

Chapter 19

A journey through narrative inquiry to autoethnography

Gwyneth James

Since entering the new (to me) world of narrative inquiry, an approach to research which aims to foreground individuals' experiences, I have encountered many detours, wrong turnings, and dead ends, but in tandem with the challenge of grasping narrative inquiry's nature, the most significant of these diversions was the challenge of how to analyze my data narratively. This data was for my doctorate where I researched the transition experiences of a group of postgraduate international students and was collected over an academic year. It primarily comprised fifteen research conversations of 60-90 minutes each, email exchanges, and conversations which just naturally occurred. So often I searched for concrete signs such as 'narrative data analysis – a clear *how to* guide' and so often the hope of something concrete proved elusive.

Despite then not focusing on the fact that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003), I am now retrospectively and consciously remembering and bringing metaphors to the surface. My experience using narrative inquiry has been that of employing a monocular focus, enabling me to understand in-depth issues I was researching at the time. Now, however, incorporating metaphors is creating a 'binocular vision' (Hanne, 2011), enabling me to widen my field of vision by acknowledging the influence and impact of metaphors on both my understanding of narrative and myself as a researcher. Along with autoethnography, this was something I discovered recently. Autoethnographies are "highly personalized accounts that draw upon the experience of the author/researcher for the purposes of extending sociological understanding" (Sparkes, 2000, p.21) and by writing this chapter from such a perspective it adds to this second field of vision. Attention to metaphor helps us to understand that while narrative inquiry is diverse and complex that does not mean we as practitioners and researchers in UK Higher Education Institutions should shy away from using it; instead, we need to celebrate the diversity, the colour, and the emotion it adds to research.

This chapter will be structured using four key metaphors to present my personal narrative from an autoethnographic perspective, a new path for me and one which extends the road I have so far travelled down with narrative inquiry. It is not looking to analyze the metaphors but rather use them with narrative inquiry to paint a picture of my experience of narrative data analysis and make sense of that experience, to see what the metaphors within this narrative can illuminate for us and what the implications are of using narrative inquiry and autoethnography for educational practice.

In reading this chapter, then, how do you – the reader – evaluate such a seemingly subjective piece? And what are the implications for educational practice using such a method of writing? I will return to the latter question at the end, but as you read, perhaps do as Ellis does: “I ask [myself] what I have learned from the story: about social life, social process, the experience of others, the author’s experience, my own life. Is there anything ‘new’ here or a new way to view or twist the familiar?” (2000, p.274). Keeping these questions in mind, I invite you now to join me on my journey.

Narrative Inquiry and Autoethnography – two sides of the same coin

I think sometimes people switch off when I mention narrative inquiry. Not intentionally, but simply because so many have never heard of it. When I am asked the almost inevitable question ‘oh, so what’s that?’, experience has taught me to respond succinctly: ‘it’s trying to understand experience through the re-telling of others’ stories.’ The word ‘trying’ is not an apology; rather it is an acknowledgement that I can never fully understand someone’s experience, my own included. While for me this focus on understanding and making sense of experience has not lost its fascination, for many it has the opposite effect and I can see the metaphorical light dimming as they respond with ‘oh, right’ or something equally vague. I have had comments such as ‘that’s definitely not something I can use in my research’ and even ‘and that’s research, is it?’ I still believe that people hesitate to use narrative inquiry as a research methodology because of its refusal to be neatly labelled and categorized. It is, after all, a “fluid form of research” (Craig, 2012, p.91), precisely because a narrative inquiry develops in response to what is encountered during the research process rather than following a set path. It is this organic process that seems to unnerve many people I have talked to. In all honesty, their response does not surprise me. For it was mine at certain low points during my own research journey.

On my journey of discovering what narrative inquiry is and how to do it I have been influenced by a variety of perspectives – of constructionists, poststructuralists, philosophers, sociologists, and ‘pure’ narrative inquirers (e.g. Brockmeier, 2000; Lawler, 2002; Clandinin, 2013 among many others). The way I have come to conceptualize narrative inquiry is that my view of experience is a Deweyan one, namely relational, continuous, and social (Dewey, 1938/1997). Because individuals are always in relationships they cannot be understood separately from those around them. Our experiences develop from and lead on to further experiences; the experience I had undertaking my doctorate has not left me unaffected, unmoved, and unchanged. As the researcher I am also on a journey – I do not stand still while others around me move on; neither am I immune to what is happening around me. I am both influencing and influenced by my research, which means that “narrative inquirers engage in intense and transparent reflection and questioning of their own position, values, beliefs and cultural background” (Trahar, 2009, p.7), and consequently the reflexivity of the researcher is actively encouraged, not bracketed off from the research.

