

Intimacy in Autoethnography: A Framework for Autoethnographic Trustworthiness

Carey E. Andrzejewski¹ and Sean A. Forbes,
Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA

Eric Hogan
Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA, USA

ABSTRACT

The hallmarks of autoethnographic research are the centering of personal experience to interpret the ways of being of a culture-sharing group and then representing that group in evocative text. This focus on personal experience in situ and representation sets autoethnography apart from other methodological traditions, even while it blends elements of autobiography and ethnography. We assert, given its unique characteristics, that autoethnography is best understood as a project rooted in intimate epistemologies. Intimate epistemologies are those that eliminate all distance between the knower and the known. Epistemologies should guide the strategies (i.e., warrants) researchers use to assert that their research is trustworthy; trustworthiness is an inherently epistemological concept. This article articulates a framework grounded in four intimacy-aligned strategies. The planks of this framework are researcher reflexivity, prolonged engagement, thick description, and collaboration. We explore how each of these four strategies is practical in the context of autoethnography projects and are consistent with intimate epistemologies.

KEYWORDS: Autoethnography, Intimacy, Trustworthiness

Autoethnography, a unique tradition in its own right, has parentage in both the genre of autobiography and the methodological frameworks of ethnography. Even given these origins, autoethnography is not fully embraced by either intellectual community. Reason being that it does not meet all the trustworthiness expectations for either (Ellis et al., 2011). Indeed, autoethnographers often face questions about the legitimacy (i.e., trustworthiness) of their scholarship from within and beyond those audiences. We assert that trustworthiness in autoethnography can best be understood, and therefore asserted, from the tradition's distinct epistemology, an epistemology rooted in intimacy as practice and ideal.

Copyright © 2026 by Author/s and Licensed by CECS Publications, United States. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

¹ Corresponding Author: Emily S. and Gerald R. Leischuck Endowed Professor; Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology; Auburn University; 345 W. Samford Avenue, Office #3319, Auburn, Alabama 36849. E-mail; cea0011@auburn.edu

On Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research

Although qualitative research cannot be treated as a monolith (Denzin et al., 2024), it is widely agreed that qualitative researchers are more concerned with the depth and nuance of lived experience than with broadly applicable patterns (Ambert et al., 1995; Bhattacharya, 2017; Tracy, 2019; Whittemore et al., 2001). These aims, along with concerns about rigor, subjectivity, and creativity, complicate the development of universal standards for qualitative research (Denzin et al., 2024; Johnson, 1999). Disparate qualitative methods and traditions, therefore, espouse different evaluative criteria (Whittemore et al., 2001), but across traditions and paradigms aligned with qualitative inquiry, there is shared focus on trustworthiness (Ahmed, 2024; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Qualitative researchers assert trustworthiness to persuade readers that their methodological choices and interpretations have merit (Stahl & King, 2020). Lincoln and Guba's (1985) ideas about trustworthiness have been field-shaping for decades. They posit that trustworthiness can be located at the intersection of 1) credibility (i.e., the believability of the findings), 2) transferability (i.e., the applicability of the implications), 3) dependability (i.e., consistency and resonance), and 4) confirmability (i.e., the presence of data-based warrants for the stated assertions). The literature bases of different qualitative research traditions—ethnography, case study, grounded theory, phenomenology, narrative inquiry, etc. (Creswell & Poth, 2024)—recommend various techniques and strategies to assert trustworthiness (see, for example, Creswell & Miller, 2000). The alignment of trustworthiness strategies and methodological tradition is mediated through epistemological assumptions. That is, each tradition is rooted in epistemological assumptions, which serve as the foundation for articulating trustworthiness, both conceptually and practically (Grass, 2024).

While many qualitative traditions have explicitly articulated these relationships in literature, little attention has been paid specifically to trustworthiness in autoethnographic research. This is made potentially more challenging by the autoethnographic continuum (Le Roux, 2017), where authors tell stories in a variety of ways that may or may not seem rigorous to those unfamiliar with this method of inquiry. We do this by asserting an intimate epistemology (see, for example, Smith, 2005) as a foundational framework of autoethnography.

Purpose

The purpose of this article is to address this gap by articulating a framework by which autoethnographers might assert trustworthiness in their studies. Positioning autoethnography as rooted in epistemologies of intimacy (Smith 2005), we detail how autoethnographers, regardless of their position on or outside the continuum between evocative and analytic approaches, can use intimate strategies. We provide a foundational framework grounded in four intimacy-aligned strategies: researcher reflexivity, prolonged engagement, thick description, and collaboration. We posit that these strategies, further described below, can serve as warrants for assertions that autoethnographies are trustworthy (Ahmed, 2024; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). First, we offer a definition of autoethnography as a distinct method.

