American ethnographers working in Europe in the 1950s and 1960s was traditional peasant cultures. Including these texts in the thesis demonstrates how the depiction of the insiders and outsider view can be comparable, complementary and applicable globally. Since the inception of the Reflexive Turn (1980s), Anthropologists culturally critique new foci, using numerous different methods and approaches. *Auto*ethnography is just one such method or form which offers a holistic approach and contributes a 360-degree outlook.

Negative Elements of Autoethnography

Despite its potential, *Auto*ethnography was criticised on numerous levels. Informants, or natives, due to ethical negligence, negatively received ethnographies like those of Scheper-Hughes, Messenger, Behar (1995) and Ellis (1995). The backlash gave rise to concern and consideration of ethics within ethnography and indeed *Auto*ethnography. Outside of the required bureaucratic protocols, ethics exists as a requirement for a fair common-sense approach to guard against unfavourable reporting/critiquing. Martin Tolich (2010) who offered Ten Guidelines for the purpose of *Auto*ethnographers highlighted this.

Furthermore, *Auto*ethnography was ill considered, and not seen as a serious academic genre, as it defied all measurement and gauge as a credible mechanism for cultural critique; it broke with the three-degree rule of separation and included the personal; it was seen as self-indulgent narcissistic solipsism. Some critics resented the lack of stoicism and the attention seeking victim mode of some *Auto*ethnographies. Some *Auto*ethnographers wrote in a manner that seemed to suggest anything goes, is plausible, acceptable; they appeared to lack discernment or filter. Some academics resisted practising *Auto*ethnography because of the bad press and out of fear of interference, restriction and/or denial of career or tenure. Nevertheless, *Auto*ethnography is finding its place as a conventional research and presentation method and it has managed to establish and maintain a presence within academic discourse.

Having reflected upon the process and progress of the thesis thus far, examining the contributory factors to the emergence of *Auto*ethnography, looking at the *Auto*ethnographer's role, established its qualities, and weighted its pros and cons in this part of the chapter, the subsequent part will examine how *Auto*ethnography continues to make a deep impact in new territories.

Part Two: New Evolving Frontiers and Future Dimensions in *Auto*ethnography

Looking forward, how *Auto*ethnography is regarded and utilised depends on the stance of researchers and readers. Viewed positively, it may find a place as an alternative, diverse and useful research tool that supplements and complements other approaches to research into culture, society, personal cultural phenomenon and human behaviour. Its future will certainly be influenced by the ubiquitous nature of technology; in social media, *Auto*ethnography can take on new guises and different forms of presentation which in turn may reinforce its contribution to Anthropology's original purpose that is, to try to understand human behaviour and find meaning in life.

This final part of the thesis comprises a number of sections. Firstly, before looking at contemporary and new *Auto*ethnographic frontiers, we will examine three major components and contributory factors to *Auto*ethnography and its future: they are the concept of the self, the role of emotions and empathy and the role of the introspective interpretive approach in *Auto*ethnographic Anthropology. These paradigms reflect a philosophical dimension to Anthropological research such as Existential and Contemplative Anthropology. Secondly, we will look at how various disciplines currently advocate and employ an *Auto*ethnographic research and presentation method; this is frequently through a recognition of what reflective self-experience research contributes towards developing educational programmes, policy making, and understanding life and meaning. Thirdly, we will examine briefly new social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram where current social, cultural and human behaviour resonate with *Auto*ethnography. Finally, we will anticipate further purposes for *Auto*ethnography and offer some concluding thoughts.

Section 1: The Self, Emotions, Empathy, and Introspective Interpretive *Auto*ethnography

For *Auto*ethnography to be practicable as a form of cultural critique, researchers have to examine their attitude to three main attributes considered in the exercise of *Auto*ethnography: The Self, the Role of the Emotions and Empathy, and the Role of the Introspective Interpretive Approach within research. Here we shall examine each of these concepts separately, and their place within *Auto*ethnography's new frontiers.

The Self

In *Auto*ethnography 'The Self' is an essential element as a locus for particular social and cultural inquiry, (emphasis added). Previously, within various disciplines, the self as central to research and the disclosure of details of one's personal existence was (and still is in some cases) inconceivable. To include the self in research, therefore, was a challenge.

Twenty years before New Wave *Auto*ethnography, Clifford Geertz's (1974) pioneering work, on the role of the researcher and the position of self within communities, attempts to clarify these issues. For Geertz, *Malinowski's Diary* (1989 [1967]) brought to fruition the many dilemmas for the researcher in distinguishing between the human person and the professional researcher. Geertz outlines various contributory factors, criteria, challenges, difficulties and limitations of an outsider researching culture, such as: inside versus outside; first person versus third person; emic versus etic which parallel differences between the ethnographic and the *Auto*ethnographic view. Barbara Tedlock (1991, 2008) echoed this theme in her discussions of the emergence of both narrative and public ethnography respectively.

Geertz determined the ultimate goal in researching other societies was to learn more about ourselves, and that the most opportune way of doing that was by seeing things from the native's point of view. Geertz uses the metaphor 'to swim in the stream of experience' and uses two primary concepts of *Auto*ethnography to enable the researcher to understand the Other. They are i) the concept of selfhood and ii) insight into values and meaning of life. Geertz suggests that exploring and understanding the concept of 'selfhood' within different cultures is an ideal vehicle to inquire into another person's mind, which subsequently can lead to an insight into one's own values and meaning of life. Through his work with the Javanese, Balinese and Moroccans, Geertz demonstrates how within each separate

community cultural meanings and concepts of self and selfhood differed. In appreciating 'how the people who live there define themselves as persons' (1974:30) Geertz concluded that the concept of the human individual is universal, but due to obvious cultural variations between different groups' frameworks of 'selfhood', the concept of 'selfhood' is local.

Geertz calls upon the psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut's distinction between the 'experience near' and 'experience distant'. The 'experience near' is what the subject (patient or informant) might naturally use to define what others see, feel, think and imagine, and the 'experience distance' is where various types of specialists, for example analysts, experimenters and ethnographers attempt to further their scientific, philosophical or practical views. In other words, the 'experience near' is that of someone from inside a situation, and the 'experience distant' is from someone who is slightly removed or outside. For Geertz, this is a matter of degree and not one of polar opposition. Geertz points out that neither concept lessens the demand on the ethnographer and that to

> capture the general feature of social life is clearly a task at least as delicate … as putting yourself in someone else's skin... the trick is not to achieve some inner correspondence of spirit with your informants … the trick is to figure out what the devil they think they are up to (Geertz, 1974:29).

Geertz suggests that individuality is socially/culturally constructed and the penetration of other people's modes of thought is central to ethnographic interpretation and understanding human behaviour, a way of life, and society, for him and *Auto*ethnographers particularly. Understanding human behaviour, or a way of life is accessible through literary, historical, philological, psychoanalytic or biblical interpretation; it is also achievable through the informal annotation of everyday experience that is common sense, their reality, and the ordinary (Geertz, 1974:44). In understanding and appreciating different perceptions of self and selfhood, and the microcosmic perspective on a cultural element, we come to understand the macro. To comprehend an issue within a society, or society itself, we need to learn how it influences the individual. *Auto*ethnographies prove useful in this regard, as is evident in Robin Boylorn and Mark Orbe's (2014) edited text *Critical Autoethnography, Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life,* a collection of stories of individual experiences of personal cultural phenomena. Boylorn and Orbe note in the introduction to their work that

> We privilege individual experiences and corporate realities in order to theorise about what we can learn relationally, personally, and culturally through personal narratives (Boylorn and Orbe, 2014: 16).

Emotions and Empathy in Autoethnography

Contingent upon the appreciation of self in *Auto*ethnographic research is an openness to emotion and empathy on the part of both the researcher and the reader. This section will examine empathy and emotion in *Auto*ethnography as a new frontier in Anthropological research. Catherine Lutz and Geoffrey White's (1986) seminal essay 'Anthropology of Emotions' provide a detailed analytical account of research on emotion and its place within both the discipline and ethnography. This new area of research coincided with the 'crisis in representation', referred to by Marcus and Fischer (1986) in *Anthropology as Cultural Critique, An Experimental Moment in the Social Sciences,* in correspondence with Clifford and Marcus (1986) *Writing Culture, The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. They anticipated new forms and elements to Anthropological discourse as it evolved with changing times in society. Though not specifically naming *Auto*ethnography, Lutz and White recommend consideration of a new person-centred genre, as an alternative approach to ethnography. They were proposing a place for 'self-ethnography' in order to understand the impact of emotion on culture and vice versa:

> Attempts to understand the relation between emotion and culture lies in ethnographic description of the emotional lives of persons in their social contexts (Lutz and White, 1986: 427).

Their essay emerged as an acknowledgment of a growing interest in emotions as cultural phenomena indicators, and an effort to understand the role of emotion in personal and social life, which also coincided with the rise of Introspective Interpretive Approaches in Anthropology and Sociology (mentioned below). This emergent cultural approach to emotion opened Anthropologists to emotion theory, an important socio-cultural framework beyond the original psychobiological. Previous antipathy between science and emotion, and theoretical and epistemological tensions in emotion study, meant emotions were relegated to the periphery, often seen as 'uniform, uninteresting, inaccessible' and occupying the natural/biological province of human experience.

Both Lutz and White view the benefits of the study of emotion as it challenges the 'robotic' image of humans as mechanical processors and producers of information. They question the distancing methodologies and ethnographers' personal and cultural assumptions about emotions. Lutz and White breakdown various perspectives on emotion, distinguishing between those who see them as being constituted biologically, expressed by bodily reactions such as facial expressions, blood pressure, hormone and neuro-chemical processes and hard wired instincts, and those who see the cultural impact through empathy or behavioural observation.

The individual is the ultimate seat of emotion and these approaches confront social/cultural patterns into/or against which emotions are placed, and make the distinction between a) emotion and b) sentiment where a) emotion is defined as 'private feeling', not usually culturally motivated or socially articulated and b) sentiment defined as socially articulated symbols and behavioural expectations. The ability to 'feel' defines humans and creates meaningfulness in individual and social life. A hybrid position among romantics are those who link emotion to cultural logic, and elevate emotions to a place of importance within society, defining them as potential sources of correct knowledge about the social world.

Beliefs about emotions determine their perception as influences on research/behaviour. If we understand emotion as embedded in socially constructed categories, the natural progression is to understand emotions in the context of people in relationship with each other. Understanding the influence of culture on emotion, and vice versa, will broaden perspectives. There is a correspondence between Anthropology and other disciplines in understanding cross-cultural variations in emotional meaning. Similarly, cross-cultural universals regarding emotion are identifiable within various Anthropological ethnographies. If emotion interpretation complements research, there will be improved cross-cultural understanding, an ambition of *Auto*ethnography. This entails a new Language of Emotion and negotiation of emotional meaning as distinct from emotional language.

Celayne Heaton Shresta (2007) describes how she was previously discouraged from including both herself and emotion in her research and suggests that to cater for issues currently being researched, researchers will have to serve emotional apprenticeships (Shresta, 2007:20). Incorporating emotion in (*Auto*) ethnography, and understanding the pain and pleasure of others, can offer a fuller view of what the everyday is like for people; it may even humanise western audiences. Manoeuvring through pain and confusion, anger and uncertainty is one of the purposes of *Auto*ethnography as outlined by Adams (2013). Through understanding emotion and evoking empathy, *Auto*ethnography works towards deciphering meaning in life. It is a call for Anthropological researchers to consider and address emotions in their research and/or be prepared to engage emotionally with their topic and perhaps disclose some personal experience. These elements are often neglected in order to preserve an uninvolved critical neutral position; some critics find exploring and publicly articulating their inner self experience or 'trauma culture' as off-putting or downright inappropriate (Buzard, 2003).

As an example of how emotion may be considered and included in social and cultural research, contributors to *The Emotions, A Cultural Reader* (2007) edited by Helena Wulff, offer a cross continental, cross-disciplinary and cross cultural perspective on emotions. In recognising emotions as not simply psychobiological or physiological, but are culturally constructed, the various authors highlight how they acquired another level of understanding, upon recognising the emotional response to cultural phenomena within and among different

societies. Perhaps the most potent of all examples is Rosaldos appreciation of the Illongots value of self, and value of rage and Head Hunting (M.Z. Rosaldo, 1983: R. Rosaldo, 1984: Wulff, 2007).

> In research, especially when it involves first hand data collection with people during participant observation or interviews, emotions matter (Wulff, 2007:3).

Introducing emotion into research no doubt calls upon the researchers' empathy. Perhaps the most profound understanding of empathy comes from Edith Stein. Stein defines empathy as "the experience of foreign experience" – understanding an experience foreign to ourselves (Stein, Chapter Two, Doctoral Dissertation (1916) Trans W. Stein [1964]1988) as explained by Dr. Mette Lebech (2015) private conversation). Freda Mary Oben (2002), in her work, *Edith Stein And The Science Of The Cross,* explains how Stein, who developed a method of philosophical anthropology, emphasised how scientific answers were insufficient. Despite the complexity and sometimes inaccessibility of Stein's work, her message was at its core a simple one: it is through knowing the self that one can live a more meaningful life.

Contemplative and Existential Anthropology

Ellis (1991), in Sociological Introspection and Emotional Experience reiterated this understanding and study of emotions. Ellis admits that research of emotions is quite complex and sometimes immeasurable, not unlike analysing *Auto*ethnography. Nevertheless, emotions can offer insights into delicate and sensitive situations, and may lead to ways of learning, and improving understanding. In this light, *Auto*ethnography, as an approach, opens up a whole plethora of concepts and routes to understanding social and cultural behaviour. In parallel with the consideration of emotions in Anthropology is the return to Contemplative Anthropology. Contemplative Anthropology is

> That which understands the experience of contemplation as intrinsic to being a human person and so also a reader (Riyeff, 2015: Abstract).

Michael Jackson, Existential Anthropology and Autoethnography

*Auto*ethnography is an associative element of Contemplative Anthropology; it is also a derivative of Existential Anthropology as understood by Michael Jackson (2005, 2009, 2013[2002] and 2013). Jackson reflects how within Anthropology norms, the presence of both the individual researcher and the informant was suppressed, but there existed an

undercurrent where the individual affected the social and cultural behaviour of one's community, and vice versa. Jackson considers the impact of events, location, environment and engagement in relationships on the individual, both informant and researcher. He openly describes his own personal and ethnographic experiences as a way to understand life and meaning, working through a number of snapshots or vignettes of events, experiences and journeys to describe and explain what he has learned about life and to assess the average everyday of being in the world; being a human:

> The profession and practice of ethnography answered a personal need, providing rhythm between absorption in the world of books and engagement in the world. Ethnography also opened my eyes to the many paths one may take in life to find a clearing, and brought me to an understanding that, for every cleared space, there are many false trails and dead ends…my work would become increasingly preoccupied by the crises and impasses of life …yet achieving, on the other hand, ways of thinking, writing, and acting that make some positive difference to one *and* all (Jackson,2013: xiii. Emphasis in original).

