

---

## **An EFL Experience in Undergraduate Thesis Writing: An Auto-Ethnography**

*Abdul Wahib*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author, English Education Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang, Indonesia; [awahib321@gmail.com](mailto:awahib321@gmail.com)

---

*Received: 17 June 2022*

*Accepted: 12 December 2022*

*Published: 24 January 2023*

---

### **Abstract**

Writing an undergraduate thesis is often a difficult challenge for college students. In this paper, I reflect on my writing experiences in my undergraduate thesis using journal review and stimulated recall to construct my understanding of auto-ethnography in writing an undergraduate thesis. I developed a chronology of the critical occasions during the time I constructed my thesis and reflected upon these events to investigate questions approximately whether my thesis was a piece of auto-ethnography or not. I analyze my experiences using critical incidents to get *aha* moments. By applying auto-ethnography theories from the experts, I conclude that my paper is a piece of auto-ethnography.

**Keywords:** Auto-ethnography, undergraduate thesis, writing

**To cite this article:** Wahib, A. (2023). An EFL Experience in Undergraduate Thesis Writing: An Auto-Ethnography. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 4(1), 100-113. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v4i1.485>

**DOI:** 10.35961/salee.v4i1.485

### **1. Introduction**

Writing is frequently a tremendous challenge for learners who learn English as a Foreign Language (EFL), especially in academic writing (Ai, 2015). Academic writing can be defined as non-fiction produced as part of academic work which uses grammatical structures correctly. Writing with appropriate spelling and grammar is a particular challenge for EFL students due to their need for proficiency in English mastery. An example of academic writing is a thesis for the undergraduate.



The thesis refers to the general claim of an essay or similar work. It means that it contains non-fictional work which needs academic writing. An undergraduate thesis composing the last stage in achieving the four-year certification has been perceived both as a climax of college studies and as a serious issue related to a quitter, protracting the length of studies, and individual uneasiness of understudies. Writing an undergraduate thesis is viewed as an inborn and essential piece of college that ensures graduates' scholastic capabilities and status. Then again, it resembles a paradox when we see the understudies work on their proposals through before, they were, for the most part, expected to review essential information and realities from course readings and talks, they are supposed to work freely, to have the option to find basics and to take part in decisive reasoning(Ylijoki, 2001).

As an English foreign language learner, the researcher has studied English since he was in third grade in elementary school. Mostly in his English experience, he focuses on grammar from elementary school until senior high school. When he continues to college, he focuses on grammar and linguistics. So in terms of grammar and writing structures, he does not have serious problems. However, grammar ability is not enough in academic writing, especially thesis writing. It means mastering sentence structures, conjunction, text, and others are not the only challenge in writing an undergraduate thesis. Other challenges include understanding the problems, the writing rules, the citation, etc. Making a gap from one topic to different topics with fitting connections is also something prominent that one should be aware of in writing an undergraduate dissertation. The most formidable challenge for the author to accomplish an undergraduate thesis is mastery of the theory needed in specific research.

Autobiography simply is a process of creating, reviewing and making sense the past events(Alexander, 1999). It means that auto-ethnography delivers critical move of making sense of the past experiences. Auto-ethnography is eventually recognized to be fairly phenomenon and contested method(Walford, 2021). Auto-ethnography is a type of research that includes a specialist expounding on a subject of great individual pertinence, arranging his encounters inside the social setting. Auto-ethnography has been increasingly developed in the study such as *Netnography* which was the combination of auto-ethnography, semi-structured interview, participant observations, and field notes(Takhar-Lail & Chitakunye, 2015). The author's experience will construct the ideas and sights about auto-ethnography. In this research, the author will reflect on his undergraduate thesis experience to pass and get a bachelor's degree, writing over one year of completion. The purpose of this research is to discuss some of the learning that occurred for the author during this time and to explore some of his emerging ideas about auto-ethnography. Through this process, the author hopes to draw insights into the undergraduate thesis, reflective practice, and its relationship with auto-ethnography. Due to this paper is his experiences, the type of this

research is autobiography. The writer only tells his experience and uses critical accident theory in analyzing the data. This is the story of how the researcher encounters the challenges and finds them out. From the challenges faced by the author and how he overcomes those challenges, the author will construct his understanding of auto-ethnography in writing an undergraduate thesis. For the rest of the study, the author will use “I” to refer to himself.