Autoethnography

Autoethnographies feature the explication of social context through the analysis of personal narratives (Chang, 2008). As Adams and Herrmann (2020) explained in the first issue of the *Journal of Autoethnography*, autoethnographic projects “use selfhood, subjectivity, and personal experience (‘auto’) to describe, interpret, and represent (‘graphy’) beliefs, practices, and identities

of a group or culture ('ethno')" (p. 2). Unlike other forms of personal writing (e.g., confessional tales (Van Maanen, 2011) or autobiography), autoethnography entails a focus on empiricism, theoretical grounding, and adding to a line of inquiry in the extant literature (Cook, 2014; Hogan, 2022a, 2022b). Autoethnographers reflect on themselves while taking the readers on a parallel journey of introspection through carefully crafted narratives and analysis (Keleş, 2022). Autoethnographers aim to engage the reader cognitively, emotionally, reflexively, and metacognitively. Researchers explicitly state the research question(s) and use it/them as a guide for scaffolding and organizing their narratives. Autoethnographers also share their data collection/generation and analysis strategies (Ellis et al., 2011). As such, autoethnography might be distinguished from autobiography via a focus on method and epistemology and a concern with trustworthiness.

Le Roux (2017) articulates a continuum of autoethnographic scholarship anchored by evocative autoethnography and analytic autoethnography. Chang et al. (2013) describe evocative autoethnography as a technique that uses the first-person to tell evocative stories; as such, they may not explicitly state data collection and analysis techniques (Bochner & Ellis, 2016; Ellis, 2007; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Le Roux, 2017). Keleş (2022) similarly asserts that evocative autoethnography explores socio-cultural phenomena and contexts through the description and analysis of emotionally charged, pertinent, personal experiences. In this way, evocative autoethnography prioritizes the 'auto' of the method.

On the other end of the continuum, and more similar to ethnographic methods, analytic autoethnographies use "narrative interpretation," wherein data collection and analysis are explicitly detailed, to include direct mention of data collection, field work, and analytic techniques (Le Roux, 2017). As such, analytic autoethnographies feature five common traits: 1) researchers who are complete members of the culture under study, 2) disclosure and presence of the researcher in the writing, 3) inclusion of conversation and observation with participants, 4) deductive analyses rooted in extant theory, and 5) intentional reflexive work by the researcher, particularly as it relates to analysis and interpretation (Anderson, 2006).

Others have troubled this organization of methods altogether (Butz & Besio, 2009). Because of the many ways people might choose to write about themselves and their sense-making, autoethnographers have more flexibility in how stories are told (Cooper & Lilyea, 2022). Despite the differences, both evocative and analytic autoethnography, and all other forms of autoethnography along, or perpendicular to, this continuum, are concerned with understanding social phenomena. Autoethnography, as method and text, centers the researcher's personal perspectives in sense-making efforts of cultural practices and the social phenomena to which they give shape (Hogan 2022a). As such, all autoethnographic work can be understood as stemming from an epistemology of intimacy.

Intimate Epistemology

We have asserted above that all arguments for the trustworthiness of research are directly tied to epistemology. That is, the warrants that support claims of trustworthiness, indeed definitions of trustworthiness, are inherently epistemological. Nearly all research traditions in the social and behavioral sciences embrace an epistemology, be it (post)positivist or interpretivist, that assumes some distance between subject and object of inquiry. For example, traditional ethnographers organize space in their work by balancing emic and etic perspectives. That is, they seek to understand a culture-sharing group from both their position as an outsider, perhaps guided by theory, and/or from the perspectives of those who enjoy insider status (Bergman & Lindgren, 2017). Autoethnography resolves this tension through "unusual closeness" (Smith, 2005, p. 70)

with the study context. Said closeness, or intimacy, is predicated on “intersubjective, co-constructive, and negotiated interpersonal knowledge” (Chuang, 2015, p. 3). Autoethnography dissolves “the boundary between authors and objects of representation” (i.e., participants; Butz & Besio, 2009, p. 1660). The distance between knower and known is not simply intertwined; they inhabit the same space. Researchers are (a part of) the object of study, and participants are repositioned as (co-)narrators of the social phenomenon in question. As such, autoethnographers are always both emic/etic, insider/outsider, subject/object, participant/researcher, reporter/analyst. These characteristics of autoethnography beg the assertion that an autoethnography is a trustworthy piece of scholarship when the techniques used to assert trustworthiness demonstrate commitment to intimacy as a way of knowing and invite the reader into intimate connection with the ethnographer.

