In a number of academic disciplines, auto/biography and auto/ethnography have become central means of critiquing the ways in which research represents individuals and their cultures. Auto/biography and auto/ethnography are genres that blend ethnographic interests with life writing and they tell about a culture at the same time they tell about an individual life. This book presents educational researchers, in exemplary form, the possibilities and constraints of both auto/biography and auto/ethnography as methods of doing educational research. The contributors to this volume explore, by means of examples, auto/biography and auto/ethnography as means for critical analysis and as tool kit for the different stakeholders in education. The four thematic sections deal with (a) different possible uses and constraints of the two methods, (b) understanding teaching and teaching to learn, (c) institutional critiques, and (d) experiences and trajectories as evidence of a sociology of everyday life.

The book was written to be used by upper undergraduate and graduate students taking courses in research design; because of its practical approach, it is highly suitable for those contexts where research methods courses do not exist. The audience also includes professors, who want to have a reference on design and methodology, and those who have not yet had the opportunity to employ a particular method.
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I

Introduction
1 Auto/Biography and Auto/Ethnography: 
Finding the Generalized Other in the Self

Wolff-Michael Roth

Auto/biography and auto/ethnography already have had histories as research strategies and tool kits in other domains, but have yet to be explored as such in education. I provide the sketch of an argument where the use of autobiography, paired with radical doubt, is legitimated as a strategy to arrive at intersubjectivity thereby avoiding false claims to objectivity and failure-prone inner (hyper) subjectivity. This argument is used to contextualize the contributions to this thematic issue on auto/biography and auto/ethnography in respect to education and educational research.

Seeing the title of this book, readers might have wondered why there is a slash that separates auto, on the one hand, and biography and ethnography, on the other. Whereas I am not certain why others might use it, I use the slash in writing auto/biography and auto/ethnography because of my dialectical training and experience. Thus, the individual and its society—which is the seat of the social and the cultural—mutually presuppose one another. They stand in a dialectical relationship. Without the individual, there is no society; yet without society, each individual would have to fend for itself, scrounging for food, fending off predators, either inherit knowledge genetically or learn entirely on its own, and so forth. The specifically human form of existence is possible only because of society.

We can also approach the issue from an action perspective. What an individual does is always a concrete realization of cultural-historical possibilities. Because actions are the heart of identifying and identification processes, writing
an autobiography always realizes the possibilities in the biographical genre and the biographical plot. Every autobiography always also realizes the cultural-historical patterns of biography. This symmetrical relation of biography and autobiography becomes very clear in and through the intersubjectivity of the biographical interview, where biographical questions and autobiographical responses together constitute the realized interview protocol (Roth, Hwang, Lee, & Goulart, 2005). Similarly, autoethnography reveals concretely realized patterns in one’s own actions rather than the actions of others, a form of research we have come to know as ethnography. All autoethnography, because it inquires the concretely realized action possibilities that exist at the collective level is a concretely realized form of ethnography viewed generally.

Coming to Auto/Biography and Auto/Ethnography

Autobiography as a critical method to write research has already had a considerable history in other fields such as anthropology (Reed-Danahay, 1999; Watson & Watson-Franke, 1985), feminist writing (Gilmore, 1994), and interpretive research more generally (Denzin, 1989). Autoethnography has also been used to deal with a variety of issues in a variety of disciplines. In these fields, auto/ethnography and auto/biography are genres that blend ethnographic interests with life writing and tell about a culture at the same time it tells about a life; at the same time, auto/ethnography and auto/biography have become important means of critiquing other forms of representing the generalized other, individuals and their culture. In education, however, a similar development has yet to happen, though there are some scholars in our field who have explored self and other using this medium (Neumann, 1998; Roth & Harama, 2000). The contributors to this book explore, by means of examples, different possible uses of autobiography as a means for critical analysis and as tool kit for educators as teachers and researchers. The important contribution auto/biography and auto/ethnography made to my own work slowly entered my consciousness over the past twenty years of working as teacher and researcher.