Jackson builds on the primary concerns and interest of Anthropologists, which were to look at 'other' so that one might come to understand oneself, to share knowledge and assist learning, so that the reader comes to understand human behaviour, and the embryonic idea and function of Anthropology, the edification of human kind. An underlying theme in Jackson's work is to understand existence, the reason for being and the Human Condition, as explored through Anthropology. As a philosophical Anthropologist, Jackson relies heavily on the work of Hannah Arendt, William James and others. Each of Jackson's texts reflects and extends a variety of previously visited themes which constantly resurge, such as the impact of events like war, colonialism, place of being and identity, language and its use, the precariousness of life, constant in-betweenness or liminality, reciprocity and methods and means of coping with every day and anxiety.

One of Jackson's primary focuses is the notion of intersubjectivity (Jackson, 2013:5). A similar notion is that of intersectionality as proposed by Boylorn and Orbe (2014). The notion of intersubjectivity, originally formulated by the philosopher Husserl, is the basic quality of human existence, the subject and the objective world. Intersubjectivity is the domain of inquiry spanning the scope of human experience, the role of the living human body, empathy, tools and the natural and cultural world (Duranti, 2010). Jackson argues intersubjectivity should be a key concept in Anthropological inquiry. He favours the anthropology of experience and expands the boundaries and practice of ethnography. Intersubjectivity for Jackson relies on the interpretation that intersubjectivity is 'shared mutual understanding', (Emphasis added).

Jackson's own research epitomises the way people engage with each other intersubjectively, and how they derive meaning in life. Understanding each other intersubjectively lends itself to the new alternative comparative method of research Jackson promotes and advocates, known as 'radical empiricism'. William James (1880) initiated Radical Empiricism, by which he proposes close physical contact and engagement with the life worlds of people. Jackson's method of research is not engaged in superficial, general layers but the particular and the underbelly of life and society. He suggests it is not simply a case of 'transcending limits of habitual ways of seeing world' nor 'seeing world of other person's point of view' but a way of overcoming estrangement from others, finding common ground, working out ways where co-existence is possible in a divided world (Jackson, 2005:31). Jackson is critical of former Anthropological methods of research such as taxonomy and broad generalisation. He refers to Leach's method as 'butterfly collecting', which entailed collecting, categorising and classifying data and phenomena, and Levi Strauss' comparative method through which particular phenomenon were integrated through generalisations into a larger whole, i.e. local became universal (Jackson, 2005:31-32).

Jackson's method of existentialism is not simply a philosophical take on life but a way to explore existence and co-existence to understand how people cope with reality and a way of being in the world. Where an individual is the sum of all their experiences, Jackson builds on the suggestion that a natural progression occurs, whereby the Anthropologist ventures to study other cultures to understand one's own, but ultimately returns to the self, to understand one's place within the grand scheme of things. Thus undergoing Srivinas' thrice born experience, as mentioned by Victor Turner (1978) or as suggested by Marcus and Fischer in their concept of the Repatriation of Anthropology (1986). For Jackson, good Anthropology

> depends less on mastery of new interpretive vocabularies than on one's ability to sustain interaction and conversation with others, in their place, on their terms, under troubling and trying circumstances (Jackson, 2005:32).

Jackson's writing is *Auto*ethnographic in the sense he combines *Auto*biography and ethnography, as he reflects upon and includes his own personal life experience, world path, and what he feels his informants are experiencing as a conduit to understanding being, and his own existence. Jackson's writing and viewpoint has another association with *Auto*ethnography, in that it defies final conclusion: it is indeterminable, a word Jackson frequently uses, to describe life and experience. The proponents and promoters of *Auto*ethnography do not specifically mention Contemplation or Existentialism, but within Contemplative and Existential Anthropology and pedagogy, there are many similarities with

Jackson's work, and the elements of New Wave *Auto*ethnography. *Auto*ethnography resonates with the exploration of the human condition, of being in the world, a human being.

Introspective Interpretive Autoethnography

Norman Denzin (2014) exemplifies a further derivative of Contemplative and Existential Anthropology in his proposal of an alternative aspect to Interpretive *Auto*ethnography. On the thirtieth anniversary of Geertz's, work Denzin (2014) complements it further by altering the notion of the interpretive approach, suggesting it is not simply about interpreting a culture but rather it should be concerned with interpreting the effect cultural phenomena have on the self, introspective interpretation. I have taken the liberty to call it Introspective Interpretive *Auto*ethnography as the interpretation reaches deep into the very core of the researcher who considers the usually very personal topic of research, by introspectively examining his/her life. This suggests an amalgamation of the three concepts, the self, the emotion and the new introspective interpretive approach. Previously in Chapter Two, the role of Interpretive *Auto*ethnography was examined but it is revisited here in order to consider its role in *Auto*ethnography's new frontiers. To differentiate the introspective interpretive approach from the earlier concept of an interpretive approach we note that the former focused/focuses on the interpretations of the individual or the personal effect of cultural phenomena, and not on the field worker gaining knowledge of subjects and systems of cultural meanings and representing them in ethnographic texts, as in the latter.

Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln have overseen the emergence and development of *Auto*ethnography and compiled the *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* now in its 6th edition. Denzin has been a formidable presence at the Annual International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry since its inception in 2004. He has witnessed, participated in, and reflected upon the many 'turning points' and changes in methods of research with the sole purpose of making meaning. As a loyal proponent of the *Auto*ethnographic method, his recent text *Interpretive Autoethnography* (2014) demonstrates the informal format of *Auto*ethnography, as his theoretical assertions pale in significance to his use of *Auto*ethnographic (other peoples') exemplars. Denzin's text encapsulates the new *Auto*ethnographic direction of research, where he lets others' experiences of current real life problems, including alcoholism, drug abuse, divorce, living (dying) with cancer, parental abuse and membership of Alcoholics Anonymous, reflect the 'trauma culture' of today's society (Denzin, 2014; Clough, 2007). Many of the stories are distressing and incredibly sad, but as Carolyn Ellis (2014) notes, people rarely take time out to write about their happy times; they are too busy enjoying the happiness.

For Denzin, some situations defy linear textual narrative and require aesthetic, poetic, performative description, faithfully conveying the experience to paper. Denzin highlights the intricacies of these stories: the beginning emerges within the family usually, yet they are not biographies or *Auto*biographies; and they defy endings, finality or closure. *Auto*ethnographic stories frequently affect readers in three ways: they encourage awareness, prompt empathy, urge caution. There is constant and consistent overlap between these three concepts. The reader is given a glimpse of an 'epiphanic' moment, one episode of a person's experience presented through a 'pathography' (Denzin's word and another derivative of *Auto*ethnography), where the author describes a path already travelled, such as one to recovery from a debilitating habit. The reader may empathise having already walked the same path or be cautioned by the experience. Lack of empathy may occur where it is the reader's first encounter with the experience. While there may be no finality or closure, as no one can predict what will happen in future, an *Auto*ethnographic experience often offers an insight about life, meaning, values and what may be happening worldwide on a global scale. The goal is always to create the conditions for a critical consciousness (Denzin, 2014:26).

Considerations

These works by Geertz, Lutz, White, Denzin and Jackson, and their associated influences, suggest ways that we might appreciate culture and cultural phenomenon from differing perspectives. To study, appreciate and practise *Auto*ethnography a change in the researcher's attitude and approach is required. So as to find the 'something missing' in research, a New Millennia generation have emerged, who are willing to put their experience in print, in order to help create an understanding of their own culture. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, in crafting an understanding of their place within their own culture, the researcher creates meaning and improves the quality of their own life, while ideally benefiting others. Because of its basis in an understanding of the three concepts, of self, the role of emotion in *Auto*ethnographic research and the introspective interpretive approach, other disciplines have adopted and adapted *Auto*ethnography, in order to add depth and understanding to that research. A brief introduction to the application of *Auto*ethnography among three of these disciplines follows.

Section Two: Advocacy for *Auto*ethnography Among Various Disciplines

The disciplines of Geography, Medicine and Education have all applied the *Auto*ethnographic method, assimilating the ideas of Geertz and Denzin, and indeed Ellis and Bochner, to research and appreciate cultural phenomenon and to make their work more meaningful. Across these disciplines, there are elements, which are contingent upon each other, particularly with regard to training and education, and there is considerable overlap in the contexts of their use of *Auto*ethnography. A comprehensive overview of this work is not possible in this thesis, but there is a brief description of each in order to record their experience and to remark on their potential.

Autoethnography and Geographers

Due to a cultural turn in the late 1980s early 1990s Geography's two main areas, human and physical geography began to incorporate social and cultural impacts. Further derivatives of geography are cultural, developmental, health, economic and political geography, many of which are subgenres within Anthropology. One aspect of geography focuses on the built environment, and how humans interrelate with space, or spatial science (Till,2009). Stemming from the idea of place/space as more fluid and connective, geographical spaces and location took on a different emphasis. With a qualitative revolution, ethnography became a component in analytical geographical investigation. Research became a mixture of old and new forms with traditional empirical data aligned with critical analysis. Observations in the field were still central to the research but researchers became aware of affective and emotional geographies. Thus, in their geographical reports geographers became contemplative. In investigating these issues, deep mapping was required, networks began to spread and multiply and a new global spatial literacy and language emerged. The research was further enabled by technologies (Till, 2009; Foley, 2014).

Within Geography, two prominent areas coincide with Anthropology, where *Auto*ethnography is deployed as a useful research tool, and method of cultural critique. They are: firstly, Landscapes and Environment at risk, and the disintegration of lifestyles, communities and places due to the impact of global warming, globalisation, capitalism, war and migration; and secondly Health/Medical/Mental and Physical Health Geography, where interests expand and subdivide to include personal health issues such as physical and mental disability, associated with space. There is also an awareness of therapeutic landscapes and advocacy towards improved and supported environments. A number of *Auto*ethnographies examined the health effects of the environment and landscapes, and specifically the benefits of running for mental health (Spinney,2006; Allen-Collinson,2013). More specifically, when disabled people describe their spatial environments and quality of life through Geographical

*Auto*ethnography, their accounts can contribute to new policies towards improved understanding and provision of facilities (Morelli-Pozzi, 2014). These health issues further correspond with medicine, which is another discipline closely connected to *Auto*ethnography.

Autoethnography, Medicine, Medical/Mental Health and Education

Within the discipline of Medicine *Auto*ethnography has been very influential for three groups, namely medical practitioners, (nurses, doctors, carers), medical educators (college lecturers) and patients. Kleinman (1988) presents a medical practitioners' perspective in *The Illness Narratives, Suffering, Healing and The Human Condition*. Kleinman states his aim as one where he writes

> to explain to patients, their families, and their practitioners what I have learned from a career passionately devoted to this interest. I write because I wish to popularise a technical literature that would be of great value for those who must live with, make sense of and care for the chronic illness...I will argue that the study of the experience of illness has something fundamental to teach us about the human condition, and its universal suffering and death (Kleinman, 1988: xiii).

Kleinman initiates the debate on the impact of his profession on the practitioner and the realisation that it is not only the illness or the symptoms that require attention but the treatment of the patient as a person and the need for a holistic approach. By extension, nurses in training, have used *Auto*ethnography to reflect on their practice placement experience. These reflective pieces inform the training facilitators, administrators and educators of the impact of the training on: the nurses; on the learning outcomes; how educational and practical training programmes may be improved or adjusted; and how different facilities such as the introduction of comprehensive holistic approaches may address nurse-training needs. Through interconnectedness, (intersubjectivity), these *Auto*ethnographies can influence policy makers at different levels with development, government programmes and economic policies. With attention paid to the nurses' needs at training level, and consideration of their observations of their experiences and practice, there is a clear route for transference to improved patient care.

As the third part of the triumvirate, and the recipient of the treatment, the perspective of the patient is vital. Within Medical Anthropology patient's *Auto*ethnographies are beneficial and therapeutic. They work in a number of ways: as a method of coping or coming to terms with a recently diagnosed illness, for the patient or in assisting members of other families dealing with similar illness, as to coping mechanisms. They are also informative for the medical profession, showing how policy, administration or treatment might improve. From the patient's perspective, Susan Greenhalgh's (2001) *Under the*

Medical Gaze is but one example. Greenhalgh learned how to cope with back pain, which the medical profession had initially dismissed to be less severe than her experience of it. Greenhalgh kept a diary and used initials to record her experience.

> S. was silenced in the public space of the doctor-patient interaction, but there were other more private spaces in which she could speak her thoughts and feelings. The most important of these spaces was her writing. From the day of her first appointments S began keeping two records of her 'adventure' with Dr. D., a medical diary and a daily chart (Greenhalgh, 2001:194).

*Auto*ethnographies such as Greenhalgh's gives voice to those marginalised by the system. They can be informative and insightful for medical professionals and future patients, offering a holistic view of the discipline. Indeed, seeking the voice of patients appears to be a more commonplace practice particularly in high profile situations. For example, Ireland recently, in addressing recurring infant mortality in a Midlands hospital, have involved and included patient/advocate testimonies; Leo Vradkar, the current Health Minister took time to listen to each individual patient's story to consider how best practice might be implemented (13/5/2015).

Mental Health and Mental Health Training

Another dimension to the value of *Auto*ethnography is in relation to Mental Health and Mental Health training (education) within the mental health services. Recently, a collection of essays, edited by Nigel P. Short, Lydia Turner and Alec Grant, titled *Contemporary British Autoethnography* (2013) combines an *Auto*ethnographic narrative presentational style with linear narrative, to address a number of concerns: Medical and Mental Health Academia, the U.K. University System and the National Health System (NHS). They speak from the perspectives of administrators, teacher educators, and recipients of mental health care. The editors and contributors to the text support the use of *Auto*ethnography, as both a teaching method and presentation, and in addition, they recognise the role it serves as a form of cultural critique (see also the work of Foster, Mc Allister and O'Brien (2005) who speak from the mental health nurses' perspective).

As educators within the UK University System of Mental Health personnel, Short et al. were frustrated by university teaching methods, and the neoliberal policies introduced by the British Government. In this regard they highlighted: 'audit creep' as previously noted by Marilyn Strathern (2006); the conveyor belt style of Higher Education; the pressure to both satisfy certain criteria and publish to maintain a position; and resistance to new reflective and contemplative programmes and methods, including *Auto*ethnography. These contributors speak of Institutional Depression as identified by Bochner (Bochner, 2014:292). A similar theme appears in the essay titled 'Emotions in Academia' by Billy Ehn and Orvar Lὸgfren

(2007) who describe emotional sterility and its repercussions within academic culture, as does B.J. Jago (2002) and Brett Smith (1999). As recipients of mental health care, Short, Turner and Grant, offer an insight into what it is like to be both patient and educator within the system. They are aware that the teaching methods do not facilitate an understanding of the patient, educator or practitioner. Using *Auto*ethnographies, they identify discrepancies within both the health and education system, and disclose their personal experience of mental health educational teaching and training methods, *Auto*ethnography PhD production, and its reception among their peers.