Asserting Trustworthiness in Autoethnography

All qualitative researchers seek to build trustworthiness so they can answer in the affirmative this question posed by Lincoln and colleagues (2018): “May I trust myself in acting on [the study’s] implications?” (p. 138). Accordingly, the degree of trust readers put in works of qualitative scholarship is typically attributed to the quality, detail, and epistemic consistency of the researcher’s telling (Stahl & King, 2020). Here, we offer a framework for asserting trustworthiness in autoethnography. The planks of the framework are practical strategies, consistent with an epistemology of intimacy, in the context of autoethnographic inquiry.

Plank 1: Researcher Reflexivity

Researcher reflexivity, as a procedure to build trustworthiness, is used for researchers to expose, examine, and disclose their assumptions, values, and beliefs (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Autoethnographers are, by definition, engaged in ongoing reflexive work. This is an essential element of their analysis as well as their data generation. Their projects are rooted in intimate knowledge and excavation of the self, and their data are derived from lived experiences and sense-making thereof. That is, autoethnographic data are, at a minimum, intrapersonal (Atkinson et al., 2003). These intrapersonal reflections are intimate explorations of the self.

As Berry (2013) said, “Reflexivity entails taking seriously the self’s location(s) in culture and scholarship, circumspectly exploring our relationship to/in autoethnography to make research and cultural life better and more meaningful” (p. 212; emphasis in original). To do so, autoethnographers, oscillating between the prereflexive ‘I’ and the reflexive ‘Me’ (Boll, 2023), leverage reflexivity for sense-making as they work to both name and interrogate the self in society, the relationship between granular experiences and cultural forces, how personal and political dynamics are mutually reified, and the ways in which research action interacts with analysis (Adams et al., 2015; Berry & Clair, 2011). They must also invite the reader into this scrutiny and circumspection. Researcher reflexivity is at the core of any autoethnographic project, regardless of its location (or not) on the continuum.

Plank 2: Prolonged Engagement

Prolonged engagement is staying in the research site—in this case, living an experience—for a long period of time, while also allowing participants, both the self and others, to provide information (Ahmed, 2024; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Auto ethnographers are expected to engage

with themselves—their sense-making, and their identities—throughout the autoethnographic project. They also may engage with others who share, and co-construct, knowledge of the social phenomenon in question. This engagement should go on long enough to create and sustain intimacy and to support the negotiation of new, intersubjective, interpersonal knowledge. There is no set timetable, but there is an expectation that researchers stay in the field long enough to gain nuanced insights from memories (Giorgio, 2013), new experiences, and the narrations of others.

Prolonged engagement runs parallel to researcher reflexivity because autoethnographers embody both the role of researcher and the role of participant. Prolonged engagement with dual identities—researcher and participant, prereflexive ‘I’ and reflexive ‘Me’ (Boll, 2023)—requires simultaneous reflexive work. Further, as relates to other participant-researchers, the interpersonal work inherent to autoethnographic projects affords self-transformation via deepening self-awareness and self-discovery (Bernauer, 2023; Raab, 2013).

Plank 3: Thick Description

Denzin (1989) explained that thick, rich descriptions are deep, dense, and detailed accounts requiring immersion (i.e., prolonged engagement) in a scene and the culture it represents (see also Geertz, 1973). Thick description—prioritizing context-based meaning-making while eschewing shallow understanding—is an expectation in all qualitative research (Tracy, 2010, 2019). Along these lines, Bochner and Ellis (2016) articulate their expectations for thick, rich description:

“I look for abundant, concrete details. I want to feel the flesh and blood emotions of people coping with life’s contingencies. I am attracted to structurally complex narratives that are told in a temporal framework representing the curve of time. I also reflect on the author’s emotional credibility, vulnerability, and honesty. I also prefer narratives that express a tale of two selves, one that shows a believable journey from who I was to who I am, and how a life course can be reimagined or transformed by crisis. I hold the author to a demanding standard of ethical self-consciousness. I want a story that moves me, my heart and belly as well as my head.” (pp. 212-213)

Note the embodied and emotional language they use to describe how they want to experience the writing. We argue that this demand for thick, rich description is heightened in autoethnography because of its relationship with intimate epistemologies. The purpose of a thick description is to have the reader feel as if they experienced the event themselves by offering concrete examples and context. Trustworthiness, and readers’ judgments thereof, is supported when readers are transported into a setting or situation where they can feel, experience, and live vicariously through someone else (Pugh & Mosseri, 2023). Thick, rich description creates intimate, resonant (Tracy, 2010, 2019) connections between readers and autoethnographic texts.