First, having had to repeat fifth grade myself, I have always been aware as a teacher that the children in my care might be in a situation where I had been years before: I acted toward and talked about entities in the world as I saw them, and yet received (especially in that fifth-grade year but also later) feedback that suggested I was wrong. My autobiographical recollections of school failure always helped me in being a better teacher, especially for students who normally are suffocated in the maelstrom of schooling. Somehow, my way of seeing and understanding problems, essay assignments, tasks and so on was not appropri-
ate. These experiences later influenced both my teaching and research. As a teacher, when students did not understand, I often thought back about my own difficulties and, rather than faulting the children and invoking low motivation, lack of intelligence, or cognitive deficits (as it often happens in teaching and research practice), I attempted to engage the children to find out more about how the world looked to them (e.g., Roth, 2005). As a researcher, finding out what the children experienced, saw, acted towards the things that made their worlds became a major preoccupation in my research. That is, I increasingly focused on children’s view of the curricular maze rather than that of the all-knowing observer who watches children run the maze.

Second, over the past decade and a half, I conducted several collaborative research projects with my fellow teacher and later graduate student Michael Bowen. Our research concerned graphing and other practices in ecology. As we interacted intensively trying to make sense of videotapes and artifacts produced by our student and scientist participants, it was evident that he and I looked at the world differently and came to different understandings based on what appeared to be the same data—I now understand that only the material base, the ink and sound patterns are the same, not how we see them. Rather than making these differences disappear, we made

Auto/biography and Auto/ethnography as Tools for Learning about Learning

Day 1. As I am cycling along, I am aware of my surroundings (trees, flowers, and so forth) without really focusing on anything in particular. Although I am aware at the moment, here at home, I remember few things in particular, few stretches of the trip. But those things I do remember are associated with a particular type of experience. There are things, like a particular house or a road sign (“Landwehr”) that are pulling my gaze to take a closer look. As I focus, sometimes with considerable delay, a memory surfaces—the house looks like the one I had lived in forty years earlier, “Landwehr” was the name of a professor and of a street in the city where I went to university.

Day 2. As I am riding along taking the same route as yesterday, there are features in the environment that I have not remembered yesterday at home after the trip, but which I nevertheless re-cognize the moment I approach them. As I come around the Y-fork, I re-member that I have seen from here the child on the bike and with the dog ahead of me. They then turn into the farm some 200 meters further on. I re-member the field with the freshly sprouting grain plants though I had not remembered them at home. Thus there are things that despite the complexity of the experience, I re-cognize even before I reach the place, that I start to anticipate when I get within reach. But then there were other farms, other signs, other features that I seem to see for the first time.

Day 5. I notice for the first time the little plates, inscribed with numbers that increase by 0.1 about every 100 meters. I infer that these are distance indicators with
them the focus of further analysis. As we progressed in our analyses and using stories from our lives as students and professionals, I began to understand our interpretive horizons as culturally (his reflection biology, mine physics culture) and historically constituted so that, to understand our respective interpretations, we needed to understand aspects of our respective biographies. Autobiographical evidence provided us with strong clues to understanding the interpretations of any other.

Third, the importance of using auto/biography and auto/ethnography as a critical tool became evident in a recently completed project on coteaching—a way of teaching in which two or more individuals collectively realize the responsibility for the lesson. I cotaught a four-month unit on water and water ecology with Nadely Boyd, a preservice teacher who was completing her two-year post-baccalaureate training with a four-month practicum. One day, I had moved into the background, I observed Nadely explode at a student and then sending him out of the classroom although from my (and his own) perspective, he had not done anything wrong. As my indignation was welling up, another image began to emerge. Images reappeared in my mind’s eye of an incident early in my career (and admittedly, under very difficult circumstances) when I slapped a student who pressed a candy wrapper that he had just pulled out of his mouth into my hand. I came to understand that the indignation was but a pre-judgment, which I was able to grapple with through my own lived experience. Here, my own autobiography became a tool to critically deal with my own pre-judgments at a later point in my life.

Auto/biography and auto/ethnography are legitimate ways of establishing intersubjectivity that escapes the false dichotomy opposing objectivism and subjectivism. Auto/biography, auto/ethnography, and other first-person methods enacted together with critical doubt are important aspects in making rigorous any disciplinary method. One of the major questions of any discipline that aspires academic legitimacy is: “How do you make its knowledge claims justifiable?”