Once I get beyond an initial explanation of what narrative inquiry is, what usually follows is the question of data analysis. I tend to say that each narrative inquiry is unique and consequently “there is no one way to analyze data narratively” (James, 2017, p.3114). Each time I sense that this response has been opaque, not because I wish it to be but because narrative inquiry is so different a form of qualitative research that to reply ‘I used grounded theory’ or ‘I used discourse analysis’ has been neither appropriate nor accurate.

Added to this first layer of complexity is now a second, namely my use of an autoethnographic perspective in writing this chapter. As I move into new territory I am aware that this may be even more unnerving and uncomfortable and more slippery to grasp than narrative inquiry has been. Perhaps it is a case of ‘out of the frying pan and into the fire’ as I find myself once more trying to convince yet another colleague that this, too, really is a ‘proper’ research methodology.

Autoethnography is itself a narrative approach and is “an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple levels of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural” (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p.739). In my context, culture would partly be that of academia, and I use autoethnography here as a vehicle through which to write about my

experience of using narrative inquiry to analyze my data, but I am not using this research method to critique that culture. Instead what I am attempting to do here as a novice autoethnographer is to practise the art of autoethnography (Duncan, 2004).

It seems that autoethnography is a catch-all phrase for studies of a personal nature, and indeed Wall (2006, p.146) writes that personal narratives are “the typical product of autoethnography”. It is not my intention here to discuss autoethnography at length as this has been done beautifully and in depth by others (e.g. Ellis, 2004; Wall, 2006) but my understanding of this method is focused on what it enables, namely:

The sharing of unique, subjective, and evocative stories of experience that contribute to our understanding of the social world and allow us to reflect on what could be different because of what we have learned. (Wall, 2006, p.148)

I will also offer some of my own reflections – and by extension implications – by interweaving them throughout.

There is one final layer of complexity to mention: That of metaphors. I have inadvertently clung to metaphors to help me navigate my way through narrative’s maze towards some kind of stability and end product. Metaphors have provided a means of understanding (even perhaps identifying) how I am both feeling and experiencing my journey, and Egan (2017) brings this into the realm of narrative inquiry by saying that we need stories to contextualize metaphors.

It now seems almost too obvious to state that metaphor and narrative go hand in glove, because metaphors generate or reflect narratives. They are recognisable and accessible to many people (Talley, 2011) and they offer “a concrete image for abstract, or not easily understandable, phenomena” (Hanne, 2011, p.226). Narrative and metaphor are both framing devices; narrative frames our experience in terms of character, action, sequence, causation, motivation, and social context. Metaphor, in turn, “is concerned more with making a flash of connection” (Egan, 2017), helping to hook the reader in and then developing that through the narrative. Fundamentally, they illuminate different aspects of the same phenomenon. In the remainder of this chapter what follows is an interweaving of narrative and metaphor through the lens of autoethnography.

The metaphor of music

Music is one of my great loves and when I was beginning my data analysis, the orchestra I belong to was rehearsing Copland's clarinet concerto, the clarinet being the warm, sonorous wind equivalent of my own instrument, the cello. It is an achingly beautiful piece, unconventionally written in two movements, starting with a beautifully slow and expressive movement, "showcasing the way the instrument can blend with the strings in a very introspective way" (Baldini, 2017). This gives way to a challenging cadenza which links the two movements, leading into the exuberant finale.

The cadenza is full of shifting speeds and musical complexity ranging from very low to very high notes, numerous accidentals, and time changes. It is a strikingly accurate snapshot reflecting my experience of data analysis and my journey of coming to understand narrative inquiry as both "a method of investigation and a mode of representation" (Craig, 2012, p.91).