Plank 4: Collaboration

As stated above, the researcher-participant distinction is dissolved in autoethnography. On some occasions, this is because the researcher is the only participant, in which case, collaboration makes little sense. When, however, others are involved in the autoethnographic project, collaboration is the means through which this occurs (Creswell & Miller, 2000; see also Ross et al., 2022 for a discussion of solidarity in research). Collaboration in autoethnography affords the building of intimacy and the pooling of experiences and narratives about the social phenomenon under study (see e.g., Zacharias & Shleykina, 2021). Dialogic accounts, created between and

among all participant-researchers, help to uncover new meaning of the “research context both on the micro level of the individual and the macro level of the society” (Miyahara & Fukao, 2022, p. 8). Wrestling with commonalities and differences across dialogic accounts opens an intersubjective door to co-construct new meanings (Chang et al., 2013).

Reflexive and analytic work might also be treated as sites for collaboration in autoethnography. Whereas researcher reflexivity is a process whereby the autoethnographer discloses—first to themselves via personal writing and second to the reader via selective sharing—relevant values, beliefs, assumptions, and positions, co- or member-reflection “allows participants to give an opinion and shape the emerging analysis” (Tracy, 2019, p. 168). Here, it is useful to draw a distinction between member reflection and member checking. The latter suggests that participant feedback is a means of ‘checking’ the validity of the researcher’s interpretation (McKim, 2023). This, we argue, is inconsistent with intimate epistemologies. The former, however, affords more intimate, interpersonal relationships among the participant-researchers, as co-constructors of knowledge. It also affords new, negotiated insights that give shape and depth to the resulting autoethnographic report.

As an example of a collaborative autoethnography, Herrera et al. (2022) demonstrate trustworthiness in their exploration of how self-care practices promote well-being at the doctoral level by alternating between individual and shared data collection and analysis with ongoing and probing communication. Through these processes, Herrera et al. (2022) achieve what Chang et al. (2013) describe as “...scholarly space to hold up mirrors to each other in communal self-interrogation” (p. 26).

Of course, having multiple researchers begs the question of whose voice dominates in the co-construction, particularly when there are preexisting power differences, such as with Herrera et al. (2022), where one researcher is a faculty member, and the others are doctoral students. Reflecting on these dynamics in other faculty and student collaborations, Chang et al. (2013,) posit: “Sharing personal experiences and perspectives on topics of mutual interest made all members equally vulnerable to each other and became a liberating equalizer in their relationships” (pp. 26-27). In this way, intimacy diffuses hierarchy.

Trustworthiness Summarized

Throughout this article, we have documented how autoethnography, as a method, might be considered in relation to trustworthiness. Leveraging epistemologies of intimacy (Cîrstea & Pescinski, 2024; Smith, 2005), we argue that three or four (when co-participant-researchers are involved) strategies are foundational for any assertion that an autoethnography is trustworthy. That is, autoethnographers assert the trustworthiness of their methods and accounts by deploying three distinct, but interrelated strategies: 1) deep reflexivity, 2) prolonged engagement, and 3) thick description. A fourth, collaboration, is necessary when more than one participant-researcher contribute to the data corpus or analysis. Certainly, autoethnographers may deploy additional strategies they deem suitable to individual projects (i.e., those aligned with their paradigmatic and theoretical foundations beyond epistemological intimacy), but we have focused here on these four strategies because they are both practical in the context of autoethnographic projects and philosophically consistent with intimate epistemologies.