The author hopes this study will be the interest of undergraduate thesis. The author also wants to show that conducting an undergraduate thesis does not always use experimental research, which needs many samples and requirements. By compounding the suitable theory and your understanding of the subjects, we can conduct the thesis without many extraordinary things.

### ***Research Question***

Based on the background above, the writer cultivates the following research question How do these experiences construct my understanding of auto-ethnography in writing an undergraduate thesis? This research question focuses on how these experiences construct my understanding of auto-ethnography and unravel the problems in writing an undergraduate thesis.

### ***Theoretical Framework***

Writing is, in many cases, a considerable test for EFL students. EFL Learners are the understudies who learn English and get an opportunity to rehearse it each time in their daily exercises in the everyday schedule. It means they barely use or even practice English as a communication tool. In this research, the author uses himself as an example EFL learner.

An undergraduate thesis (likewise called Bachelor's paper) is an enormous scholastic composing piece requiring gigantic examination on the chosen point. It's typically allowed during the last year of the degree program. According to Djatmiko (2018), an undergraduate thesis is a scientific work in the form of a research report with specific field problems written by students under the guidance of the supervising lecturer as a condition for completing a bachelor's degree (Djatmiko, 2018). Generally, an undergraduate dissertation is a scientific paper that forms an experiment' result or thinking result as one of the requirements to pass college and gain a bachelor's degree. In other words, an undergraduate thesis is non-fiction of academic words to accumulate a bachelor's degree in Indonesia.

Autobiography, usually known as auto-ethnography, is a type of research that includes a specialist expounding on a subject of great individual pertinence, arranging his encounters inside the social setting. Auto-ethnography is a well methodological approach in research (Roy & Uekusa, 2020). Auto-ethnography, in this manner, requires profound reflection on one's unique encounters and the general inside oneself. Holman (2015)

expressed that auto-ethnography is the utilization of individual experience and individual composition to (1) reason ultimately remark on/study rehearses; (2) make commitments to existing exploration; (3) embrace weakness with reason; and (4) make a corresponding relationship with crowds in to constrain a reaction (Sikes, 2015). Bringing out the substance of autoethnographic work according to an alternate point of view, Hunt (2009) draws upon the expressions of St Augustine: People travel to marvel at the level of the mountains; at the enormous rushes of the oceans; at the long course of the waterways; at the considerable compass of the sea; at the round movement of the stars; but they pass without anyone else without pondering (*Hunt-SCUTREA 2009*, n.d.).

Auto-ethnography, as a type of composing, permits the writer to write in an exceptionally customized style, drawing on their dare to learn a cultural peculiarity(Ai, 2015). In doing so, the author needs to write selectively and retroactively the experiences in the past. The narrative's construction expresses the author's perspective as a mirror to elevate certain subjects(McLain, 2012). Auto-ethnography does not need to answers the problem, yet it only provides the author's experiences in doing something. There are not many previous undergraduate theses that conduct auto-ethnography. The author barely finds this type of research in undergraduate thesis, so for the previous investigations, the author uses old research yet helpful to study in the circumstances.

## **2. Method**

### ***2.1. Data Collection Technique***

#### *2.1.1. Reflective Journal*

A reflective journal is a record of the work underway, yet more basically a chance for reflection on the opportunity for growth. It can be something good or bad that has happened to me that I can self-reflect on and learn from past experiences. It is stated that reflective journals are seen as the culmination of all other forms of reflexes. These activities are carried out not solely to revisit the past, but to guide future actions (Hess, 2010). Furthermore, Larrive (2008) said that using reflective journals is expected to train students to get used to writing scientifically (Larrivee, 2008). In summary, it can be concluded that a reflective journal is a compilation of written experiences to know the critical points in the author's experiences.

A reflective journal can help the author to identify essential learning events that had happened in my writing process. It can be electronic such as videos or blogs, and it can be a diary form with visual and written material cut and pasted into scrapbooks. In this research, the author utilizes a diary or journal review, which contains the author's experiences in conducting an undergraduate thesis.