My journey too started slowly with much thrill and beauty as I explored the wonderful new world of narrative inquiry. Then the middle period was demanding and challenging, characterized by confusion and frustration both with narrative as a research methodology and with the data analysis in particular. The cadenza reflects this with the use of accidentals and somewhat clashing harmonies. In the first 14 bars the music gets faster and moves towards the top F held in suspension for two whole beats, like a rollercoaster car reaching the top of the ride, before rushing somewhat bumpily downwards towards a bottom F, almost the lowest note in the clarinet's range. The music seems to utilize most of the clarinet's range of notes and if I liken this to the emotions I experienced, there is significant similarity as I experienced many, both high and low, in the course of my research. Enchantment, enjoyment, and enthusiasm with the methodology so often led to frustration, vexation, and lack of confidence as I could not find concrete guides explaining 'How to do your narrative inquiry' before heading back up to enchantment, enjoyment, and enthusiasm again when I felt I was grasping what narrative inquiry was or when I had read a particularly well written narrative inquiry which caused me to experience it viscerally. I was intrigued to read Baldini's notes on the concerto saying that the clarinet blends 'introspectively' with the strings. I don't know what that means musically, but it makes me wonder how this mirrors my experience; by being a reflexive researcher I am necessarily exercising a form of introspection. But what am I blending? Myself as someone who is fairly conventional with

my somewhat unconventional research methodology? Or my desire for organisation and linearity with messiness and a lack of guidelines? Music demands order and clarity; I was trained to read ahead when playing so I would know what was coming. In a narrative inquiry I couldn't read ahead as there was nothing written, no score to read ahead from. Consequently, I didn't know what was coming.

After the challenging cadenza the rhythm of the finale is almost jaunty, sounding confident and happy. The final stages of my research were also jaunty as I became more comfortable and at ease with it. I surprised myself at my love of the concerto because it is modern, which instantly contrasts with my love of all things ordered and harmonious. And yet analysing my data was anything but an ordered process. Copland's music looks deceptively simple – perhaps like the idea of re-telling stories being research – and yet the jazz-like rhythms, which I am not used to playing (being classically trained) are complex but simultaneously intricate and ingenious. Narratives too are intricate and ingenious, not necessarily because of the way in which I have written and co-constructed them with the participant, but because they reflect someone's lived experience.

In playing the music I had to force myself to count, not to rely on instinct, which I often do when I am out of my depth. I remember becoming totally lost in the music, swerving violently from one bar to the next, rather than do what was ingrained in me from childhood lessons: Read ahead and be prepared – there should be no surprises.

And yet what I discovered about narrative data analysis in particular was that it was replete with surprises; it seemed to me that if it were not replete with surprises then I must be doing something wrong. The detours, wrong turnings, and dead ends I met along the way were unwanted as order vanished and messiness, confusion, and frustration took its place. I stepped out of my comfort zone many times over with this research, as I did with Copland's music, but found, again, that these were the times when I learned more about myself as much as I learned more about my work and the world of research.

A 'fermata': how do I understand narrative data analysis?

A fermata is a musical articulation mark meaning a pause of unspecified length. It is the performer or conductor alone who controls how long the fermata is held for, so here I want to

pause my personal narrative briefly to outline what analysing data narratively means. Essentially it involves an attempt to make sense of an experience or experiences which we, both the researcher and the researched, have had. Kim (2016, p.190) explains it as “a meaning-finding act through which we attempt to elicit implications for a better understanding of human existence” so at its very core, narrative data analysis searches for the meanings an individual has made. This is inherently problematic though, because “meaning is not tangible, nor static, thus it is not easily grasped” (ibid.). At the same time, we do not have direct access to the meaning which is given to an experience by someone else. Arguably the meaning we ascribe to our own experiences is not always accessible or capable of being verbalized and therefore in turn is not ‘verifiable’. This necessarily opens the way for various issues to be discussed, which are vital for consideration in a narrative inquiry, i.e. narrative interviewing, re-presentation, trustworthiness, time, and memory.

Challenges of narrative inquiry: the metaphor of the minefield

A minefield is a term used to refer to a situation with many hidden problems, although I recognize that the challenges or issues I faced, while initially hidden for me to uncover, are not necessarily hidden from or surprises for others.