The problem of justification of knowledge claims arises from the separation of knowing from that which is known. For a long period of time, at least from Descartes to the early twentieth century, the natural sciences have been based on the assumption that observer independent knowledge of the world is possible.
Descartes, in his (in)famous analysis claimed that there were two independent substances *res extensa* (matter) and *res cogitans* (mind). Within the Cartesian paradigm body and mind became separated, and therefore also the connection between knowledge a subject of the mind and our being of this material world. While this approach has provided the sciences with (its presupposition of) objectivity, the separation of mind and matter has led to a fundamental problem in epistemology: How is knowledge grounded in the world? That is, by thinking knowledge as independent from the world we observe, we have the problem of explaining how the objects of thought, the tokens or signs that we manipulate (representations) relate to the world that we observe.

**Observer and Observed**

The idea of an independence of the observer (and therefore his/her knowledge) and the world observed has been seriously questioned both in the natural and the social sciences. In the natural sciences, relativity theory and quantum mechanics both suggest that the status of the observer co-determines what and how it is observed. Relativity theory provides a mathematical formalism that translates the observations of one observer into those of another; it can therefore survive relatively unscathed the critique of an observer dependence because simple calculations translate one observation into another. More serious is the critique that is associated with the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum theory. Here, the knowing observer is implicated in every observation without recourse; observer and observed are coupled and need to be accounted for in the mathematics which contains both a pan for the developing but inaccessi-

![Figure 1.1. The observer is observing the observer. Out of view, however, is the technology that mediates observation.](image)

When observation now turns n upon itself and directs its attention to the Notion existing as free Notion, it finds, to begin with, the Laws of Thought. . . . But observing is not knowing itself, and is ignorant of it; it converts its own nature into the form of *being*, i.e., it grasps its negativity only as *laws* of knowing. It is sufficient here to have pointed out the invalidity of the so-called Laws of Thought from the general nature of the case. (Hegel, 1977, pp. 180, 181)
ble system, and a part that accounts for the act of observation; observation is not passive but an active operation which determines both observational categories and the range of possible observables.

Critiques of an observer-independent world have also been constructed in European phenomenology and existential and hermeneutic philosophy from Søren Kierkegaard through Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Paul Ricoeur, and Pierre Bourdieu. From a phenomenological perspective, the very condition of having experiences at all is that as body among bodies. Both Merleau-Ponty and Bourdieu insist that without our material bodies, no cognition would be possible. Having a body that moves about in the world is a precondition of all perception. Recent research in the cognitive neurosciences confirms that such conditions need to exist. First, perception of movement requires the same neuronal groups that are needed to execute the movements themselves. Second, we know objects and events not in abstract terms but in terms of a collection of perspectives. Third, it is movement in the world that brings about axon sprouting and brain connectivity.

The observer and the observed cannot be separated, and if what and how the observer perceives is determined by the current state of the organism that has its history. If we want to understand (that is, where it comes from and what its groundings are) the what and how of the knowledge claims of another, we need to understand his/her history. In human terms, this requires us a better understanding of the autobiography of the individual observer. Therefore and ultimately, practical understanding testifies to our being as belonging to a praxis that precedes all objectification, all opposition between subject and object. It is only after the fact that we begin to articulate our experience, explicate it, and ultimately theorize it in a variety of ways.

**Science and Phenomenology**

Phenomenological thought begins with the assumption that we are always already pan of the social and material world, as bodies among bodies, shot through with meaning. From a phenomenological perspective, the aspect of the world which individuals perceive and towards which they orient their actions, is always and already transparent (understood). Any hope of coherence between the (scientific) knowledge of ourselves and our idiosyncratic experiences in the world requires that both sides, science, the external (inter!) subjectivity and personal experience (inner subjectivity) are pushed. Scientists of all brands—including the Princeton physicist Piet Hut and the neurophysiologist Francisco Varela—have begun to suggest that we can overcome the epistemological prob-
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Problems raised by the observer/observed and mind–body dichotomies by drawing on first-person methodologies (see special issue of the Journal of Consciousness Studies, 1999, Volume 6(2). Among these first-person methodologies auto/biography and auto/ethnography can furnish descriptions of experiences that phenomenological methods attempt to investigate in terms of deeper structures.