In the text's closing chapter, the editors, Short, Turner and Grant, present a discussion of the validity of the exercise of producing an *Auto*ethnographic text, and the value of *Auto*ethnography in education. They highlight common issues with the method, for example: the challenges of new public management within higher education who are resistant to alternative teaching methods; the call for evidence based knowledge; the effort to legitimise accounts; the dismissiveness of narratives; the avoidance of emotion; and 'the dismissal of emotional intelligence and integrity' (Short et al., 2013:231-240). Rejection of *Auto*ethnography as an ideal methodology is not uncommon, as recollected in the previous chapter. Nicholas Holt (2003) also described his efforts to seek legitimation. Echoing Andrew Sparkes, (2009:314), Short, Turner and Grant suggest the validity, credibility and reliability of the material requires a new kind of scientific checklist and evaluation, a 'connoisseurship'.

Mark Maguire (2013) echoes his UK contemporaries' concerns in his comments about pressure to produce students for the 'job market'. Maguire was responding to an article by Rick Newman in Forbes Magazine (2012). Newman advised students against subjects like psychology, history or anthropology, and suggested universities aim to produce employable students, where research is to be seen as productive rather than sentimental or contemplative, and cold hard statistics are required as 'not to produce them in a text is punishable' (Maguire, 2013:23). Maguire believes the overall aim of university education to be to produce well-rounded people. He reflects on Irish Anthropology students' achievements, who in contemplating rather than reacting bring their talents beyond 'the realm of numerical representations of human life to the very core of meaning in every day lived experiences' (Maguire, 2013:24). His hopes for the future of Irish Anthropology are that it will contribute more to a contemplative society (Maguire, 2013:25). Contemplative Anthropology, as advanced by Maguire, resonates with *Auto*ethnography's strong reflexivity and existential anthropology as previously mentioned.

Autoethnography and Mainstream Education

Mary Louise Pratt in her essay 'Arts of the Contact Zone' (1991) initially flagged the issues for teachers and practitioners in Mental Health, and Health Education, and *Auto*ethnography's role within education. This was the keynote address presented at Responsibilities for Literacy Conference, Pennsylvania, 1990. Pratt identified that teachers had to find imaginative alternative approaches to replace old outdated and redundant methods, to fulfil the requirement to cater for everyone's needs in the multicultural classroom environment. Twenty years later, Lisa Starr (2010) reiterated this sentiment as she explains how teachers, in order to address the influx of students from multiple ethnic groups, can use *Auto*ethnography as a way of understanding both education and its practice:

> *Auto*ethnography is a valuable tool in examining the complex, diverse and sometimes messy world of education (Starr, 2010:2).

Starr reflects how in her experience teachers and teachers in training began to practise the *Auto*ethnographic method to enhance their teacher training programmes, methods, and practice, having experienced clashes between what they felt was required, and the ideologies of the Institute, as all too often teachers' views were underrepresented at whole school development and planning forums. Their inclusion influences policy making through the interconnection of educationalists with government Education Departments. Through sharing their experiences *Auto*ethnographically, teaching performances improved (Starr, 2010). In implementing new teaching methods, the agents of education have to change too. Fernanda Duarte (2007) explains how *Auto*ethnography

> significantly altered my outlook on teaching and learning, as it forced me to reflect more critically on why I teach the way I do, and look at my pedagogical practices anew (Duarte, 2007: abstract).

In turn, the teachers improved performance influences students (Holt, 2003:6). Along with knowing the different learning preferences of students, there was a growing awareness that something more was needed to facilitate students' personal growth. The integration of pedagogy and contemplation, or contemplative pedagogy could address this. Contemplative pedagogy is a new form of learning and knowing, where students become conscious of themselves, their surroundings and the welfare of their fellow classmates. Part of this process involves students writing reflective pieces, rethinking, evaluating and articulating their current education and life experience through *Auto*ethnographies. The stated benefits of Contemplative pedagogy and sharing personal experience through *Auto*ethnography are: increased self-worth; self-esteem; social and emotional growth; increased concentration;

enhanced progress; and improved educational and life journeys (Baxter Magolda, 2009: Hart, 2004). As *Auto*ethnography becomes a technology of knowing and learning, transformation occurs for both learners and teachers as the quality of the teaching, learning and classroom experiences improve. (See also the work of Gilbourne and Marshall (2013), Doloriet and Sambrook (2011) and Price and Mc Millan (2010) who also write of their experience in Third Level and Post Graduate education).

Section 3: *Auto*ethnography and New Social Media

Cyberspace Autoethnography

Perhaps the newest frontier for *Auto*ethnography is in cybernetics and social media including Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Social networking sites allow people to share their everyday experiences online, in a daily demonstration of how technology influences people's lives. Millions of individuals worldwide engage in social media where people use these sites as a method of sharing news, life experiences, opinions etc. Disclosure can be from the quotidian to the extraordinary: from the personal, local, national to international and world events. This online behaviour has evolved into cultural phenomena providing an important insight into personal, social and cultural behaviours. The contribution is *Auto*ethnographic in the sense that the self is at the very heart of the indigenous cultural trend.

One of the drawbacks and complications of this very public private life is the private life is no longer private. A challenge of real versus virtual is significant where intimacy may be an illusion and personal boundaries demolished. Equally, the darker world of social media seems particularly prevalent as evidenced in accounts of virtual abuse, cyber bullying, textual abuse, cyber addiction, and antisocial behaviour and habits, where more time spent on phones and tablets replaces real face-to-face interaction (Turkle, 2013). This is not the focus of this thesis, but it is necessary to note that how people engage with the technological world in the New Millennia is a reflection of people's new social and cultural behaviour. Another example is musical *Auto*ethnography, as demonstrated by Michael Wolff-Roth's (2009) take on Eminem's rap. Listening to the lyrics Roth realised Eminem (2004) was recounting his own personal life, which reflected and highlighted many of the experiences within contemporary American culture, unemployment, marriage break up, the impact of these on children and the feeling of failure from a father/husband perspective (Eminem, 2004 cited in Wolff-Roth,2009).

Conclusion/Onwards

In this chapter of two parts, we have traced the development of the thesis thus far, while anticipating the role of *Auto*ethnography in Anthropology in the future. Firstly, we reflected on each section of the thesis. The aim of the thesis was to create an understanding of what *Auto*ethnography is and what it does, and establish its value as a useful research tool within Anthropology. We began by examining the original concept of *Auto*ethnography, and its perception within the discipline. Since the New Millennium, we recognise *Auto*ethnography has taken on a new guise addressing social, cultural issues from a personal perspective, often left under the radar. To appreciate and understand what *Auto*ethnography is and does I identified four categories with which it is suitably fits. Further to that, I demonstrated how *Auto*ethnography complements and supplements ethnographies, focusing on an Irish context. Because of its nature as a personal interrogation of a social and cultural phenomenon, *Auto*ethnography is ethically sensitive and this too required consideration. *Auto*ethnography is not without its critics, and some of its negative aspects were analysed.

Moving on the latter part of the chapter examined new frontiers and the potential scope for *Auto*ethnography. *Auto*ethnography has emerged in many disciplines as a means of bridging the gap and addressing the call to find the 'something missing' in both research method, presentation and/or outcome. Combined with self-narrative, *Auto*ethnography is a useful approach in understanding perceptions of self within society and culture, and thus understand society itself, and has proven itself invaluable in diverting attention to social problems needing reform.

Concluding Chapter/Discussion

Introduction

In the previous chapter we reflected on the development of the thesis from its earliest inquiry into what *Auto*ethnography is to what it has become, and consequently how it might fit in the future. By way of building on these considerations within the thesis, this chapter will highlight and discuss an analysis of its findings and some of the major points addressed.

The aim of this thesis was to examine what *Auto*ethnography is, and to establish its relevance within the discipline of Anthropology. Put in the simplest terms, the thesis is an ethnography of *Auto*ethnography. In this context, I as the researcher tried to maintain the position of neutral observer. However in lieu of the subject under review, I cannot deny that I often was empathetic towards the authors of the many texts I read, 'putting myself in their shoes', as it were, due to the nature of the research and the purpose of the topic, *Auto*ethnography.

This study has addressed the emergence, establishment, development, pros, cons, limitations and future trends of *Auto*ethnography, in order to consider its worth as an alternative method of research and presentation, and as a tool for understanding human behaviour, culture and society. Consequentially, it shows how personal narrative sometimes supersedes theoretical explanations (the theory tyrant), as a way of understanding people, culture and society through personal experiences which ultimately contributes to a better way of living. It is necessary to first distinguish between what *Auto*ethnography is, and what *Auto*ethnography does.

Deciphering the term Autoethnography

To understand what *Auto*ethnography is, we must separate the term into three components i.e. *Auto*-ethno-graphy, to demonstrate and emphasize the relevance of each. We are no strangers to the word ethnography and its meaning; however, ethnography's connection to the personal pronoun *Auto* distinguishes it as a new category. I am emphatic that *Auto* and ethno combined are the most fundamental aspects of *Auto*ethnography, as both a method of research and as a form of presentation. The word *Auto* here means Self, My Own, or I, and in the context of Anthropology, we are speaking about research that is investigating a phenomena that is culturally connected to oneself. Whether it be one's own culture, or a personal experience that has a cultural relevance, or one that reflects a cultural phenomenon through the lens of a personal experience. I have italicised the word *Auto* to highlight the extent of its significance in this context. As previously stressed, *Auto*ethnography is to

ethnography what Autobiography is to biography, but the perspective and the purpose of each is very different. Though some biographical data pertains and contributes to *Auto*ethnography, the priority is the purpose, element and relevance of the cultural stance, or impact as indicative of a cultural phenomenon. This is a distinguishing feature of *Auto*ethnography in an Anthropological context.

Autoethnography: a morphed genre

*Auto*ethnography emerged on the tail of a change (and crisis) within Anthropology, especially following the classical analyses by Clifford, Fischer and Marcus (1978). A change in approach and presentation emerged. As previously mentioned it was differently designated 'Anthropology at Home'. Anthropology found itself in a period of transition. Subsequently, Gordon and Behar (1990s) highlighted the need for consideration of the female perspective. One notable transition, which involved a shift in focus and perspective, came in the late 1990s and at the outset of the New Millennium from Carolyn Ellis, Art Bochner, Norman Denzin and a number of their cohorts, collectively known here as the Walnut Creek Group in Sociology. These contributed to the emergence of a new *Auto*ethnographic technique. For the Walnut Creek Group, conventional research methods and methods of presentation did not sufficiently address social, cultural and personal phenomenon; nor did they address questions or problems at the core of society, which could offer a new understanding of how we exist in the world. *Auto*ethnography was reintroduced as a way of addressing deficiencies in formal quantitative conventional methods, or the 'something missing' from research and representation. The concept of *Auto*ethnography originally came from Anthropology, but took on a different guise in this context, where the self-experience and the personal became the central focus for the researcher. This reflective experiential graph of the personal, social and cultural, with the 'self' as a central exponent of the research, opened up new foci for the researcher. Eventually, *Auto*ethnography assumed an essentially existential flavour, although rarely mentioned. This contributed to the search for meaning in life as espoused by Michael Jackson. This resurrected the following questions: what is *Auto*ethnography? What does *Auto*ethnography do?

From Historical to New Definitions of Autoethnography

Throughout the thesis, we noted there are many different ways to define *Auto*ethnography. *Auto*ethnography, was intended and seen initially, and perhaps over simplistically considered, as the Study of One's Own Culture, as defined by Mary Louise Pratt, Deborah-Reed-Danahay, David Hayano and Anthony Jackson to name but a few. *Auto*ethnography, is not an unknown entity, though not coined as such; in fact, many

Indigenous Ethnographers, under the Boasian tradition of 'salvage ethnography' captured the essence of *Auto*ethnography while studying their own communities. These include Ella Cara Deloria, Christine Quintasket and Zora Neale Hurston. The concept captures perfectly Malinowski's anticipation that Anthropology would come full circle when researchers began to study 'home'.

Pratt's definition of *Auto*ethnography as the Study of One's Own Culture can imply two things: either the Study of One's Own Culture in response to observations and critiques of outside researchers, or the highlighting of particular cultural phenomena from an insider's personal experiential perspective. David Hayano was more concerned with the method of *Auto*ethnography and the benefit it brings to Anthropology. Deborah Reed-Danahay is enthused by this new way of looking at culture and combines three different perspectives. She suggests that an *Auto*ethnographer is i) a native anthropologist, writing ii) an ethnic iii) autobiographical ethnography. Some contemporary definitions include those of Tony Adams and Jacquelyn Collinson. Collinson coined the term *Auto*phenomenology or Autophenomenography. Both Adams and Collinson have portrayed *Auto*ethnography as something where personal experience better illuminates general cultural phenomena like anorexia. Such an experience can stifle or deny certain people and their stories. The complexities of these definitions are determined by whether or not *Auto*ethnography is identified as a research method, or as a method of representation but they also provide us with a greater understanding of the potential of *Auto*ethnography as a new methodological approach.

*Auto*ethnographers' shift their in-depth analysis of the lived experience towards the culture end of the auto-ethno spectrum. François Lionnet best encapsulates the mood of *Auto*ethnography as she recounts Zora Neale Hurston's *Dust Tracks* as an 'an-anarchic style' (emphasis added). She further intimates that Hurston's was a study that was not strictly by the book or composed within any singular set of rules of ethnography. Looking at *Auto*ethnography in 'new contexts', the inclusion of emotion or personal intimate awareness of the phenomenon is highly prevalent [emphasis added]. *Auto*ethnography offers an insight into a cultural phenomenon not previously engaged with, or understood, and can act as a response to an underappreciated or previously misrepresented phenomena. In this 'new context', *Auto*ethnography addresses phenomena rarely ever spoken about in a cultural context, and serves as a representative of a society's issues and dilemmas. For example, in Ireland, we now have murder-suicides. Unfortunately, it is not possible to get the victim's perspective on the matter, but disclosure by close relatives on their particular experience may contribute to an improved societal response and assist those coming from a similar experience. In an effort to clarify what exactly we mean by the term *Auto*ethnography, I have proposed a

New Definition

> *"Autoethnography is the study and critique of culture or culture phenomena, using the 'self' as resource, subject and means of research, to understand one's own personal and cultural behaviour and consequently understand human behaviour, culture and cultural phenomena, ultimately making research and life more meaningful. Furthermore, it is useful to note Autoethnography is to ethnography what Autobiography is to biography" (Cluxton-Corley, 2016).*

*Auto*ethnographic research addresses the perpetual desire to examine the role and place of the self, and the place of others too, and understanding life, through thoroughly deep investigation. Equally, there is also a clear quest to find meaning. At times, it can reach to the very soul of the researcher and society. In that sense, *Auto*ethnography addresses the philosophical/theological vein of Anthropology.