Other widely recognized trustworthiness-building strategies that are not included in our list above involve: member checking, disconfirming evidence (i.e., negative case analysis), triangulation, auditing, and peer debriefing (Ahmed, 2024; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Shenton, 2004). As previously mentioned, we do not consider member checking to be aligned with an

intimate epistemology because this strategy assumes an objective reality that can be discovered and then ‘checked’ by the participants. This strategy depends on the distinction between researcher and participant, rather than a focus on the co-construction of intimate knowledge. Similarly, the search for and acknowledgement of disconfirming evidence focuses on deviation rather than negotiation in the co-construction of knowledge, rendering this strategy misaligned with intimate epistemologies. Triangulation of data, context, theory, or researchers is also misaligned (i.e., not intimate) because triangulation is fundamentally a test of validity and an effort to eliminate bias. Intimate epistemologies, on the other hand, position bias as constant and negotiated, perhaps through commitments to reflexivity, and validity as synonymous with trustworthiness. Finally, we position audit trails and peer debriefing as misaligned with intimate epistemologies because they seek to substitute researcher-participant voices and knowledge with the voices and knowledge of those disconnected from the project; they intentionally involve those who are distant from (i.e., not intimately involved with) the project. In sum, we focus here on the foundational elements of an assertion of trustworthiness as being those processes that are literally meant to build trust—dare we say intimacy—among the participant-researchers and between the participant-researchers and the reader.

Conclusion

The engaging thing about autoethnography is that everyone’s story matters, but this mattering hinges on intimate methods, intimate data, and intimate analyses. As autoethnography becomes even more mainstream, we reflect and appreciate how this method has grown. We envision that autoethnography will continue to evolve in ways that balance aspects of the evocative and analytical autoethnography continuum and integrate other points of view. Even as we envision this increasingly robust future for autoethnography and autoethnographic methods, we cannot imagine that autoethnography will ever cease to be an intimate mode of inquiry.

Intimacy is inherent even in the word: auto-ethno-graphy (Adams & Herrmann, 2020). These interrelated components are both etymological and practical, indicating simultaneous concern with the self (i.e., the construction of intimate personal knowledge), culture and cultural practices (i.e., the intimate co-construction of cultural knowledge), and representation via text (i.e., hoped-for intimate connection with the reader). They dictate that autoethnographic projects filter representations of a group or culture subjectively through the self (Adams & Herrmann, 2020). This article provides a framework for trustworthiness consistent with the broad nature and practice of autoethnographic inquiry. While the planks of that framework are particular trustworthiness-building strategies—researcher reflexivity, prolonged engagement, thick description, and collaboration—the joints of the framework are intimate epistemologies. It is our aim that this framework is supportive of the work of those who bravely, vulnerably, and intimately engage in autoethnography.

References

- Adams, T., & Herrmann, A. (2020). Expanding our autoethnographic future. *Journal of Autoethnography*, 1(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1525/joae.2020.1.1.1>
- Adams, T., Holman Jones, S., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.
- Ahmed, S. K. (2024). The pillars of trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, 2, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2024.100051>

- Ambert, A.-M., Adler, P. A., Adler, P., & Detzner, D. F. (1995). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 879–894. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353409>
- Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449>
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (2003). *Key themes in qualitative research: Continuities and change*. AltaMira Press.
- Bergman, Å., & Lindgren, M. (2017). Navigating between an emic and an etic approach in ethnographic research: Crucial aspects and strategies when communicating critical results to participants. *Ethnography and Education*, 13(4), 477–489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2017.1387066>
- Bernauer, J. A. (2023). The six voices of Logue in qualitative inquiry: Prologue, monologue, dialogue, polylogue, metalogue, and epilogue. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 7(4), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/13597>
- Berry, K. (2013). Spinning autoethnographic reflectivity, cultural critique, and negotiating selves. In S. Holman Jones, T. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 209–227). Left Coast Press.
- Berry, K., & Clair, R. (2011). Reflecting on the call to ethnographic reflexivity: A collage of responses to questions of contestation. *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*, 11, 199–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708611401339>
- Bhattacharya, K. (2017). *Fundamentals of qualitative research: A practical guide*. Routledge.
- Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (2016). *Evocative autoethnography: Writing stories and telling lives*. Routledge.
- Boll, T. (2023). Meet “me” in the field(-notes): The selves and self-relations of autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 30(8-9), 674–683. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004231196921>
- Butz, D., & Besio, K. (2009). Autoethnography. *Geography Compass*, 3(5), 1660–1674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00279.x>
- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Left Coast.
- Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K-A.C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.
- Chuang, H. S. (2015). Complete-member ethnography: Epistemological intimacy, complete-membership, and potentials in critical communication research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915611551>
- Cîrstea, A. M., & Pescinski, J. (2024). ‘Intimacy as method’: Ethnographic reflections on equitable knowledge production in migration research. *Migration Studies*, 12(3), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnae020>
- Cook, P. (2014). To be sociological: Autoethnography as an assessment and learning tool. *Journal of Sociology*, 50(3), 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783312451780>
- Cooper, R., & Lilyea, B. (2022). I’m interested in autoethnography, but how do I do it? *The Qualitative Report*, 27(1), 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5288>
- Creswell, J., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2
- Creswell, J. & Poth, C. (2024). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Sage.

- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., Giardina, M., & Cannella, G. S. (2024). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, M. D. Giardina, & G. S. Cannella (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (6th ed., pp. 1-28). Sage.
- Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), 3-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406294947>
- Ellis, E., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung* 36(4), 273-290. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23032294>
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). Sage.
- Erickson, F. (2024). A history of qualitative inquiry in social and educational research. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, M. D. Giardina, & G. S. Cannella (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (6th ed., pp. 33-60). Sage.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- Giorgio, G. (2013). In his own time: An autoethnographic memorial. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(2), 119-126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412462994>
- Grass, K. (2024). The three logics of qualitative research: Epistemology, ontology, and methodology in political science. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 42-56. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/14083>
- Hogan, E. (2022a). An autoethnographic reflection of my academic privileges while working with high school interns. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(4), 937-944. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.4807>
- Hogan, E. (2022b). Changing my language and understanding: An autoethnography of dumb-upness. *National Youth Advocacy and Resilience Journal* 5(2), 50-67. <https://doi.org/10.20429/nyarj.2022.050203>
- Johnson, M. (1999). Observations on positivism and pseudoscience in qualitative nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 30(1), 67-73. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1999.01050.x>
- Keleş, U. (2020). Writing a “good” autoethnography in educational research: A modest proposal. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(9), 2026-2046. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5662>
- Le Roux, C. S. (2017). Exploring rigour in autoethnographic research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(2), 195-207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1140965>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2018). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 108-150). Sage.
- McKim, C. (2023). Meaningful member-checking: A structured approach to member-checking. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 7(2), 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/12973>
- Miyahara, M., & Fukao, A. (2022). Exploring the use of collaborative autoethnography as a tool for facilitating the development of researcher reflexivity. *System*, 105, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102751>
- Pugh, A. J., & Mosseri, S. (2023). Trust-building vs. “just trust me”: Reflexivity and resonance in ethnography. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 8, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1069305>
- Raab, D. (2013). Transpersonal approaches to autoethnographic research and writing. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(42), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2013.1516>

- Ross, K., Li, P., & Call-Cummings, M. (2023). Solidarity as methodological praxis. *Qualitative Research*, 23(5), 1181-1202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941221098919>
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63-75. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201>
- Smith, C. (2005). Epistemological intimacy: A move to autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 4(2), 68-76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690500400206>
- Stahl, N. & King, J. (2020). Expanding approaches for research: Understanding and using trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 44(1), 26-28. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45381095>
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121>
- Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact* (2nd ed.). Wiley Global Research.
- Van Maanen, J. (2011). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography* (2nd ed.). The University of Chicago Press.
- Whittemore, R., Chase, S., & Mandle, C.L. (2001). Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(4), 522-537. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973201129119299>
- Zacharias, N., & Shleykina, G. (2021). Collaborative autoethnography as a pathway for teacher learning. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 5(2), 10-21. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/11030>

Notes on Contributors

Carey E. Andrzejewski is a Professor of Educational Foundations and Research Methods at Auburn University's College of Education. As a critical scholar, she explores and facilitates the work of educators toward more socially just schools. You can access her recent scholarship in *Critical Education*, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *Educational Psychologist*, and *Journal of Participatory Research Methods*.

Sean A. Forbes is a Professor of Educational Psychology at Auburn University's College of Education. As an engaged scholar, his teaching, research, and outreach efforts address educational challenges to impact the well-being of students and the community. He is the founder and director of O Grows, a community food project with a mission to cultivate local food, relationships, and knowledge-sharing. You can access his recent scholarship in the *Journal of Adolescent Research* and the *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*.

Eric Hogan is an Associate Professor of Educational Psychology at Georgia Southern University. He teaches courses on learning theory, motivation, development, and assessment. His research focuses on creating effective learning environments in and outside of schools. Recent publications can be found in *Educational Psychology Review*, *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, and *National Youth Advocacy and Resilience Journal*.

ORCID

Carey E. Andrzejewski, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9168-795X>

Sean A. Forbes, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0900-2507>

Eric Hogan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2010-1787>