In the quest of finding an answer to the question “What is actual?” the ultimate goal of scientific knowledge has to be able to model my personal experience of looking at a sunset of the Pacific, or the rush (flow) I experience cycling the mountains of Colorado. On the other hand, the study of personal experience requires a radical suspension of judgment and submission to systematic method of dealing with one’s own prejudices and prejudgments—lest auto/biography and auto/ethnography are to lead to ideology, delusion, and conceptual blindness. The authors in this volume deal in different ways with this problem, some favoring an entirely first-person perspective (e.g., Ellis, Tobin) whereas others play first- and third-person perspectives against one another (a method and genre I personally prefer). The two ways of knowing, one grounded in science the other in rigorous first-person accounts, can be usefully employed in constraining the theorizing of the other; “disciplined first-person accounts should be an integral element of the validation of a neurobiological proposal, and not merely coincidental or heuristic information” (Varela, 1996, p. 343). Auto/biography and auto/ethnography, when they are conducted in the disciplined manner, can therefore contribute tremendously to the study of cultural practices concretely realized in our patterned behaviors acquired in and through socially mediated participation in societal affairs.

There are, in fact, not even two methods, scientific explanation and first-person understanding, for strictly speaking, only the former is methodical (Ricœur, 1991). The two methods are but two sides of the same coin. Practical understanding is the non-methodical moment that makes all explanation possible. That is, understanding precedes, accompanies, concludes, and therefore envelops explanation; in turn, explanation develops understanding in analytic ways. Auto/biography and auto/ethnography are but two ways in which educators can expose their pre-judgments (prejudices) that they bring to the understanding of issues in teaching and learning.

Epoché, Radical Doubt, and Suspicion of Ideology

Auto/biography and auto/ethnography could easily lead us into the mires of fuzzy thinking, will-o’-the-wisp inspiration, and self-congratulatory, feel-good accounts of worldly events. Fluffy stuff, however, is not what the authors in this
collection have in mind when they draw in different ways on auto/biography and auto/ethnography to explore relevant or pressing issues. By advocating auto/biography and auto/ethnography as a means of generating understanding in education, we do not intend to support self-indulgence, ideology, and prejudice.

The irremediable functional dependence between the individual, its knowledge, and its world requires—if we want to have any hope of establishing an educational science that self-reflexively includes knowing the conditions of knowing—a radical questioning and suspension of beliefs. This requirement has come to be known as the phenomenological *epoché* (Gr. ἔποχη, suspension of judgment), the process of setting aside cultural-historical presuppositions and factual knowledge, or phenomenological reduction, radical doubt, and suspicion of ideology. These are systematic methods of stepping out of the work to step more fully into it; it is a method that is analogous to laboratory work in science, where the complexity of the world is controlled in small environments. Because the pre-constructed is everywhere—which we notice when we question our habitual ways of thinking about and doing things—we need to subject our pre-understandings themselves to a radical questioning.

The dialectical model, which combines an explanation-seeking, theoretical and historically embedded (disciplinary) method and individual understandings that have evolved through our own histories (auto/biographies, auto/ethnographies), appears to me a useful way of pursuing the quest for deeper, more elaborate understandings of teaching and learning. Especially, a rigorous study of how we cope and learn in difficult situations should allow us to evolve better understandings of the difficulties students face when it comes to teaching or learning some subject matter or of being and becoming a researcher and scholar in education. This dialectic approach allows us to move from the individual and idiosyncratic understandings that characterize

![Figure 1.2. Auto/portraits teach us that in auto/ethnography and auto/biography there always remains something hidden. They usually all leave out the structural determinations from the outside of our lifeworlds, here, for example, the ideology embodied in photography as a form of representation and the machinery of the representational tool itself.](image)
each umwelt to the world (environment, “Welt”) that we share with others, that is, which is inter-individual subjectivity.

Auto/biography (-ethnography) is Otobiography (-ethnography)