Thesis Findings: Categories of *Auto*ethnography

Visibility of self; strong reflexivity; vulnerability; engagement; open-endedness or resistance to conclusion, have been identified as the criteria for *Auto*ethnography. These criteria address issues not previously addressed or excluded from the scientific restrictive conventional route, to contribute to existing knowledge and evoke a response from the audience and writing to right. In its essence, *Auto*ethnography fits two types: Analytic and Evocative. Analytic *Auto*ethnography is a view of a culture from a member's perspective, and despite the 'self' being implicated in the research, it is not specifically about the individual but his/her culture. Evocative *Auto*ethnography is more personal and confessional. These perspectives often provide an insight into situations that dwell beneath, or are silenced. These insights very often relate to sensitive social issues, like eating disorders, failed relationships, or coping with specific illness, either mental or physical.

Using these criteria as a base line, and having appraised and evaluated the different definitions of *Auto*ethnography, I identified four categories in which *Auto*ethnography proved most suitable. Firstly, the Study of One's Own Culture (the emic perspective), whether it be to redress an outside (etic) perspective, or to highlight a current cultural phenomenon experienced from within. The reader or outsider benefits by understanding the culture more easily. This was particularly apparent in the work of Deloria, Quintasket and Hurston. These women are representative of grossly misunderstood and maligned races. Their writings demonstrate the value of the insider's story to allay any misconceptions and explain unknown cultural phenomena, such as the Sundance in Deloria's case, and Voodoo in Hurston's case. Because the stringencies of academic theoretical criteria did not serve their purpose, these writers used the novel as their *modus operandi*. For this reason, in the academic field their work met with scant regard.

The second category is the Study of One's Own Culture Once Removed, also known as Second Generation *Auto*ethnography or Ethnic Identity Ethnography (Fischer, 1986). This applies to instances in which the researcher glimpses into family history or heritage in an effort to comprehend their identity and their place in the world. Barbara Myerhoff is but one example of someone who is anxious to understand his or her own identity, and what better way to do it than by listening to those more experienced than oneself. Her original intention was to examine the lives of elderly people, but because her focus group were Jewish, and because she was of Jewish descent, her research turned in a different direction. Her work is *Auto*ethnographical as she is personally involved and central to her research. She is constantly reflecting on the usefulness of her work, bringing it back to understanding elderly people, to the experience of elderly immigrants in the USA, their past, and to their

circumstances. She also reflects on how such circumstances affected her parents, and how society was not necessarily conducive to them, or by extension to her own life. In the end, Myerhoff was prompted to consider how she would be an old lady someday. This *Auto*ethnographic perspective can be very effective as it evokes empathy, sympathy and understanding. It is also very topical in light of current world refugeeism and immigration.

The third category is the Anthropologists *Auto*ethnography, as seen through the work of Jean Briggs, which explores practices within the discipline of Anthropology itself. Through this method, the Anthropologist is investigating/researching/representing their experience within their own discipline, and disclosing its challenges and triumphs as a method of research and presentation. These insights are particularly useful as they often highlight some negative aspects of *doing* Anthropology. Briggs is a prime example of someone who was out of their depth while doing their research. In highlighting the precariousness of the research site, she uncovers many things such as her own vulnerability, the problem of the language barrier, the difficulties that accompany being a long way from home, an appreciation of the Anthropologist's intrusiveness on a close-knit community. She also discussed how at odds this community was with her own, how she could not easily assimilate into this world, or into its patriarchal hierarchy, and the vulnerability of the Anthropologist and the place of emotions within research.

The fourth category, Self-Reflective Experiential *Auto*ethnography, is possibly the most intimate and sensitive of all, as it is an inquiry into a personal experience that has social and cultural implications, which in turn offers both an understanding and way of empathising with those who have had similar experiences. Carolyn Ellis writes about a personal relationship that covered the following facets: intergenerational relationships; relationships that threatened professional status; dealing with the dependency of an ill partner, and all that entails. Providentially entitled *Final Negotiations*, Ellis's text emphasises how we negotiate personal, social and cultural phenomena on a daily basis.

*Auto*ethnographic Researchers take a position on the assemblage of elements such as self-reflection, self-awareness, emotions, empathy, introspection, contemplation and sharing experiences, which are significant to the research. Assuming this position, and adopting these elements opens up a new sphere of research that is not just about superficially understanding culture, and human behaviour on a practical level, but also about exploring towards understanding one's own position in the world.

Earlier we reflected on essential components of *Auto*ethnography such as Self, the Emotions and Empathy, Introspective Interpretive *Auto*ethnography, Contemplative and Existential Anthropology, as highlighted by Geertz, Lutz/White, Denzin and Jackson. Including the Anthropology of Emotions in Anthropological research, brings it to yet another

level: noting how emotion is perceived within academia, and its role within the individual's position and performance within society. *Auto*ethnography is central to emotion interpretation and emotion is often central to *Auto*ethnography.

Critiques of Autoethnography and Autoethnographers

The criticism of *Auto*ethnography, and in particular the work of Deloria and Zora Neale Hurston, demonstrates two important things: in the immediate sense, it highlights the patriarchal nature of the Anthropology hierarchy at that time, but it also highlights how this hierarchy influenced methods of inquiry and representation. Despite the fact that Franz Boas encouraged women into Anthropology, few received real academic acclaim except perhaps Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead. There is some debate concerning whether or not women write Anthropology differently, and consequently whether *Auto*ethnography might suit them better. This discussion is beyond the scope of this study. However, Elizabeth Etorre is already addressing it in her text, *Autoethnography as Feminist Method: Sensitising the feminist 'I'* (2017).

Responses to Hurston's work varied. On the one hand, it received a positive reception from female Anthropologists, who found it alerted them to their own position within the discipline. Hurston's work is to be admired on many levels, not least her style of writing, her openness and honesty, her forthrightness and her willingness to disclose her own vulnerability, position and that of her fellow Black South Americans. On the other hand, many male critics took Hurston to task, particularly in the literary scene and beyond the field of Anthropology. One specific criticism was her use of the term 'lies'. What Hurston meant was as an insider she understood the 'blάs' (Irish term), or local idioms, not readily appreciated by an outsider. As Hurston declared, it was due to her training as an Anthropologist, and her use of the 'spyglass of Anthropology', that she was better positioned to give an insight into her community and culture. This exemplifies how beneficial it can be when a trained Anthropologist carries out *Auto*ethnography.

One of the most interesting things I found in my research is Victor Turner's (1978) vision, which can be neatly summarised by his suggestion that "New theoretical wine requires new presentational bottles", as it encapsulates concisely what is going on in *Auto*ethnography. Victor Turner also used M.V. Srinivas' 'thrice born concept' to explain what should happen to an Anthropologist to become a full fledgling [emphasis added]. The idea is that the Anthropologist begins (orientation) within their own community, they then move outside their box, having trained in the skills of observation and research, to observe a different society (disorientation) through the 'Spyglass of Anthropology'. Finally, when they return to their own environment they are equipped to make observations of it (re-orientation). However, Turner suggested that few reach the third stage, and that they therefore do not

actually do *Auto*ethnography. Zora Neale Hurston, Ella Cara Deloria and Barbara Myerhoff achieved this, and Ellis brought reorientation a step further by introducing the self-reflective introspective research mode. This includes emphasising the fact that emotion in research is particularly challenging, as the boundaries and elements are not as distinctive or as easily identifiable, and we know emotional situations differ from society to society.

Specific claims why Autoethnography is/is not valuable and effective

As with any mode of research or representation, *Auto*ethnography has its advantages and disadvantages, which revert to the aim and purpose of a research problem. One of the chief advantages of *Auto*ethnography is recognisable when ethnographies and *Auto*ethnographies are compared as we saw in the in an Irish context. We realise the advantages of the insider view working in conjunction with the outsider view, to offer a more comprehensive understanding of a culture or of a cultural phenomenon. The outsider, using the Spyglass of Anthropology, often registers something overlooked or taken for granted by the insider. The insider has the advantage of having intimate knowledge of a particular phenomenon, as these phenomena are often completely misunderstood, or misrepresented, by the outsider. We can appreciate the counterbalance, as the emic view often encapsulates something disregarded or missed by the etic view and vice versa.

*Auto*ethnography has been criticised for being narcissistic, self-indulgent, navel-gazing solipsism. *Auto*ethnography has been perceived as too emotive, and as an unreliable source of information; one not grounded in any scientific or quantitative basis. The practice of *Auto*ethnography hampered academic achievement, recognition, progress, or tenure and for these very reasons has been avoided. In addition, *Auto*ethnography has been resisted, because being deeply personal, it can be emotionally challenging for the researcher. Some researchers are disinclined to expose their personal vulnerabilities. Indeed, for these reasons I have postponed writing my own *Auto*ethnography and sought to understand the genre better before commencing on work of that nature. *Auto*ethnography also has serious ethical implications, given that frequently there are many others, apart from the self, implicated in the research. These might include family members, spouses, partners, parents, children, relatives, friends and enemies. Where *Auto*ethnographies are poorly written, criticism may be justified, especially those with no ethical consideration. Like a tattoo, elements of an *Auto*ethnography are permanent and not easily erased. Similarly, there is a need for caution in the production of an *Auto*ethnography, because at some future date closely connected participants may read it. Paradoxically reading an *Auto*ethnography has often brought clarity to a situation. There is also a problem with natural bias in the sense of over or under self-promotion. *Auto*ethnography has the propensity for blatant opportunism to vent. *Auto*ethnography is evocative and one has to defend against whether the researcher/writer is

on a personal journey, which may not lend anything to understanding a general or specific cultural phenomenon. An *Auto*ethnography may be plainly evoking sympathy or simply attracting attention. However, poor practice can be an issue even in the most established fields of research.

*Auto*ethnography appears in many guises with benefits and limitations for those willing to participate in and practise it. Already in other disciplines such as education, medicine and geography *Auto*ethnography has become a mode of research and representation that has helped actors to understand their work in different ways and from different perspectives in order to gain new, deeper, richer, insights. While *Auto*ethnography should not be seen as an independent, all in one research method, it is a useful alternative mode of research and expression, for those for whom the quantitative purely scientific approach is either inadequate or inappropriate.

As a technique, *Auto*ethnography is rather difficult to apply due to its intense nature. It comprises many complications, not least those pertaining to consent and discretion. The possible outcomes of the research are extensive. One goal is to give life more meaning or make it better, which may prove to work well on a case-by-case basis. Those in the education and medical sectors, highlight general positive consequences of *Auto*ethnography, who see the benefits in using it as a teaching method.

Limitations of Research and Genre of Autoethnography

Research was limited for this thesis due to it not simply being an overview of *Auto*ethnographies per se, but an analysis of the method, and how it is perceived by those inside and outside the discipline. It is difficult to offer a concise definition of what *Auto*ethnography actually is or does, but as we have seen, we could distinguish between these things. In many ways, this was one of the key challenges of the thesis. As we have seen, there are numerous variables to consider when it comes to *Auto*ethnography's method, its focus and its purpose. It does not easily fit under one rubric, as it were; it is fluid and malleable and covers a range of issues and concerns. Most researchers suffer the same dilemma as my main exemplars, Deloria, Hurston, Myerhoff, Briggs and Ellis, with regard to deciding who and what to leave in, who and what to leave out, and where to draw the line on the research. In all of these cases, the *Auto*ethnographers had to eliminate almost half of their research.

When is an Autoethnography not an Autoethnography?

This is perhaps one of the challenging questions, as most texts read contain an inner message. However, in the context of *Auto*ethnography, a number of things may delimit a text

from being *Auto*ethnographical; the most obvious being if it does not reflect a cultural phenomenon from a personal perspective. Therefore, texts that are too biographical, or autobiographical, or solely focused on the personal life of the author without cultural context, are not *Auto*ethnography. Texts not specifically intended to relay a cultural phenomenon, but are only personal to the author, are not *Auto*ethnography. It is a rather fine, delicate line, but the deciding factor is obviously the cultural aspect. 'Insertion stories' are common in ethnographies but they are not specifically *Auto*ethnographies. An *Auto*ethnography should be telling me something that pertains to a cultural phenomenon, albeit through a self-reflective, introspective, personal experience. Not all *Auto*ethnographies have a 'happy ending' (or have an ending at all, as they capture a certain phenomenon at a particular period in time, and we rarely get to know what happens next), but they are indicative of societal dilemmas, and they may lead to an improved situation. As a methodological approach, *Auto*ethnography proves particularly successful if used for the understanding of a particular social dilemma, or as sources of information for government policy. An example of this could be the plight of refugees or immigrants. *Auto*ethnographies also offer a better understanding and way of life for the author, the researcher and reader collectively. This is the ultimate goal of *Auto*ethnography.

Anticipations of Autoethnography

From a vague and under examined concept with little supportive literature, *Auto*ethnography has become a phenomenon in itself. There are now numerous texts explaining the method, its process and progression, and its alternate genres, as in linear narrative, poetry, drama and art. As mentioned, *Auto*ethnographers are known to go where no researcher has gone before; thus, disclosing not only a new insight into a largely unknown cultural phenomenon, but a way to comprehend it. Currently, there is a whole plethora of *Auto*ethnographies using the *Auto*ethnographic method, addressing numerous social and personal issues, which are reflective of personal, social and cultural phenomenon. These include, but are not limited to relationships, as in adult-adult relationships, parent-child relationships, and divorce. They might also include various life stages, middle age, old age and coping with dependent relatives, illness and death. Other social and personal phenomena *Auto*ethnography examines are instances of psychological and physical abuse, drug and alcohol addictions, eating disorders and life choices like homosexuality. What we can look forward to in Anthropology through *Auto*ethnography is a more comprehensive perspective and evaluation of a cultural phenomenon because it will be from the inside track. This approach is especially prevalent in contemporary society where open disclosure of personal experience is the order of the day.

The scope for *Auto*ethnography is by no means exhausted; there are numerous areas within *Auto*phenomenography to be uncovered or disclosed. The strategies and modes of employing *Auto*ethnography also deserve further research whether they are linear, non-linear narrative, oral, aural or visual. *Auto*ethnography's future lies in its potential to supplement and complement existing research approaches to give better understanding and appreciation of human behaviour. *Auto*ethnography and self-narrative are useful tools for this research. Perhaps the rule of thumb should be the Atticus Principle from Harper Lee's (1960) *To Kill a Mocking Bird*:

> You never really understand a person until you … climb into his skin and walk around in it (Lee, 1960: 30).

Final Conclusion

*Auto*ethnography is fundamentally a L.I.M.B.Y., (Look in My Back Yard) perspective and process. The researcher chooses a topic very close to home and offers a comprehensive perspective on it. Within *Auto*ethnographic texts, the existential element is currently a relatively unremarked continuum, as most notably identified by Michael Jackson. Ellis, Bochner and their cohorts suggest *Auto*ethnography leads to a better way of being in the world, but that matter has yet to be comprehensively examined. However, I will refer back to my opening quote by Dustin Hoffman, and reiterate that stories do make an impact on the reader, and that personal reflection on lived experiences can improve one's understanding of the meaning of life, and make these lived experiences far better. In the words of Socrates, 'the unexamined life is not worth living' (Plato, *Socratic Dialogues,* Apology).