Nevertheless, this is how I perceived the challenges as I travelled along the road of understanding what narrative inquiry is and how to do data analysis within this methodological framework: As unwanted and unwelcome interruptions which exploded onto my consciousness. Every time I traced a path through the minefield another issue would appear, not derailing me altogether but stopping me in my tracks until I had taken a breath, collected my thoughts, and considered that particular issue sufficiently to feel confident to continue.

The first of these minefields was narrative interviewing, which was my main source of data. Additional sources of data came from participants’ background questionnaires, email exchanges, conversations with my participants and colleagues when discussing narrative inquiry, and reflective reading around what narrative inquiry is and particularly at the data analysis stage, how to do it. My reflections were usually frustrated reflections precisely because of the minefields which kept appearing.

This is not a chapter about narrative interviewing but it highlights this somewhat slippery issue of narrative meaning. I had no idea what a ‘narrative interview’ was or how to conduct one, and indeed when I emailed my supervisor to tell her that I confronted a brick wall at every turn in trying to find a book on ‘narrative interviewing’ she said that as far as she knew, one hadn’t yet been written. I therefore read about unstructured interviews which seemed to me the closest relative to a narrative interview. In research interviews with my participants I initially, and with hindsight very naïvely, asked them to tell me a story about their learning experiences, expecting that they would simply “burst out with stories” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2009, p.41). Although some of them did tell stories, whatever is understood by that term (e.g. Bamberg, 2006), mostly my data consisted of in-depth conversations, both with the participants and later with colleagues. So, from all this data, how was I to make sense of both the experiences which had been shared with me *and* my own experiences? After all, I am not an objective or “disembodied recorder of someone else’s experience” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p.81).

The remainder of my struggles with narrative interviewing are necessarily edited out here, but it led to other issues and challenges I discovered and had to deal with. Before I could even consider the move from raw data to narrative construction, I had to grapple with other minefields in the shape of four further issues: re-presentation, trustworthiness, time, and memory.

I was aware from my reading that the narratives had to be firstly constructed by my analysing and interpreting those stories told and then co-constructed with my participants, so narratives are “produced and created within social relationships and between storytellers and their audiences” (Etherington, 2007, p.600). But these interpretations present complexities regarding both re-presentation and voice, precisely because I don’t have “direct access to another’s experience” (Riessman, 1993, p.8). A narrative “cannot ‘represent’ some reality. It can only re-present it i.e. present another narrative version” (Watson, 2008, p.336). This means that my interpretations will necessarily be equivocal, which is where Riessman’s (2008, p.184) “trustworthiness” (i.e. validity) is key. In the early stages of my research I was asked at the end of a conference presentation how I could know whether my participants were telling me the truth. This question astonished me, as I wanted to reply, ‘how can *anyone* know this?’ In quantitative or qualitative research that question stands – surely it is not a question singled out just for narrative inquirers? Yet I also realized that it was a concern I

myself had. This quote provides a wonderfully eloquent response which was unavailable to me in that moment of answering as I had not come across it:

When talking about their lives, people lie sometimes, forget a lot, exaggerate, become confused, and get things wrong. Yet they *are* revealing truths. These truths don't reveal the past "as it actually was" aspiring to a standard of objectivity. They give us instead the truths of our experiences... Unlike the truth of the scientific ideal, the truths of personal narratives are neither open to proof nor self-evident. We come to understand them only through interpretation, paying careful attention to the contexts that shape their creation and the world views that inform them. (Personal Narratives Group, 1989, p.261, emphasis in original)

I was given the truths of my participants' experiences as they understood them and as they were able to articulate them. My own understanding of their experiences started by looking at the context in which they were told and the participants' own worldview. I also had to trust that the experience was real and here the notions of time and memory are touched on. Ellis and Bochner (2000, p.750) capture this so clearly by writing that "the truth is that we can never capture experience" because each experience has already moved on in time from its telling and remembering (Speedy, 2010). Stories told to me then in that research setting would naturally be changed and adapted now, and when re-told to a different person. This comes back full circle, albeit briefly, to the fact that memories will not be truly re-presented because they are simply not static, changing over time with the person who does the remembering: "memory of the past is continuously modified by the experiences of the present and of the 'self' who is doing the remembering" (King, 2000, p.33). This links in with the Deweyan view of experience to which I hold. When we are telling a story about an experience we had, in remembering the past we are, intentionally or otherwise, attempting to make sense of that experience. Yet what is problematic is the relationship between time, memory, and narrative, because we "revise and edit the remembered past to square with our identities in the present" (Brockmeier, 2000, p.56). Another point to note is that "every story is partial and situated" (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p.750) and so the key point is not that the story accurately reflects the past, but what consequences are produced by the story and how they can be used (ibid. p.746).