More than anyone else, Jacques Derrida may have laid the groundwork for auto/biography and auto/ethnography as central issue of postmodernism. First, he helped us understand that all auto/biography (ethnography) is also otobiography or otoethnography (Gr. ὀτο- combining form for ear, oto-), that is, a biography (ethnography) that comes to life only through the countersignature of the reader or hearer (Derrida, 1985). Oto, that which pertains to the ear, plays an important role because it is for the other that we write and speak; for the other, through the other, in terms of the other’s language. So in Derrida’s writing, as in Ricoeur’s hermeneutic phenomenology, or Bourdieu’s sociological phenomenology, both the specific other whom we face in situations and the anonymous generalized other (who constitutes society of which we are a member) play most crucial roles in the ultimate meaning of the text. Both autobiography (autoethnography) and biography (ethnography) are genres written for a generalized other who, in the descriptions of the authors, recognize descriptions of cultural-historical and sociocultural practices that they might have given themselves. Any auto/biography or auto/ethnography is therefore never quite owned by the person who signs through assuming authorship, and who is the principal figure of the account. Rather, because any meaning of the text arises from the interaction of text and reader, the reader also owns it. This also provides a basis for countering those critics that fault authors for writing heroic stories and myths. Auto/biography as otobiography and auto/ethnography as otoethnography place as much responsibility for meaning on the reader as these genres place on their authors. Because readers always counter-sign a text, critical (deconstructionist) readers must take explicit responsibility for the meanings they de/construct.
Second, Derrida further problematized the ownership of words and texts in suggesting that they are never just one’s own, they always also belong to someone else (Derrida, 1998). This someone else, the generalized other listens with one ear, monolingually, which provides an inherent interpretive and ontological flexibility and ambiguity to any text. If language is of the other, even the “I” that I utter is of the other, and so there is a fundamental alienation that in the very moment I want to point to myself, I have to do so by using language which also belongs to culture and therefore the other. Autobiography as written text is therefore also associated with alienation, for we always have to use the words which are not entirely our own, but always also belong to the Other.

Finally, Derrida (1995) pointed out that autobiography is a process of creating an archive of Self. He focuses on the historical constitution of our Selves, which always participates in future constructions of Selves in an evidently recursive process. Thus, “[t]he technical structure of the archiving archive also determines the structure of the archivable content even in its very coming into existence and in its relationship to the future. The archivization produces as much as it records the event” (p. 17). The Self as autobiographical text therefore augments itself, engrosses itself, and gains in authority. In the process, the (auto- and oto-biographical and -ethnographical) texts which define each Self remain spectral (i.e., has multiple meanings) which is perhaps a general structure of every archive. But in the same stroke autobiography also loses any absolute and meta-textual authority it might claim to have.

**Writing and W/ri(gh)ting**

Postmodern, feminist, and constructivist critiques took, among others, aim at the way in which the world of our experience came to be represented in language, diagrams, mathematical forms, and so on. Representations and especially academic representations came to be criticized because, in and through the context...
where they appeared, the laid claims to truth. In the wake of this critique, representations were recognized to be context-dependent, always embodying interests, politics, and power. Yet much of the postmodern, feminist, and constructivist literature continued to employ genres characteristic of modernism. That is, the critiques, lacking self-reflexivity, merely wrote new truths. This problem, however, was squarely addressed in the sociology of science, particularly in the *The Reflexive Thesis: Wrighting the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge* (Ashmore, 1989) and *Knowledge and Reflexivity: New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Woolgar, 1988).

How do you write social research (education, sociology) without committing the same errors that are characteristic of modern scholarship, which rested on the notion of absolute truth? How to right the wrongs of previous writings?

[VOICE OVER:] It/Id happens . . . by means of ruptures and disruptions of the code in one’s manner of writing, teaching, practicing, or trafficking in language or the instruments of logic and rhetoric, as by means of what are called actions intervening in or through the most recognizable form of the [literary] apparatuses. (Derrida, 1995b, p. 57)

These considerations led Malcolm Ashmore to reflexivity and the *wrighting* of research, which led me a few years later to attempts of *wrighting* research (Roth & McRobbie, 1999). These attempts used a variety of means to break the voice of the dominant narrative to the point that the different voices intersect, overlap, resist, and contrast one another. It is a form of writing that resists language, all the while making use of it.

The contributors to this volume employ a variety of ways of writing within the genre of autobiography and autoethnography. These different forms of writing are especially important when there are multiple voices within the same text, which, in the very form that they are presented, change the background against which the authors write. Above all, the assert the presence of the “I,” the knower alongside the known in a dialectical knower|known relation, the knower and the known presupposing one another.