I do not envisage *Auto*ethnography to be the only or even the main method of research, or that it might displace or overwrite what has gone before. I believe it to be complementary and supplementary, and that it has its place, and serves a useful purpose in exposing and explaining many social issues often overlooked, under examined or misunderstood. Many of these issues, if properly recognised, comprehended, and shared in the right forum could lend themselves to the original purpose of Anthropology, which is of course to understand human behaviour and the edification of humankind towards the betterment of society.

Bibliography

AAA (2012) Statement of Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility, Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association. Available at: http://www.aaa.net.org/profdev/ethics/uplod/statement-on-ethics-principles-of-professional-responsibility.pdf. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Abu-Lughod, L. (1992) *Veiled Sentiments*. University of California Press.

Abu-Lughod, L. (1990) Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?. *Women and Performance: a journal of feminist theory,* 5 (1). Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07407709008571138?journalCode=rwap20. (Accessed 13/4/14).

Achebe, C. (1994[1958]) *Things Fall Apart*. London: Penguin.

Adams St. Pierre and Richardson, L., eds. (1990) Writing, A Method of Inquiry in Denzin, N. Lincoln, Y. eds. (1990) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research,* (Third Edition), London, Sage. Chapter 38.

Adams, T.E. (2014) Post-Coming Out Complications, In Boylorn R., and Orbe, M., (2014) eds. *Critical Autoethnography, Intersecting Cultural identities in Everyday Life*.Walnut Creek, CA. Ch. 3.

Adams, T.E., Holman-Jones, S. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013). *Handbook of Autoethnography,* Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.

Adams T. (2013) Introduction In: Adams, T.E., Holman-Jones, S. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography,* Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.

Adams, T.E., Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C., (2011). *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).

Adler, PA. and Adler, P. (1987) Membership Roles in Field Research Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications In: *Qualitative Research Guidelines Project*. Available at: http://www.quatres.org/Home memb-3649.html. (Accessed 6/6/15).

Allen, M., *Personal Interview*, (2006) In: Ellis, C., Adams, T.E. and Bochner, A.P., (2011). *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).

Allen-Collinson, J., (2013) *Auto*ethnography as the Engagement of Self/Other; Self/Culture, Self /Politics, Selves/Futures In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 13.

American Ethnologist's A.E. Forum, (2006). 33(4). Available through JSTOR at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40988874. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Anderson, L. (2006) Analytic *Auto*ethnography, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4) 373-396. Available at: http://intl-jce. sage.pubcom. (Accessed 3/12/14).

Anderson, L. and Glass-Coffin, B. (2013) I Learn By Going, *Auto*ethnographic Modes of Inquiry In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch.1.

Appell. G.N. (1978) *Ethical Dilemmas in Anthropological Inquiry: A Case Book*. Massachusetts: African Studies Association.

Ardener, E. (1975b) The "Problem" Revisited In: S. Arderner ed. Perceiving Women (1975) London: Malaby Press. 21-23 cited In: Wall, C.J., and Gannon-Leary, P. A sentence made by Men: Muted Group Theory Revisited In: *European Journal Women's Studies* (1999)6:21-29. Available at: http://www.brown.uk.com/brownlibrary/ETWS.html. (Accessed 6/6/15).

Barnard, A., and Spencer J., eds. (2002) *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* 3rd Edition, London: Routledge. 193-198.

Basso, K. (1996) *Wisdom Sits in Places,* New Mexico: University Press.

Basu, A. and Dutta, M.J. (2013) Negotiating Our Postcolonial Selves, From the Ground to the Ivory Tower In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 5.

Baxter-Magolda, M. (2009) *Authoring Your Life: Developing an Internal Voice to Navigate Life's Challenges*. Virginia: Stylus Publishing.
Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995*) Women Writing Culture*. University of California Press.
Behar, R. (1995) Introduction: Out of Exile In: Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995*) Women Writing Culture*. California: University of California Press.1-29.
Behar, R. (1995) Writing in My Father's Name: A Diary of *Translated Woman's* First Year In: Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995*) Women Writing Culture*. California: University of California Press. Ch. 3.
Behar, R. (1996) *The Vulnerable Observer*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Behar, R. (1993) *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Benedict, R. (1948) Anthropology and The Humanities, *American Anthropology*, 50 (1) http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/aa.1948.50.4.02a00020/pdf. (Accessed 2/4/14).
Berry, K. (2013), Spinning *Auto*ethnographic Reflexivity, Cultural Critique, and Negotiating Selves In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 9.
Bochner, A.P. (2014) *Coming to Narrative: A Personal History of Paradigm Change in the Human Sciences*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.
Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C., (2014), *We Can Tell You Stories: Politics, Pleasure and Pain in Qualitative Inquiry*, The Fourth Israeli Interdisciplinary Conference of Qualitative Research [video online]. Available at: ICQM http://www.youtube.com/ published 23/4/2014. (Accessed August 2015).
Bochner, A.P. (2013), Putting Meanings into Motion, *Auto*ethnography's Existential Calling In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Section 1, Introductory Ch.50-56.
Bochner, A.P., Ellis, C. and Adams, T.E., (2011). *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).
Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C., eds. (2002) *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.
Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C., eds. (1996) Composing *Ethnography, Alternative Forms of Qualitative Writing*. Walnut Creek CA: Alta Mira Press.
Bohannon L. (aka Eleanore Bowen Smith) (1964 [1954]) *Return To Laughter*. New York: First Anchor Books, Random.
Boylorn R. and Orbe, M., eds. (2014) *Critical Autoethnography, Intersecting Cultural identities in Everyday Life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Brettel, C.B. (1997) Blurred Genres and Blended Voices: Life History, Biography, *Auto*biography, and the *Auto*/Ethnography of Women's Lives In: Reed-Danahay, D. ed. (1997) *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Oxford, UK: Berg. Ch.9.
Briggs, C.L. (1984) Learning How to Ask: Native Meta communicative Competence and the Incompetence of Fieldworkers. L*anguage in Society*. 13(1)1-28. Available at: http://journals.cambridge.org/article_S0047404500015876. (Accessed 10 /1/14).
Briggs, J. (1970) *Never in Anger*, *Portrait of an Eskimo Family*. Harvard University Press.
Briggs, J. http://www.mun.ca./anthro/facultystaff/briggs.php. (Accessed 2/10/13).
Buzard, J. (2003) On *Auto*ethnographic Authority. *Yale Journal of Criticism,* 16, (1) 61-91.Yale University and John Hopkins University Press. Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/yale_journal_of_criticism/v016/16.1buzard.html. (Accessed 6/2/12).
Carless, D. and Douglas, K., (2013) A History of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry In: Holman -Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 2.
Cesara, M. (1982) *Reflections of a Woman Anthropologist: No Hiding Place*. London: Academic Press.
Chang, H. (2013) Individual and Collaborative *Auto*ethnography as Method, A Social Scientist's perspective, In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 3.
Chang, H. (2008) *Autoethnography as Method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Chang, H. (2008) *Auto*ethnography as Method, Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast in *Project Muse,* Biography, Vol.32, No. 2, Spring 2009, Review by Carolyn Ellis. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/biography/v032/32.2.ellis.html. (Accessed 25/4/10).
Chatterjee, P. (1993) *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Post Colonial Histories*. US: Princeton University.
Charmaz, K. (1993) *Good Days, Bad Days: The Self and Chronic Illness in Time*. US: Library of Congress.
Chiu, J. (2004) "I Salute the Spirit of my Communities": *Auto*ethnographic innovations in Hmong American literature. *College Literature* 31(3). Available at: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/lit/summary/vo31/31.3chiu.html. (Accessed 1/4/2009).
Christakis N.A. and Fowler J. H. (2011) *Connected The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives -- How Your Friends' Friends' Friends Affect Everything You Feel, Think, and Do*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
Clandinin, D.J. and Connelly, F.M. (2000) *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story In Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. E., eds. (1986) *Writing Culture, the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* University of California Press.
Clifford, J. (1983) On Ethnographic Authority. *Representations (2)118-146*.Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2928386. (Accessed 3/7/12).
Clough, P. (2008) The Affective Turn, Political Economy, Biomedia and Bodies. Theory, Culture and Society, 25(1)1-22. Available at: http;//www.academia.edu/41/70245 AffectiveTurn. (Accessed 17/5/15).
Cohen, M. ed. (2015) Introduction In*: Novel Approaches to Anthropology: Contributions to Literary Anthropology*.U.K. Lexington.
Connelly, F.M and Clandinin, D.J. (2000) *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story In Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Conquergood, D. (2002) *Performance Studies Interventions and Radical Research. TDR* 46(2)145-156. Available at: www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/105420402320980550. (Accessed 6/6/15).
Conrad, J. (1994) [1902], *Heart of Darkness,* London, Penguin.
Dauphinee, E. (2010). The ethics of *Auto*ethnography. *Cambridge Journals, Review of International Studies*.36 (3) July pps.799-818. Available at: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/dispalyFulltext?type=6&fid=7. (Accessed 4/5/14).
Davis C. (1999*) Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London and New York: Routledge.
Deck, A. (1990) *Auto*ethnography: Zora Neale Hurston, Noni Jabavu, & Cross Disciplinary Discourse. *Black American Literatures Forum,* 24(2)237-256. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3041706. (Accessed 13/4/14).
Delamont, S. (2009) The only honest thing: *Auto*ethnography, reflexivity and small crises in fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education* 4(1) 51-63. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17457820802703507. (Accessed 27/5/15).
Deloria, E.C. (2009) [1988] *Waterlily*. USA: University of Nebraska Press.
Deloria, E.C. (1998) [1944] *Speaking of Indians*. USA: University of Nebraska Press.
Denzin, N. (2014) *Interpretive Autoethnography*. USA: Sage.
Denzin, N. (2013) Interpretive *Auto*ethnography In: Holman- Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 4.
Denzin, N. (2003) *Performative Ethnography, Critical Pedagogy and The Politics of Culture*. US: Sage.
Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. eds. (2003) *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief*. Walnut Creek CA: Alta Mira Press.
Doloriert, C. and Sambrook, S. (2011) Accommodating an *Auto*ethnographic PhD: The Tale of the Thesis, the Viva Voce, and the Traditional Business School. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 40 (5)582-615. Available at: http://jce.sagepub.com/content/40/5/582.full.pdf+html . (Accessed 20/7/15).
Douglas, K. and Carless, D. (2013) A History of *Auto*ethnographic Inquiry In: Holman Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013). *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 2.

Duranti, A. (2010) Husserl, intersubjectivity and anthropology, *Anthropological Theory,* Sage, 10, (1), 1-20. Available at: http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/anthro/faculty/duranti/Husserl-Intersubject-AT.pdf. (Accessed 2/1/16).
Dutta, M.J., Basu, A., (2013) Negotiating Our Postcolonial Selves, From the Ground to the Ivory Tower In: Holman Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 5.
Duarte, F. (2007). Using *Auto*ethnography in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Reflective Practice from 'the Other Side of the Mirror'. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 1(2). http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl. (Accessed 13/4/14).
De las Casas, B. (1999 [1542]) A *Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*. Translated by N. Griffin. London: Penguin.
DeMallie, R. (2009) Afterword In: E.C. Deloria, *Waterlily,* USA: University of Nebraska Press.
Ehn, B., Lȍgfren, O. (2007) Emotions in Academia In: Wulff, H. ed. (2007) *The Emotions, A Cultural Reader*. New York: Berg Publishers. Ch.8.
Ellis, C. (2009) Revision*: Autoethnographic Reflections on Life and Work*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Ellis, C. (2007) Telling Stories, Revealing Lives: Relational Ethics in Research with Intimate Others *Qualitative Inquiry*. 13(1) 3-29. Available at: http://online.sagepub.com. (Accessed 16/1/15).
Ellis, C. (2006) PhD, Qualitative Methods, Emotions, *Auto*ethnography. Course: Communicating Illness, Grief and Loss, Fall 2006.Available at: http: //web3.cas.usf.edu/main/depts. /com//ellis/ (Accessed 25/4/10).
Ellis, C. (2004) *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.
Ellis, C. (1995) Final *Negotiations: A Story of Love, Loss, and Chronic Illness*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Ellis, C. (1995) Emotional and Ethical Quagmires in Returning to the Field. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*.24 (1) 68-98. Available at: DOI.10.1177089124195024001003. (Accessed 16/1/15)
Ellis, C. (1991) Sociological Introspection and Emotional Experience. *Symbolic Interaction* [online] 14(1)23-50. Available at: http://libweb.maynooth.ie/library/ejournals. (Accessed 14/8/15).
Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P., (2014) *We Can Tell You Stories: Politics, Pleasure and Pain in Qualitative Inquiry*. , The Fourth Israeli Interdisciplinary Conference of Qualitative Research [video online]. Available at: ICQM http://www.youtube.com/ published 23/4/2014. (Accessed 14/8/15).
Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P., eds. (2002) *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics,* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P., eds. (1996) *Composing Ethnography: Alternative Forms of Qualitative Writing*. Walnut Creek CA: AltaMira Press.
Ellis, C., Adams, T.E. and Holman-Jones, S., eds. (2013). *Handbook of Autoethnography,* Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.
Ellis, C., Adams, T.E. and Bochner, A.P. (2011) *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).
Edwards, B. (1996) How The West Was Wondered: County Clare and Directions in Irish Ethnography, Folklore Forum 27(2):65-78. Available at: https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/2223/27%282%29%2065-78.pdf?sequence=1. (Accessed 4/1/16).
El-Tom, A. (2011) Study *War No More*. New Jersey: Red Sea Press.
Fassin. D. (2006) *The* end of ethnography as collateral damage of ethical regulation? *American Ethnologist,* 33(4) 522-524. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098882. (Accessed 2/2/13).
Finn, J.L. (1995) Ella Cara Deloria and Mourning Dove: Writing for Cultures, Writing Against The Grain In: Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995*) Women Writing Culture,* California: University of California Press. Ch. 6.
Finn, J. (2000) Walls and Bridges: Cultural mediation and the Legacy of Ella Deloria *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 21, (3) 158-182. Available at: http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/4037012/walls-bridges-cultural-mediation-legacy-ella-deloria. (Accessed 4/5/14).