There is more to be said on this but for now, I hope the above has given a flavour of the complexities of narrative data collection with which I grappled. I mention it here as data collection is inextricably linked with its analysis; it was not the linear process I had been

expecting. It was more an iterative process, one which is “interpretive at every stage” (Josselson, 2006, p.4) and so we as narrative inquirers are subjectively positioned both in our analysis and research as a whole because “I, too, lead a storied life” (Winkler, 2003, p.399).

The metaphor of the maze (of ways of analysing)

Once I had dealt with (or more accurately, pondered on) some of these issues I then had to begin the process of constructing the narratives, where I experienced all the detours, wrong turnings, and dead ends. I have written in detail about the actual construction elsewhere (see James, 2017) but briefly, the detours were in the form of ‘forays into data analysis’ beginning with my very first attempt using structural analysis (Riessman, 1993; 2008). This approach focuses on how the narrative is organized and while content is of interest, it is the form (or structure) that is paramount. I analyzed an extract from a postgraduate student’s personal oral narrative by dividing the extract into clauses according to the function of each clause (see Riessman, 2008, p.84). For example, when a clause mentioned ‘time, place or characters’, I labelled this *OR* (i.e. Orientation). The effect, however, was a fragmented personal narrative which felt both cold and detached, rather than one which longed to be “used rather than analyzed; to be told and retold rather than theorized and settled; to offer lessons for further conversation rather than undebatable conclusions” (Ellis & Bochner 2000, p.744). I had also used the model of analysis beyond its original intention, applying it to data obtained from a recorded interview rather than from a naturally occurring conversation. Frustrating though this was, it was still a valuable experience in highlighting the problems inherent in applying an ‘off-the-shelf’ model of analysis.

My second attempt was with my pilot study data, where I had interviewed six postgraduate international students once over the course of one term. Having transcribed five of the six interviews myself, I was left wondering how to analyze the data and so for the first three I simply inserted my own thoughts retrospectively, rather like speech bubbles, following my supervisor’s suggestion. But after doing this for three of the participants I began to get frustrated as I found this method dry and repetitive. This is where I longed for a set of ‘How to...’ guidelines. I varied my approach for the fourth participant, constructing a monologue from her data, but this felt somewhat reductionist. Another dead end. So, I set off in another direction and went to the opposite extreme with my fifth participant, employing Gilligan, Spencer, Weinberg and Bertsch’s (2006) *Listening Guide*, where I listened repeatedly to the

interview, each time focusing on a different aspect of the participant's experience. The irony was that although this finally gave me a set of concrete guidelines to follow, the analysis which emerged was far too lengthy and practically speaking it became problematic.

Despite my first two forays, or more aptly dead ends, I still felt I had no real idea about how to analyze my data for my actual doctoral study and so I returned to my starting point for my final foray, looking again at Riessman's (2008) four forms of analysis. I combined two of those for my final analysis (i.e. thematic and dialogic/performance) but although this gave me a clearer framework, it still did not help supply me with my increasingly elusive 'How to...' guidelines. With deadlines on the horizon I necessarily had to stop and find my way out of the maze which I did by basing my analysis on Hunter's (2010) article, which helpfully outlined steps and stages of her own narrative data analysis. And yet I quickly came to the realisation that I also had to adapt her method otherwise I would be pigeonholing both it and my data, which Kim (2016) warns against.

The metaphor of the swan

This final metaphor was one which emerged only after I had submitted my dissertation. In my viva one of the examiners, having both read the five narratives and heard me talk about how I had written them, challenged what she (rightly) perceived as a discrepancy between what she had read and what she was hearing. The image of a swan on a lake was her metaphor to describe that discrepancy, namely that the way I had portrayed the narratives was such that above the surface all is calm and tranquil, but what I was describing in terms of their construction and analysis was frenzied activity beneath. Completely unintentionally I had given the impression that they had been written with ease, implying that their construction and analysis was straightforward and not replete with the actual detours, wrong turnings and dead ends along the way. I was frustrated with myself for having inadvertently given this impression because I had really wanted my readers to sympathize with me in my messy journey of data analysis.