**Looking Ahead**

Because we are the products of the world that we attempt to describe, our autobiographies and our scholarly works are deeply integrated. Recent authors in ethnography and anthropology reject the notion that we can somehow write innocent descriptions of others (e.g., Marcus & Fischer, 1986). Ethnography is
better considered as encounters of actors that are differently embedded with-in particular social/cultural milieus. On this view, our knowledge of the other is always relational. Rather than describing attributes of a population from some neutral position outside the field of view, accounts of cultural meanings and practices are inevitably created from particular standpoints that set up the lines of comparison and contrast between the speaker/writer and the persons and practices described. The stories ethnographers create are as much a reflection of their own cultural positioning as they are descriptions of the positioning of others. Making these historically-constituted positions clear to the reader, that is, writing autobiography is one way of understanding and incorporating our prejudices into our practices and into what we produce. Making sense and use of representations of some Other involves our own positioning in relation to what we are seeing as much as any meaning inherent in the images themselves; autobiography is one of the central means of making this positioning salient.

The essays in this collection attempt, each in its own way, to elaborate and render salient the position of the author or, alternatively, use auto/biography and auto/ethnography as methods to have others explore important issues related to education. All too often, students and teachers in educational research appear to be disembodied and to have no life other than voices, computing and cognizing heads, and so forth. More so, researchers most often disappeared making their accounts impersonal, objectivity-exacting pretentious claims for an illusive objectivity in which observer and observed are clearly separated. On the other hand, the accounts provided by all authors to this volume show how our lives are entangled with our projects, whether these are teaching, working in shelters, or learning in schools and elsewhere.

I have divided the book into sections, each being opened by a brief editorial commentary on its underlying ideas and the chapters that constitute it. In Section II, the authors use auto/biography to explore teaching and teacher education and thereby show how we can elaborate and explicate our experiences to arrive at better understandings. The contributions to Section III exemplify how auto/biography and auto/ethnography can be employed as a form of institutional criticism, and, in this, are forms of doing critical, that is, positional scholarship. Section IV focuses on explorations of activities that constitute everyday life, reading and writing reflexive sociology, tending graves, doing dissertation research and writing dissertations, or dealing with emigration|immigration. In the epilogue, Franz Breuer and I take a look over this volume to find answers to the question what educational researchers can gain by adopting auto/biography and auto/ethnography into their methodological repertoires. All authors do not simply write about auto/biography and auto/ethnography, but practice the methods they are
they are (implicitly) arguing for to set the stage for a reflection on how the method provides them with an understanding of cultural-historical practices more generally.

In its entirety, the volume assembled here shows how auto/biography and auto/ethnography can be used to construct knowing and an understanding of this knowing. Rather than seeing in auto/biography and auto/ethnography as ways of retreating into personal, inner subjectivity, we should adopt it as a way to establish and stabilize intersubjectivity. As bodies among bodies, we cannot achieve removed and disembodied knowledge; all our knowledge is singular and embodied but also representative of the collective in that it constitutes a concrete realization of cultural-historical and sociocultural possibilities. Rather than pretending to create objective observer-independent knowledge or retreating into an inner subjectivity, we can use critical methods together with inner subjectivity to bring about a maximum of intersubjectivity, that is, understanding the Self to understand the Other.

Here at the end of this introduction, I want to alert readers of the potential dangers of auto/biographical and auto/ethnographical methods that both Alberto Rodriguez and I present in the first section—auto/biography and auto/ethnography bring with them the danger of illusion, grandiose myths, and delusion. More so, they can—it is very evident in totalitarian systems—support ideology and prejudice. Critical literary methods can be used to deconstruct such accounts. However, with deconstruction also come dangers our advice to contribute intentionalities does not sufficiently address. Because every auto/biography is otoautobiography and every auto/ethnography is otoethnography, the meaning of a text arising from the countersigning, overzealous and self-righteous critics may do great injustice to a text. Take for example the story of the American cyclist Lance Armstrong who, despite what doctors had called a fatal cancer, won the most prestigious road bicycle race, the Tour de France. One can take his own accounts and deconstruct them as heroic myths of the “everyone can do it” type; but we can also read it as an inspiration, not to win the Tour de France, not to admire the hero Armstrong, but in order to go with the same sort of spirit about one’s own everyday life affairs. Readers should always know and be aware that their own readings are de/constructions, involving disassembly and construction.

Notes

1 On the point of legitimacy and goodness of auto/biographical and auto/ethnographical method and genres, see in particular the discussion near the end of David Geelant’s chapter.
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