Fish, S. (1980) Is *there A Text in This Class, (the Authority of Interpretive Communities*), Harvard UP.
Fischer, M. M.J. and Marcus G.E., eds. (1996[1986]) 2nd Edition. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique, An Experimental Moment in the Social Sciences*. University of Chicago Press.
Fischer, M.M.J. (1986) Ethnicity and the Post Modern Arts of Memory In: Marcus G.E. and Clifford, J., eds. (1986) *Writing Culture, The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press. 194-233.
Flower, R. (1985 [1944]) The *Western Island,* Oxford University Press.
Fluehr-Lobban, C. (2002) A Century of Ethics and Professional Anthropology. *Anthropology News*. 43(3) 20. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/an.2002.43.3.20/epdf. (Accessed 16/1/15).
Foley, R. (2013). *Geographical Perspectives on Ethnography*, Unpublished paper presented at: Ethnography Winter School, Maynooth University, January 2013.
Foreman, P. G. (1990) 'Looking back from Zora, or Talking out Both Sides of my Mouth for Those Who have two Ears'. *Black American Literature Forum/ Women Writers Issue* 24(4). Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/3041794: (Accessed 11/7/15).
Foster, K., Mc Allister, M. and O'Brien, L. (2005). Coming to ethnography: A mental health nurses' experience. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 4(4) Article 1. Available at: http://wwww.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_4/pdf/foster.pdf. (Accessed 29/8/15).
Fowler J. H. and Christakis N.A. (2011) *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives -- How Your Friends' Friends' Friends Affect Everything You Feel, Think, and Do*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
Frank, G. (1995) The Ethnographic Films of Barbara G. Myerhoff: Anthropology, Feminism, and the Politics of Jewish Identity In: Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995) *Women Writing Culture*. California: University of California Press. Chapter 10.
Gardner, S. (2009) Introduction In: E.C. Deloria, *Waterlily*. USA: University of Nebraska Press.
Geertz, C. (2004) Interview with Alan Mac Partlane (Parts 1 and 2) 5 May 2004. Cambridge. Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3dQDx3axrDS. (Accessed 20/7/15).
Geertz, C. (1995) *After the Fact: Two Countries, Four Decades, One Anthropologist*. Cambridge Mass. Harvard University Press.
Geertz, C. (1974) "From the Native's Point of View": On the nature of Anthropological Understanding. *Bulletin of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences,* 28(1)26-45. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/3822971. (Accessed 3/7/12).
Geertz, C. (1973) *Interpretation of Cultures*. US: Basic Books.
Gilbourne, D. and Marshall, P. (2013) Writing Forms: Glimpses on The Essence of Self, In: Short, N.P., Grant, A. and Turner, L., eds. (2013) *Contemporary British Autoethnography*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. Ch. 10.
Gillam, L. and Guilleman, M. (2004) 'Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 10, 261-280. Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/contents/refs/10/2/261. (Accessed 27/5/10).
Glass-Coffin, B. and Anderson, L. (2013) I Learn By Going, *Auto*ethnographic Modes of Inquiry In: Holman- Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Goffman, E. (1990[1959]) *The Presentation of Self In Everyday Life*. London: Penguin.
Gordon, D. and Behar, R., eds. (1995) *Women Writing Culture*. University of California Press.
Grant, A., Short, N.P. and Turner, L., eds. (2013). *Contemporary British Autoethnography*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Greenhalgh, S. (2001) *Under the Medical Gaze*. University of California Press.
Grupetta, M. (2004) *Autophenomenography? Alternatives uses of Autobiographically based research,* Paper presented AARE Conference, Melbourne, Australia (2004). Available at: http://www.academia.edu/1986604/*Auto*phenomenography_Alternative_uses_of_*Auto*graphically_based_research. (Accessed 6/5/15).
Harding, M. (2014) *Hanging with the Elephant*. Ireland: Hachette Books.
Hayano, D. (1979). *Auto*ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects, *Human Organisation,* Vol.38 99-104. Available at: ce.sagepub.com/content/35/4/373. (Accessed 5/5/14).
Heaton-Schresta, C. (2007) Emotional Apprenticeships: reflection on the role of academic practice in the 'construction' of the field, *Anthropology Matters,* (9)1.Available at: www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/.../100. (Accessed 9/3/14).

Heilbrun, C.G. (1999) Contemporary Memoirs: Or, who cares who did what to whom? *American Scholar*, (30) Summer. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41212901. (Accessed 7/2/14).
Handbook of Autoethnography, (2013) Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Hernández, G. (1995) Multiple Subjectivities and Strategic Positionality: Zora Neale Hurston's Experimental Ethnographies In: Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995*) Women Writing Culture*. California: University of California Press. Ch. 7.
Hernandez, K.A. and Ngunjiri, F.W. (2013) Relationships and Communities in *Auto*ethnography In: Holman-Jones., Adams, T.E. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography,* Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.
Hoffman D. (2011) Sky TV advertisement.
Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T.E. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013). *Handbook of Autoethnography,* Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.
Holman-Jones, S. (2005). *Auto*ethnography: Making the personal political In: Denzin N. K. and Lincoln Y. S., eds. (2005) Handbook *of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 763-791.
Holsberg, C.S. (1980) Review Number Our Days, B. Myerhoff, in *American Anthropologist* 82(1) 151. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/aa.1980.82.1.02a00360/pdf. (Accessed 14/7/15).
Holt, N. L., (2003) Representation, Legitimation, and *Auto*ethnography: An *Auto*ethnographic Writing Story. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 2(1). Available at: http://www.ualberta.ca˜iiqm/backissues/2_1/html/holt.html. (Accessed 25/4/10).
Hurston, Z. N. (1995 [1935]) Mules and Men In: Wall, C.A., ed. (1995) *Hurston, Folklore, Memoirs, & Other Writings*. New York: The Library of America.
Hurston, Z. N. (1995 [1938]) Tell My Horse In: Wall, C. A., ed. (1995) *Hurston, Folklore, Memoirs, & Other Writings*. New York: The Library of America.
Hurston, Z. N. (1995 [1942]) Dust Track on a Road In: Wall, C. A., ed. (1995) *Hurston, Folklore, Memoirs, & Other Writings*. New York: The Library of America.
Iser, W. (1978) *The Act of Reading*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP.
Jackson, A. ed. (1987) *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock.
Jackson, M. (2014[2002]) *The Politics of Storytelling, Variations on a Theme by Hannah Arendt*. 2nd edition. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
Jackson, M. (2013) *Lifeworlds, Essays in Existential Anthropology*. University of Chicago Press.
Jackson, M. (2009) *The Palm at the End of the Mind*. Duke University Press.
Jackson, M. (2005) *Existential Anthropology: events, exigencies, and effects*. Oxford: Berghan Books.
Jago, B.J. (2002) Chronicling Academic Depression. *Journal of contemporary Ethnography* 31(6) 729-757. Available at: jca.sagepub.com. (Accessed 26/7/15).
Kanaaneh, M. (1997), The "Anthropologicality" of Indigenous Anthropology, *Dialectical Anthropology* 22:1-21. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Available at: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1006815109475#page-1. (Accessed 20/7/15).
Karinthy F. (1929) Chain *Links* [Láncszemek] Available at: https://djjr-courses.wdfiles.com/local--files/soc180%3Akarinthy-chain-links/Karinthy-Chain-Links_1929.pdf (Accessed 20/7/15)
Kim, C. S. (1990) "The Role of the Non-Western Anthropologist Reconsidered: Illusion versus Reality". *Current Anthropology,* 31(2), 196. Available at: http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/toc/ca/1990/31/2. (Accessed 20/7/15).
King-O'Riain, R. (2013) Presentation at Ethnography Winter School, Maynooth University, January 2013.
Kleinman, A. (2007) Review: M. Jackson (2005) Existential Anthropology: events, exigencies, and effects. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.),*13, 477-522. Available at: (Accessed 10/9/15).
Kleinman. A. (1988) *The Illness Narratives, Suffering, Healing and The Human Condition*. USA: Basic Books.
Landsberg, A. (1997) America, The Holocaust and the Mass Culture of Memory: Towards a Radical Politics of Empathy. *New German Critique* (71) Spring, Summer. Available at: (Accessed 27/5/15).

Lassiter, L.E. (2005) *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lederman, R. (2006) Introduction: Anxious borders between work and life in a time of bureaucratic ethics regulation. *American Ethnologist*. 33(4) 477- 481. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40988877. (Accessed 2/2/13).
Lee, H. (2004 [1960]) *To Kill a Mocking Bird*. Vintage, Random.
Lebech. M. (2015) *Private Conversation*. Dept. Of Philosophy, Maynooth University: 20/7/15.
Lebech, M. (2004) Study Guide to Edith Stein's Philosophy of Psychology and the Humanities Faculty of Philosophy, NUIM, Maynooth: Available at : http://eprints.maynoothuniversity.ie/393/1/Edith_Stein.pdf. (Accessed 20/7/15).
Lins Ribeiro, G. (2006) IRBs are the tip of the iceberg: State regulation, academic freedom, and methodological issues. A*merican Ethnologist,* 33(4) 529-531. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098884. (Accessed 2/2/13).
Lincoln, Y.S., and Denzin, N. eds. (2003) *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief*. Walnut Creek CA: Alta Mira Press.
Lionnet, F. (1989) *Auto*ethnography: The An-archic Style of Dust tracks on a Road in *Auto-biographical Voices: Race, Gender, Self-Portraiture*. Cornell University Press. Ch.3.
Lionnet, F. (1990) *Auto*ethnography: The An-archic Style of Dust tracks on a Road In: Gates Jnr., H.L., ed. (1990) *Reading Black, Reading Feminism: A Critical Anthology*. New York: Meridian. 382- 414.
Lȍgfren,O. and Ehn. B. (2007) Emotions in Academia In: Wulff, H. ed. (2007) *The Emotions, A Cultural Reader*. New York: Berg Publishers.Ch.8.
Lutkehaus, N.C. (1995) Margaret Mead And The "Rustling-Of-The-Wind-In-Palm-Trees School" of Ethnographic Writing In: Behar, R. and Gordon, D., eds. (1995*) Women Writing Culture*. California: University of California Press. Ch. 9.
Lutz, C. and White, G. (1986) The Anthropology of Emotions in *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 15:404-436. Available at: http://www.jstor.org.jproxy.nuim.ie/stable/2155767?pq-origsite=summon. (Accessed 2/2/14).
Malinowski, B. (1984 [1922]) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Illinois: Waveland.
Malinowski, B. (1989 [1967]) *Diary in the Strictest Sense of the Term*. University of Stanford Press.
Maguire, M., (2013) 'From the Door of My Tent I Could See Latour: Remarks on Anthropology, Universities and Jobs'. *Irish Journal of Anthropology,* Vol. 16(2) 0.
Marcus G.E. and Clifford, J., eds. (1986) *Writing Culture, the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press.
Marcus G.E. and Fischer, M. M.J., eds. (1996 [1986]) 2nd Edition. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique, An Experimental Moment in the Social Sciences*. University of Chicago Press.
Marshall, P. and Gilbourne, D. (2013) Writing Forms: Glimpses on The Essence of Self In: Short, N.P., Grant, A. and Turner, L., eds. (2013) *Contemporary British Autoethnography,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. Ch. 10.
Mead, M. (1959) *An Anthropologist at Work, Writings of Ruth Benedict*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Medicine, B. (1980) Ella C. Deloria: The Emic Voice. *Melus,* 7 (4) 23-30. Available at: http://www.jstor.org. (Accessed 13/4/15).
Mehan, H. and Woods, H., (1975) The Morality of Ethnomethodology. *Theory and Society*, 2 (4) 509-530. Available at: http://jstor.org. (Accessed 16/1/15).
Messenger, J. (1969) *Inis Beag, Isle of Ireland*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
Mikell G. (1982) When Horses Talk Back: Reflections on Zora Neale Hurston's Haitian Anthropology. *Phylon,* 43(3) 218-230. Available at: http://www.jstor.org. (Accessed 2/5/14).
Miller, Nancy K. (2000) "*But enough about me, what do you think of my memoir*?" The Yale Journal of Criticism 13 (2) 421-436. Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/yale_journal_of_criticism/v013/13.2miller.pdf. (Accessed 2/2/2014).
Morella-Pozzi, D. (2014) The (Dis) Ability Double Life: Exploring Legitimacy, Illegitimacy, and The Terrible Dichotomy of (Dis) Ability in Higher Education In: Boylorn R. and Orbe, M., eds. (2014) *Critical Autoethnography, Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.Ch.10.
Moriarty, J. (2014) Leaving The Blood In: Experiences with an *Auto*ethnographic Doctoral Thesis In: Grant, A. Short, N.P. and Turner, L., eds. (2013) *Contemporary British Autoethnography*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Moro, P. (2006) It takes a Dam Good Writer…A Review of the Ethnographic I. *Symbolic Interaction,* 29 (2) 265-269. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/si.2006.29.2.265/pdf. (Accessed 2/2/14).
Motzafi-Haller, P. (1997) Writing Birthright: On Native Anthropologists and the Politics of Representation In: Reed-Danahay, D. ed. (1997) *Auto/Ethnography Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Oxford, UK: Berg. Ch.8.
Myerhoff, B. (1978) *Number Our Days,* New York: E.P. Dutton.
Number Our Days. (1976) [Film/Documentary]. Directed by Lynne Littman. Public Broadcasting Corporation; Direct Cinema, Santa Monica, California.
In Her Own Time. (1986) [Film/Documentary]. Directed by Lynne Litmann and Barbara Myerhoff. Direct Cinema Limited. Sancta Monica California.
Mc Allister, M., Foster, K. and O'Brien, L. (2005). Coming to ethnography: A mental health nurses's experience. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 4(4) Article 1. Available at: http://wwww.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_4/pdf/foster.pdf. (Accessed 29/8/15).
Mc Mahon, B. (1974) translation Péig, *The Autobiography of Peig Sayers of the Great Blasket Island*. Dublin, Ireland: Talbot Press.
Mc Millan, S. and Price, M. (2010) 'Through the Looking Glass: Our *Auto*ethnographic Journey Through Research Mind-fields'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16 (2)140-147. Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/16/2/140.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 27/5/15).
Ní Ghrada M. (1995[1964]) *An Trial*, Gum, Ireland.
Narayan, K. (1993) How Native Is the "Native" Anthropologist. *American Anthropologist, New Series, 95*(3), 671-686. Available at: http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-7294%28199309%292%3A95%3A3%3C671%3AHNIA%22A%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z. . (Accessed 13/4/15).
Ngunjiri, F.W. and Hernandez, K., (2013) Relationships and Communities in *Auto*ethnography In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press. Ch. 12.
Oben, F.M. (2002) Edith Stein And The Science Of The Cross. Available at: http://piercedhearts.org/theology_heart/writings_on_saints_/edith_stein_cross.htm. (Accessed
Okely, J. (1987), Fieldwork up the M1: policy and political aspects In: Jackson A., ed. *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock.
Okely, J. and Callaway, H., eds. (1992) *Anthropology & Autobiography,* London: Routledge.
Orbe, M. and Boylorn R., eds. (2014) *Critical Autoethnography, Intersecting Cultural identities in Everyday Life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
O'Brien, L., Foster, K. and Mc Allister, M. (2005). Coming to ethnography: A mental health nurses's experience. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 4(4) Article 1. Available at http://wwww.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_4/pdf/foster.pdf. (Accessed 29/8/15).
O'Crohán, T. (2000 [1937, 1929]), *The Islandman*. Translated by R. Flower. Oxford University Press.
O'Súilleabhain, A. (2007[1979, 1936]) *Cín Lae Amhlaoibh* (*Diary of an Irish Countryman* 1827-1845) *Translated byT. De Bhaldraithe* .Cork: Mercier Press.