So, metaphor and narrative have been my constant companions throughout my experience. Metaphors are what I used to make sense of my experiences, explaining one experience in terms of another to both highlight conceptual similarities and to allow a window into my inner world explained externally through both words and images. Even writing this chapter

has uncovered more metaphors, as though like a dam which has burst they have started to flow into my consciousness and cannot stop. In drawing attention to metaphors my personal narrative now seems startlingly replete with them because they are such a helpful tool with which to both explain my research and help us – i.e. you, my reader, and me – make sense of my research experiences.

Concluding thoughts

Having come to the end of my personal narrative, what are the implications for educational practice of using narrative inquiry and autoethnography?

In an autoethnography there are no fixed rules or guidelines to evaluate what has been written; much of the evaluation seems inherently subjective (Ellis, 2000). There are similarities here with narrative inquiry, which demands that a different set of evaluative criteria be applied as it is so different from other forms of qualitative research (e.g. Webster & Mertova, 2007), focusing as it does on individuals' experience and meaning thereof. Readers need persuading of the trustworthiness of the re-presented data, so it is vital that researchers follow “a methodical path, documenting claims, and practising reflexivity” (Riessman, 2008, p.193).

I end by putting forward some of my own reflections on what I am learning about how to evaluate autoethnography using some of Adams, Jones and Ellis' (2015) criteria. The first of these criteria is to value “the *particular, nuanced, complex* and *insider* insights that autoethnography offers researchers, participants, and readers/audiences” (2015, p.103, emphasis in original) but what does this look like in what I have shared?

In my struggles to find a way of analysing my data narratively I have used numerous metaphors to both illustrate and conceptualize what I experienced. In identifying them, what I have retrospectively discovered has been immensely valuable in making sense of my experience, both for my own benefit and to try and show visually and in a more concrete, external way for readers what my inner turmoil during that analysis process was like. In that sense, what I have written is deeply personal to me, although perhaps you can liken your own experience to the metaphors I have used – or perhaps not. But that is not the purpose of this

chapter; its purpose was to offer an insight into my world by making the abstract concrete, and I hope I have done that.

Secondly, I value the personal and experiential, where I explore “*experience* as a means of insight about social life and recognising and embracing the risks of presenting *vulnerable selves* in research” (Adams et al, 2015, p.103, emphasis in original). Metaphor has been of significant value here, giving me insight into my feelings and emotions about conducting social research, looking at the experiences of others through the lens of narrative inquiry and now, by looking at my own experiences in even more naked vulnerability through the lens of autoethnography.

Where I perhaps depart from a ‘true’ autoethnography is that I have not tried here to “foreground the *power of stories* to describe and critique culture” (ibid. p.103, emphasis in original) because although I believe that personal narratives are indeed powerful, I am not aiming to critique the culture of narrative inquiry and its concomitant data analysis. I talk and write to make sense of the changes I am experiencing. Despite all I have written, I recognise that no one method exists in which to analyze data narratively. This is hardly a groundbreaking conclusion, but I write it because for me it is part and parcel of developing the “maturity and experience that are required to be a good narrative researcher” (Kim, 2016, p.2).

Lastly, I need to take a relationally responsible approach to research and representation, in which I need to make sure my research is accessible to a variety of readers, as well as thinking carefully about protecting identities of others I talk about in sharing my experiences. Like so many, I have been educated in an environment which tells me that ‘real’ research is scientific, using experiments and numbers to quantify and categorize people by labelling them in ever fragmented ways. Even some qualitative methods sing from this same hymnsheet. The presentation of much of these studies is still greatly impenetrable and not accessible to those who do not move in the seemingly hallowed halls of academia. Stories and experience, focusing on the *whole* person and letting *their* voice speak, are still not seen as valuable ways of doing research. But with approaches like narrative inquiry and autoethnography this is beginning to change. With the postmodern shift comes a slight wind of change in which room is made for other ways of knowing (Hall 2006) including the move of social science to affect people morally (Bochner, 2001).

My hope is that now you, the reader, ask yourself what you have learned from my story and that I will have achieved my goal not of portraying the facts of what happened to me accurately but rather that I conveyed the meanings I attached to my experience. I wanted to tell a story that readers could enter and feel part of...I wanted them to experience the experience (Ellis, 1999). I hope that I have done that.

References

- Adams, T.E, Jones, S.H., & Ellis, C. (2015) *Autoethnography*. New York: OUP.
- Baldini, C. (2017) Copland: Clarinet concerto. UC, Davis. Retrieved from <http://arts.ucdavis.edu/post/copland-clarinet-concerto>
- Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories: Big or small. Why do we care? *Narrative Inquiry*, 16 (1), 139-147.
- Bochner, A.P. (2001). Narrative's virtues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(2), 131-157.
- Brockmeier, J. (2000) Autobiographical time. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10 (1): 51-73.
- Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, F.M. (2000) *Narrative inquiry – Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, D.J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Craig, C.J. (2012) 'Butterfly under a pin': an emergent teacher image and mandated curriculum reform. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105: 90-101.
- Dewey, J. (1938/1997) *Experience and education*. USA: Touchstone.
- Duncan, M. (2004). Autoethnography: Critical appreciation of an emerging art. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(4), Article 3.
- Egan, K. (2017) Discovering the oral world and its disruption by literacy. Paper presented at *Look both ways: Narrative & metaphor in education conference*, Amsterdam, 30 March 2017.
- Ellis, C. (1999). Heartful autoethnography. *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(5), 669-683.
- Ellis, C. (2000) Creating criteria: an ethnographic short story. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6 (2): 273-277.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Ellis, C. & Bochner, A. (2000) Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N.K.

- Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (pp. 733-768).
- Etherington, K. (2007) Ethical research in reflexive relationships. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13 (5): 599-616.
- Gilligan, C., Spencer, R., Weinberg, M.K. & Bertsch, T. (2006). On the listening guide – A voice-centred relational method. In S. N. Hesse-Biber and P. Leavy (Eds.) *Emergent methods in social research*, (pp.253-271). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, J.F. & Holstein, J.A. (2009) *Analyzing narrative reality*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hanne, M. (2011) The binocular vision project: an introduction. *Genre*, 44 (3): 223-238
- Hunter, S.V. (2010). Analysing and representing narrative data: the long and winding road. *Current Narratives*, 1 (2): 44-54.
- James, G. (2017). Cul-de-sacs and narrative data analysis – A less than straightforward journey. *The Qualitative Report*, 22 (12), 3102-3117. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss12/2>
- Josselson, R. (2006). Narrative research and the challenge of accumulating knowledge. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16 (1), 3-10.
- Kim, J. (2016). *Understanding narrative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- King, N. (2000) *Memory, narrative, identity – Remembering the self*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawler, S. (2002). Narrative in social research. In T. May (Ed.) *Qualitative research in action*, 242-258. GB: Sage.
- Personal Narratives Group (1989) Truths. In Personal Narratives Group (Eds.) *Interpreting women's lives: Feminist theory and personal narratives*. Bloomington, USA: Indiana University Press (pp.261-264).
- Riessman, C.K. (1993) *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Riessman, C.K. (2008) *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sparkes, A.C. (2000) Autoethnography and narratives of self: reflections on criteria in action. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17: 21-43.
- Speedy, J. (2010) Time. [Lecture] University of Bristol, 8th November 2010.
- Talley, J. (2011) Metaphor, narrative and the promotion of public health. *Genre*, 44 (3): 405-

423

- Trahar, S. (2009) Beyond the story Itself: Narrative inquiry and autoethnography in intercultural research in higher education [41 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(1), Art. 30, Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0901308>
- Wall, S. (2006). An autoethnography on learning about autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5 (2): 1-12.
- Watson, C. (2008) Tensions and aporias in the narrative construction of lives. *Qualitative Research*, 8 (3): 333-337.
- Webster, L. & Mertova, P. (2007) *Using narrative inquiry as a research method: An introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Winkler, G. (2003) Are we nice or are we real? Ethical issues emerging from collaborative narrative research. *Educational Action Research*, 11 (3): 389-402.