Panourgia, N. (2000) Review of Reed-Danahay, D., *Auto*/ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social. *American Ethnologist,* 27(2)551-553. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/5561178/*Auto*_ethnography_Rewriting_the_Self_and_the_Social. (Accessed 25/4/10).
Pathak, A. (2013) Musings on Post Colonial *Auto*ethnography, Telling the tale of/through my life In: Holman Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 30.
Patai, D. (1994) Sick and Tired of Scholars Nouveau Solipsism, Point of View, *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Vol. 23. Published 23/2/1994. (Accessed via Inter Library Request 4/5/14).
Peacock, J.L. (1997) The Future of Anthropology, *American Anthropologist, New Series* 99, (1) 9-17. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/682128. (Accessed 4/5/14).
Pelias, R. (2011) *Leaning: A Poetics of Personal Relations,* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Porter, N. (2004) CMA Methodology: *Auto*ethnography (Computer Mediated Anthropology), Available at: http://anthropology.usf.edu/cma/CMAmethodology-ae.htm. (Accessed 25/4/2010).

Powdermaker, H. (1966) *Stranger and Friend, The Way of an Anthropologist*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
Pratt, M.L. (2008 [1992] *Imperial Eyes, Travel Writing and Transculturation,* 2nd edition, New York: Routledge.
Pratt, M.L. (1991) Arts of the Contact Zone, *Profession,* 33-40. Available at: http://www.jstor.org (Accessed 7/10/13).
Pratt, M.L. (1986) Fieldwork in Common Places In: Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. E., eds. (1986) *Writing Culture, the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* University of California Press.27-50.
Price, M. and Mc Millan, S., (2010) 'Through the Looking Glass: Our *Auto*ethnographic Journey Through Research Mind-fields'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16 (2)140-147. Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/16/2/140.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 27/5/15).
Propp, K. (2014) *What is the Contemporary Memoir?* Available at*:* http://www.karenpropp.com/stories/memoir.htm. (Accessed 9/3/14).
Quintasket, C. (1981[1927]) *Co-Ge-We-A, The Half Blood: A Depiction of The Great Montana Cattle Range*. University of Nebraska Press.
Quintasket, C. (1990 [1933]) *Coyote Stories*. University of Nebraska Press.
Rabinow, P. (1986) Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology In: Clifford, J. and Marcus G.E., eds. (1986) *Writing Culture, the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press.
Rabinow, P. (1977) *Reflections of Fieldwork In Morocco,* University of California Press.
Rambo, C. (2007) Handing IRB an Unloaded Gun .*Qualitative Inquiry* 13(3).353-367. Available at*:* http://online.sagepub.com. Accessed 16/1/15).
Reed-Danahay, D. (2002) Sites of Memory: Women's *Auto*ethnographies from Rural France *Biography* 25.1 (2002) 95-109. Available at: http://muse.jhu.rdu/journals/biography.v025/25.1reed-danahay.html. (Accessed 25/4/10).
Reed-Danahay, D. (2000) *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*, Review by Neni Panourgia, American Ethnologist, Vol.27, No. 2, (May 2000), Wiley Blackwell, American Anthropology Association. (Accessed through JSTOR, 25/4/10).
Reed-Danahay, D. ed. (1997) *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
Richardson, L. (2007) Last *Writes, a daybook for a dying friend*. Walnut Creek CA. Left Coast Press.
Richardson, L. (2001). Getting Personal: Writing Stories, *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 14, 33-38. Available at: http://libweb.maynooth.ie/library/ejournals/. (Accessed 16/7/15).
Richardson, L. (1990) *Writing Strategies Reaching Diverse Audiences*. Sage Publications.
Riyeff, J. (2015) Homo Contemplans: The Order of the World, Gregorian Contemplative Anthropology, and old English Poetics *Viator* 46(1). Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1484/J.VIATOR.5.103498. Accessed via InterLibrary Maynooth University, 20/7/15).
Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. U.S.: Vintage Books.
Said, E. (1999) *Out of Place, A Memoir*. London: Granta.
Sambrook, S. and Doloriert, C., (2011) Accommodating an *Auto*ethnographic PhD: The Tale of the Thesis, the Viva Voce, and the Traditional Business School. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 40(5) 582-615. Available at: http://jce.sagepub.com/content/40/5/582.full.pdf+html . (Accessed 20/7/15).
Sayers, P. (1936, 1974) *Péig, A Scéal Féin*, Translated by B.Mc Mahon, Ireland: Talbot Press.
Schachter, J. (2009) Writing Lives: Ruth Benedict's Journey From Biographical Studies to Anthropology. *Pacific Studies* 32 (2/3) 348-366. Available at: https://ojs.lib.byu.edu/spc/index.php/PacificStudies/issue/view/2413.(Accessed 2/4/14).
Scheper-Hughes, N. (2001, [1977]) *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics* University of California: The Regents.
Scheper-Hughes, N. (2000) Ire in Ireland, *Ethnography,* 1(1), 117-140. Available at: https://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/methods/scheper-hughes.pdf. (Accessed 29/4/13).
Scheper-Hughes, N. (1992) *Death Without Weeping, The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Short, N.P., Turner, L. and Grant, A., eds. (2013) Contemporary *British Autoethnography,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Smith, B. (1999) The Abyss: Exploring Depression Through a Narrative of the Self *Qualitative Inquiry,* 5(2) 264-279). Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/5/2/264.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 6/6/15).
Smith, P. (1998) What Memoir Forgets, *The Nation*.30. (Accessed 9/3/14).
Sparkes, A. (2009) Novel ethnographic representations and the dilemmas of judgement, *Ethnography and Education,* 4(3) 301-319. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17457820903170119. (Accessed 13/8/15).
Spinney, J. (2006) A place of sense: A Kinaesthetic Ethnography of Cyclists on Mount Ventoux. *Environment & Planning D. Society & Space (2006)* 24. 709-732 Available at: DOI: 10.1068/d66j. (Accessed 6/6 2015).
Spry, T. (2011), *Body, Paper, Stage: Writing and Performing Autoethnography,* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Stacey, J, (1988) Can there be A Feminist Ethnography? *Women's Studies Int. Forum,* 11(1)21-27. Available at : http://researchmethodswillse.voices.wooster.edu/files/2012/01/Stacey.pdf. (Accessed 14/4/14).
Starr. L.J., (2010) The Use of *Auto*ethnography in Educational Research: Locating Who We Are in What We Do, *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education/Revue canadienne des jeunes chercheures et chercheurs en education*, 3(1). Available at: http://cjnse.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/ojs2/index.php/cjnse/article/viewFile/149/112. (Accessed 13/4/14).
Stocking Jnr., G.W. (2010) *Glimpses Into My Own Black Box: An Exercise in Self-Deconstruction (History of AnthropologyVol.12)*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Strathern, M. (1987) The limits of *Auto*-anthropology In: Jackson, A. ed. *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock.
Strathern, M. (2006) Don't eat unwashed lettuce, *American Ethnologist,* 33(4) 532-534. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098885. (Accessed 2/2/13).
Stein, E. (1988 [1964] [1916]) *On the Problem of Empathy: The Collected Works of Edith Stein*. (3rd.Volume). Translated by W. Stein. Washington: ICS Publications.
Sundar, N. (2006) Missing the ethical woods for the bureaucratic trees *American Ethnologist,* 33(4)535-537. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098886. (Accessed 2/2/13).
Tamas, S. (2011) *Life After Leaving: The Remains of Spousal Abuse*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.
Taylor.L. (1995) *Occasions of Faith, An Anthropology of Irish Catholics,* Ireland: Lilliput Press.
Tedlock, B. (2008) The Observation Of Participation And The Emergence of Public Ethnography In: Denzin, N. and Lincoln Y.S, eds. (2008) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry Research,* Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch. 5.
Tedlock, B. (1991) From Participant Observation to the Observation of Participation: The Emergence of Narrative Ethnography *Journal of Anthropological Research,* 47 (1) 69-94. Available at: http://www.rnld.org/sites/default/files/TedlockNarrativeEthnography1991.pdf. (Accessed 13/4/15).
Till, K. (2009) Ethnography in Kitchin and Thrift, *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Elsevier. 626-631. Available at: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780080449104004302. (Accessed 13/4/14).
Tolich, M. (2010) A Critique of Current Practice: Ten Foundational Guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers, *Qualitative Health Research*. Sage 20(12), 1599-1610. Available at: http://qhr.sagepub.com/content/20/12/1599.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 16/1/15).
Tomkins, J.P. ed. (1980) *Reader Response Criticism, from Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
Tullis. J.A., (2013) Self and Others: Ethics In *Auto*ethnographic Research In: Holman-Jones, S., Adams, T. and Ellis, C., eds. (2013) *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press. Ch.11.
Turkle, S. (2013) *Alone Together*. New York: Basic Books.
Turner, L., Short, N.P. and Grant, A., eds. (2013) *Contemporary British Autoethnography,* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Turner, V. (1978) Foreword In: B. Myerhoff, *Number Our Days*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
Turner, V. (1987) The *Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications.
Van Maneen, J. (1988) *Tales of The Field*. University of Chicago Press.

Visweswaran, K. (1988) Defining Feminist Anthropology In: Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. eds. (2003) *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief*. Walnut Creek CA: Alta Mira Press. Chapter 3.
Walker, A. (1983) *In Search of Our Mothers Gardens*. Florida: Harcourt Books.
Wall, C.A. ed. (1995) *Hurston, Folklore, Memoirs, & Other Writings* USA: Library of America.
Wallace, M. (1990) Who Owns Zora Neale Hurston?: Critics Carve Up the Legend", in *Invisibility Blues: From Pop to Theory,* New York. Verso. Ch. 20.
Warren, K.B. (1997) Narrating Cultural Resurgence: Genre and Self-Representation for Pan-Mayan Writers In: Reed-Danahay, D. ed. (1997) *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social',* Oxford, UK: Berg. Ch.1.
Waterston, A. (2014) *My Father's Wars, Migration, Memory, and the Violence of a Century*. New York: Routledge.
Wax, M.L. (1982) Research Reciprocity Rather than Informed Consent in Fieldwork In: J.E. Sieber, ed. (1982) *The ethics of Social research: Fieldwork, Regulation, and Publication*. New York: Springer-Verlag. Ch.2.
Wax, M. (1976) Introduction: The Plenary Address to 35th Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, *Human Organisation*, 35(4)331-333.
White, G. and Lutz. C. (1986) The Anthropology of Emotions in *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 404-436. Available at: http://www.jstor.org.jproxy.nuim.ie/stable/2155767?pq-origsite=summon. (Accessed 2/2/14).
William, J. (1999) The New Belletrism', *Style,* 33 (3) 414-42. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.33.3.414. (Accessed 2/2/14).
Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. Farnborough: Saxon House.
Wolf, D. (1993) Introduction: Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork. *Frontiers 13*(3)1-8.
Wolff-Michael, R. (2009) *Auto*/Ethnography and the Question of Ethics *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 10 (1, Art. 38) Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1213/2645. (Accessed 6/10/13).
Wulff, H. ed. (2007). *The Emotions, A Cultural Reader,* New York: Berg Publishers.

Web Sources:

AAA (2012) Statement of Ethics: Principles of Professional Responsibility, Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association. Available at: http://www.aaa.net.org/profdev/ethics/uplod/statement-on-ethics-principles-of-professional-responsibility.pdf. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Adams, T.E., Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C., (2011). *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).

Adler, PA. and Adler, P. (1987) Membership Roles in Field Research Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications In: *Qualitative Research Guidelines Project*. Available at: http://www.quatres.org/Home memb-3649.html. (Accessed 6/6/15).

American Ethnologist's A.E. Forum, (2006). 33(4). Available through JSTOR at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40988874. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Anderson, L. (2006) Analytic *Auto*ethnography, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4) 373-396. Available at: http://intl-jce. sage.pubcom. (Accessed 3/12/14).

Ardener, E. (1975b) The "Problem" Revisited In: S. Arderner ed. Perceiving Women (1975) London: Malaby Press. 21-23 cited In: Wall, C.J., and Gannon-Leary, P. A sentence made by Men: Muted Group Theory Revisited In: *European Journal Women's Studies* (1999)6:21-29. Available at: http://www.brown.uk.com/brownlibrary/ETWS.html. (Accessed 6/6/15).

Benedict, R. (1948) Anthropology and The Humanities, *American Anthropology* ,50 (1) http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/aa.1948.50.4.02a00020/pdf. (Accessed 2/4/14).

Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C., (2014), *We Can Tell You Stories: Politics, Pleasure and Pain in Qualitative Inquiry*, The Fourth Israeli Interdisciplinary Conference of Qualitative Research [video online]. Available at: ICQM http://www.youtube.com/ published 23/4/2014. (Accessed August 2015).

Bochner, A.P., Ellis, C. and Adams, T.E., (2011). *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).

Briggs, C.L. (1984) Learning How to Ask: Native Meta communicative Competence and the Incompetence of Fieldworkers. L*anguage in Society*. 13(1)1-28. Available at: http://journals.cambridge.org/article_S0047404500015876. (Accessed 10 /1/14).

Chang, H. (2008) *Auto*ethnography as Method, Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast in *Project Muse,* Biography, Vol.32, No. 2, Spring 2009, Review by Carolyn Ellis. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/biography/v032/32.2.ellis.html. (Accessed 25/4/10).

Chiu, J. (2004) "I Salute the Spirit of my Communities": *Auto*ethnographic innovations in Hmong American literature. *College Literature* 31(3). Available at: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/lit/summary/vo31/31.3chiu.html. (Accessed 1/4/2009).

Clifford, J. (1983) On Ethnographic Authority. *Representations (2)118-146*.Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2928386. (Accessed 3/7/12).

Clough, P. (2008) The Affective Turn, Political Economy, Biomedia and Bodies. Theory, Culture and Society, 25(1)1-22. Available at: http;//www.academia.edu/41/70245 AffectiveTurn. (Accessed 17/5/15)

Conquergood, D. (2002) *Performance Studies Interventions and Radical Research. TDR* 46(2)145-156. Available at: www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/105420402320980550. (Accessed 6/6/15).

Dauphinee, E. (2010). The ethics of *Auto*ethnography. *Cambridge Journals, Review of International Studies*.36 (3) July pps.799-818. Available at: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/dispalyFulltext?type=6&fid=7. (Accessed 4/5/14).

Deck, A. (1990) *Auto*ethnography: Zora Neale Hurston, Noni Jabavu, & Cross Disciplinary Discourse. *Black American Literatures Forum,* 24(2)237-256. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3041706. (Accessed 13/4/14).

Delamont, S. (2009) The only honest thing: *Auto*ethnography, reflexivity and small crises in fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education* 4(1) 51-63. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17457820802703507. (Accessed 27/5/15).

Doloriert, C. and Sambrook, S. (2011) Accommodating an *Auto*ethnographic PhD: The Tale of the Thesis, the Viva Voce, and the Traditional Business School. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 40 (5)582-615. Available at: http://jce.sagepub.com/content/40/5/582.full.pdf+html . (Accessed 20/7/15).

Duarte, F. (2007). Using *Auto*ethnography in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Reflective Practice from 'the Other Side of the Mirror'. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 1(2). http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl. (Accessed 13/4/14).

Ellis, C. (2007) Telling Stories, Revealing Lives : Relational Ethics in Research with Intimate Others *Qualitative Inquiry*. 13(1) 3-29. Available at: http://online.sagepub.com. (Accessed 16/1/15).

Ellis, C. (1995) Emotional and Ethical Quagmires in Returning to the Field. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*.24 (1) 68-98. Available at: DOI.10.1177089124195024001003. (Accessed 16/1/15).

Ellis, C. (1991) Sociological Introspection and Emotional Experience. *Symbolic Interaction* [online] 14(1)23-50. Available at: http://libweb.maynooth.ie/library/ejournals. (Accessed 14/8/15).

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P., (2014) *We Can Tell You Stories: Politics, Pleasure and Pain in Qualitative Inquiry*. , The Fourth Israeli Interdisciplinary Conference of Qualitative Research [video online]. Available at: ICQM http://www.youtube.com/ published 23/4/2014. (Accessed 14/8/15).

Ellis, C., Adams, T.E. and Bochner, A.P. (2011) *Auto*ethnography: An Overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 12(1, Art). Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095. (Accessed 6/10/13).

Edwards, B. (1996) How The West Was Wondered: County Clare and Directions in Irish Ethnography, Folklore Forum 27(2):65-78. Available at: https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/2223/27%282%29%2065-78.pdf?sequence=1. (Accessed 4/1/16).

Fassin. D. (2006) *The* end of ethnography as collateral damage of ethical regulation? *American Ethnologist,* 33(4) 522-524. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098882. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Finn, J. (2000) Walls and Bridges: Cultural mediation and the Legacy of Ella Deloria *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 21, (3) 158-182. Available at: http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/4037012/walls-bridges-cultural-mediation-legacy-ella-deloria. (Accessed 4/5/14).

Fluehr-Lobban, C. (2002) A Century of Ethics and Professional Anthropology. *Anthropology News*. 43(3) 20. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/an.2002.43.3.20/epdf. (Accessed 16/1/15).

Foreman, P. G. (1990) 'Looking back from Zora, or Talking out Both Sides of my Mouth for Those Who have two Ears'. *Black American Literature Forum/ Women Writers Issue* 24(4). Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/3041794: (Accessed 11/7/15).

Foster, K., Mc Allister, M. and O'Brien, L. (2005). Coming to ethnography: A mental health nurses' experience. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 4(4) Article 1. Available at: http://wwww.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_4/pdf/foster.pdf. (Accessed 29/8/15).

Geertz, C. (2004) Interview with Alan Mac Partlane (Parts 1 and 2) 5 May 2004. Cambridge. Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3dQDx3axrDS. (Accessed 20/7/15).

Geertz, C. (1974) "From the Native's Point of View": On the nature of Anthropological Understanding. *Bulletin of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences,* 28(1)26-45. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/3822971. (Accessed 3/7/12).

Gillam, L. and Guilleman, M. (2004) 'Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 10, 261-280. Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/contents/refs/10/2/261. (Accessed 27/5/10).

Grupetta, M. (2004) *Autophenomenography? Alternatives uses of Autobiographically based research,* Paper presented AARE Conference, Melbourne, Australia (2004). Available at: http://www.academia.edu/1986604/*Auto*phenomenography_Alternative_uses_of_*Auto*graphic ally_based_research. (Accessed 6/5/15).

Hayano, D. (1979). *Auto*ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects, *Human Organisation,* Vol.38 99-104. Available at: ce.sagepub.com/content/35/4/373. (Accessed 5/5/14).

Heaton-Schresta, C. (2007) Emotional Apprenticeships: reflection on the role of academic practice in the 'construction' of the field, *Anthropology Matters,* (9)1.Available at: www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/.../100. (Accessed 9/3/14).

Heilbrun, C.G. (1999) Contemporary Memoirs: Or, who cares who did what to whom? *American Scholar*, (30) Summer. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41212901. (Accessed 7/2/14).

Holsberg, C.S. (1980) Review Number Our Days, B. Myerhoff, in *American Anthropologist* 82(1) 151. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/aa.1980.82.1.02a00360/pdf. (Accessed 14/7/15).

Holt, N. L., (2003) Representation, Legitimation, and *Auto*ethnography: An *Auto*ethnographic Writing Story. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 2(1). Available at: http://www.ualberta.ca˜iiqm/backissues/2_1/html/holt.html. (Accessed 25/4/10).

Jago, B.J. (2002) Chronicling Academic Depression. *Journal of contemporary Ethnography* 31(6) 729-757. Available at: jca.sagepub.com. (Accessed 26/7/15).

Kanaaneh, M. (1997), The "Anthropologicality" of Indigenous Anthropology, *Dialectical Anthropology* 22:1-21. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Available at: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1006815109475#page-1. (Accessed 20/7/15).

Karinthy F. (1929) Chain *Links* [Láncszemek] Available at: https://djjr-courses.wdfiles.com/local--files/soc180%3Akarinthy-chain-links/Karinthy-Chain-Links_1929.pdf (Accessed 20/7/15)

Kim, C. S. (1990) "The Role of the Non-Western Anthropologist Reconsidered: Illusion versus Reality". *Current Anthropology,* 31(2), 196. Available at: http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/toc/ca/1990/31/2. (Accessed 20/7/15).

Kleinman, A. (2007) Review: M. Jackson (2005) Existential Anthropology: events, exigencies, and effects. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.),*13, 477-522. Available at: (Accessed 10/9/15).

Landsberg, A. (1997) America, The Holocaust and the Mass Culture of Memory: Towards a Radical Politics of Empathy. *New German Critique* (71) Spring, Summer. Available at: (Accessed 27/5/15).

Lebech, M. (2004) Study Guide to Edith Stein's Philosophy of Psychology and the Humanities Faculty of Philosophy, NUIM, Maynooth: Available at : http://eprints.maynoothuniversity.ie/393/1/Edith_Stein.pdf. (Accessed 20/7/15).

Lins Ribeiro, G. (2006) IRBs are the tip of the iceberg: State regulation, academic freedom, and methodological issues. A*merican Ethnologist,* 33(4) 529-531. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098884. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Lutz, C. and White, G. (1986) The Anthropology of Emotions in *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 15:404-436. Available at: http://www.jstor.org.jproxy.nuim.ie/stable/2155767?pq-origsite=summon. (Accessed 2/2/14).

Medicine, B. (1980) Ella C. Deloria: The Emic Voice. *Melus,* 7 (4) 23-30. Available at: http://www.jstor.org. (Accessed 13/4/15).

Mehan, H. and Woods, H., (1975) The Morality of Ethnomethodology. *Theory and Society*, 2 (4) 509-530. Available at: http://jstor.org. (Accessed 16/1/15).

Mikell G. (1982) When Horses Talk Back: Reflections on Zora Neale Hurston's Haitian Anthropology. *Phylon,* 43(3) 218-230. Available at: http://www.jstor.org. (Accessed 2/5/14).

Miller, Nancy K. (2000) "*But enough about me, what do you think of my memoir*?" The Yale Journal of Criticism 13 (2) 421-436. Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/yale_journal_of_criticism/v013/13.2miller.pdf. (Accessed 2/2/2014).

Moro, P. (2006) It takes a Dam Good Writer…A Review of the Ethnographic I. *Symbolic Interaction,* 29 (2) 265-269. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1525/si.2006.29.2.265/pdf. (Accessed 2/2/14).

Mc Allister, M., Foster, K. and O'Brien, L. (2005). Coming to ethnography: A mental health nurses's experience. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 4(4) Article 1. Available at: http://wwww.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_4/pdf/foster.pdf. (Accessed 29/8/15).

Mc Millan, S. and Price, M. (2010) 'Through the Looking Glass: Our *Auto*ethnographic Journey Through Research Mind-fields'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16 (2)140-147. Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/16/2/140.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 27/5/15).

Narayan, K. (1993) How Native Is the "Native" Anthropologist. *American Anthropologist, New Series, 95*(3), 671-686. Available at: http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-7294%28199309%292%3A95%3A3%3C671%3AHNIA%22A%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z. . (Accessed 13/4/15).

Oben, F.M. (2002) Edith Stein And The Science Of The Cross. Available at: http://piercedhearts.org/theology_heart/writings_on_saints_/edith_stein_cross.htm. (Accessed

O'Brien, L., Foster, K. and Mc Allister, M. (2005). Coming to ethnography: A mental health nurses's experience. *International Journal of Qualitative methods*, 4(4) Article 1. Available at http://wwww.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_4/pdf/foster.pdf. (Accessed 29/8/15).

Panourgia, N. (2000) Review of Reed-Danahay, D., *Auto*/ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social. *American Ethnologist,* 27(2)551-553. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/5561178/*Auto*_ethnography_Rewriting_the_Self_and_the_Social. (Accessed 25/4/10).

Peacock, J.L. (1997) The Future of Anthropology, *American Anthropologist, New Series* 99, (1) 9-17. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/682128. (Accessed 4/5/14).

Porter, N. (2004) CMA Methodology: *Auto*ethnography (Computer Mediated Anthropology), Available at: http://anthropology.usf.edu/cma/CMAmethodology-ae.htm. (Accessed 25/4/2010).

Pratt, M.L. (1991) Arts of the Contact Zone, *Profession,* 33-40. Available at: http://www.jstor.org (Accessed 7/10/13).

Price, M. and Mc Millan, S., (2010) 'Through the Looking Glass: Our *Auto*ethnographic Journey Through Research Mind-fields'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16 (2)140-147. Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/16/2/140.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 27/5/15).

Propp, K. (2014) *What is the Contemporary Memoir?* Available at*:* http://www.karenpropp.com/stories/memoir.htm. (Accessed 9/3/14).

Rambo, C. (2007) Handing IRB an Unloaded Gun .*Qualitative Inquiry* 13(3).353-367. Available at*: http://online.sagepub.com*. Accessed 16/1/15).

Reed-Danahay, D. (2002) Sites of Memory: Women's *Auto*ethnographies from Rural France *Biography* 25.1 (2002) 95-109. Available at: http://muse.jhu.rdu/journals/biography.v025/25.1reed-danahay.html. (Accessed 25/4/10).

Reed-Danahay, D. (2000) *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*, Review by Neni Panourgia, American Ethnologist, Vol.27, No. 2, (May 2000), Wiley Blackwell, American Anthropology Association. (Accessed through JSTOR, 25/4/10).

Richardson, L. (2001).Getting Personal: Writing Stories, *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 14, 33-38. Available at: http://libweb.maynooth.ie/library/ejournals/. (Accessed 16/7/15).

Sambrook, S. and Doloriert, C., (2011) Accommodating an *Auto*ethnographic PhD: The Tale of the Thesis, the Viva Voce, and the Traditional Business School. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 40(5) 582-615. Available at: http://jce.sagepub.com/content/40/5/582.full.pdf+html . (Accessed 20/7/15).

Schachter, J. (2009).Writing Lives: Ruth Benedict's Journey From Biographical Studies to Anthropology. *Pacific Studies* 32 (2/3) 348-366. Available at: https://ojs.lib.byu.edu/spc/index.php/PacificStudies/issue/view/2413.(Accessed 2/4/14).

Scheper-Hughes, N. (2000) Ire in Ireland, *Ethnography,* 1(1), 117-140. Available at: https://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/methods/scheper-hughes.pdf. (Accessed 29/4/13).

Smith, B. (1999) The Abyss: Exploring Depression Through a Narrative of the Self *Qualitative Inquiry,* 5(2) 264-279). Available at: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/5/2/264.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 6/6/15).

Smith, P. (1998) What Memoir Forgets, *The Nation*.30. (Accessed 9/3/14).

Sparkes, A. (2009) Novel ethnographic representations and the dilemmas of judgement, *Ethnography and Education,* 4(3) 301-319. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17457820903170119. (Accessed 13/8/15).

Spinney, J. (2006) A place of sense: A Kinaesthetic Ethnography of Cyclists on Mount Ventoux. *Environment & Planning D. Society & Space (2006)* 24. 709-732 Available at: DOI: 10.1068/d66j. (Accessed 6/6 2015).

Stacey, J, (1988) Can there be A Feminist Ethnography? *Women's Studies Int. Forum,* 11(1)21-27. Available at : http://researchmethodswillse.voices.wooster.edu/files/2012/01/Stacey.pdf. (Accessed 14/4/14).

Starr. L.J., (2010) The Use of *Auto*ethnography in Educational Research: Locating Who We Are in What We Do, *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education/Revue canadienne des jeunes chercheures et chercheurs en education*, 3(1). Available at: http://cjnse.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/ojs2/index.php/cjnse/article/viewFile/149/112. (Accessed 13/4/14).

Strathern, M. (2006) Don't eat unwashed lettuce*, American Ethnologist,* 33(4) 532-534. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098885. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Sundar, N. (2006) Missing the ethical woods for the bureaucratic trees *American Ethnologist,* 33(4)535-537. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4098886. (Accessed 2/2/13).

Tedlock, B. (1991) From Participant Observation to the Observation of Participation: The Emergence of Narrative Ethnography *Journal of Anthropological Research,* 47 (1) 69-94. Available at: http://www.rnld.org/sites/default/files/TedlockNarrativeEthnography1991.pdf. (Accessed 13/4/15).

Till, K. (2009) Ethnography in Kitchin and Thrift, *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Elsevier. 626-631. Available at: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780080449104004302. (Accessed 13/4/14).

Tolich, M. (2010) A Critique of Current Practice: Ten Foundational Guidelines for *Auto*ethnographers, *Qualitative Health Research*. Sage 20(12), 1599-1610. Available at: http://qhr.sagepub.com/content/20/12/1599.full.pdf+html. (Accessed 16/1/15).

White, G. and Lutz. C. (1986) The Anthropology of Emotions in *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 404-436. Available at: http://www.jstor.org.jproxy.nuim.ie/stable/2155767?pq-origsite=summon. (Accessed 2/2/14).

William, J. (1999) The New Belletrism', *Style,* 33 (3) 414-42. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.33.3.414. (Accessed 2/2/14).

Wolff-Michael, R. (2009) *Auto*/Ethnography and the Question of Ethics *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 10 (1, Art. 38) Available at: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1213/2645. (Accessed 6/10/13)

Wolf, D. (1993) Introduction: Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork. *Frontiers 13*(3)1-8.