### *2.1.2. Stimulated Recall (Video)*

A stimulated recall is a research method that allows the investigation of cognitive processes by inviting participants to recall their concurrent thinking during an event when prompted by a video sequence or some other form of visual recording. In this research, the author will use electronic journals in video form. The videos will be taken after the author writes step by step from the first until the end. By watching the videos of the activities done by the author in conducting the research, the author can get points about something interesting in his experiences.

### *2.2. Data Analysis Technique*

To analyze data, the writer employs the critical incident. The critical incident is an examination strategy where in the exploration member is approached to review and depict when a way of behaving, activity, or event influenced (either emphatically or adversely) a predefined result. Tripp (2011) characterized primary occurrences as 'an understanding of the meaning of an occasion. To accept something as a primary occurrence is a worth judgment we make, and the premise of that judgment is the importance we join to the significance of the episode' (Tripp, 2011). In other words, it can be stated that the critical incident is something surprising or *aha* moment that the researcher found in his journal reflection and stimulated recall (video). In this research, the author will deliver the author's story in conducting an undergraduate thesis and show surprising moments or *aha* moments in his writing undergraduate thesis experiences.

## **3. Finding and Discussion**

### *3.1. Journal Review*

#### *3.1.1. Me and My Thesis*

I have studied in English Department at University since 2017. To pass and get a bachelor's degree, I need to accomplish the requirements. One of the requirements is writing an undergraduate thesis. As an English Department student, I took a *Research Methodology* class which had the purpose of preparing the students for conducting the title for their undergraduate dissertation. Unfortunately, I did not recognize it well and thought it was only the practice for the students to complete the idea and for the final exam. So I did not do it well and only imitated what my comrades did. My classmates primarily selected quantitative research because they thought it was easier to drive and analyze the data since we got statistics class in the previous semester and were taught how to operate the application to process the data in quantitative research. I did well and got a pretty good score on the final exam. However, I was surprised when the lecturer told us to submit the assignment as the research proposal for the undergraduate thesis. I only did it for the final exam and did not think about how to conduct it in actual research, so my research proposal was rejected when I got a supervisor.

I had tried to conduct my other research proposals three times in one year, and all of them were rejected. My research proposals were experimental because I only knew that type of research. My supervisor told me that it would be better for me to conduct qualitative research than quantitative because she thought I did not have enough knowledge and acquaintance with that. I was pretty depressed at that moment, even when I saw that most of my classmates had passed and got their bachelor's degrees using quantitative research, and I could not do it. However, what my supervisor told me had a strong point, and I thought a lot about what she suggested to me until I had a solid decision to conduct the qualitative research for my reasons.

While my comrades mainly selected quantitative research (experimental research), I chose qualitative research for several reasons. First, I wouldn't say I like the number that much, so it would confuse me to process the data. Although we do not need to count that much since the data operation would be processed with a specific application, it would still be slurring for me. Second, I was not clear beyond a shadow of a doubt about what I needed to explore in experimental research. I just wanted to pass quickly and never thought about the results given by my research. I thought I could not conduct the empirical research since I was sure that teaching practitioners, not the students, would better perform the type of research. Although I got *Praktik Pengalaman Lapangan*, the teaching practice in the school directly, I considered it was not enough to claim the capability to conduct experimental research. (120) Third, I was confident that what I did not want was to be "plugged into" an existing research program to answer some questions which another researcher had already set. It does not mean that other researchers in my group do that stuff, yet I am anxious if my work would be something unnecessary or has been found before by the previous researcher. Fourth, I am an introverted person, so I could not make a good relationship with many people to get many participants. I lack social skills and tend to do something by myself.

To conduct qualitative research based on my senior's research mainly used several participants to collect the data, although not many as quantitative research. I tried to select the type of research which did not have many participants. Firstly I thought the reflective study was good for me, yet my supervisor gave a clue that the selected participants were not appropriate enough for my research title. The second was ethnography, yet my lecturer did the same as the previous one. My supervisor gave me a clue why I did not research myself but instead other people. She suggested I conduct autobiography research or usually called auto-ethnography. She told me that writing could be made as research if I could write my experiences well and compile them academically. I only knew the word autobiography as the type of text or history instead of study. I looked up the references about autobiography, yet in the authorities, autoethnography was mentioned. I was anxious since I tried to write "auto-ethnography" in *Microsoft Word*, yet still had a red dot. A red mark means it is an error or wrong spelling. It surprised me while I checked the literature review

and spelling from the journal posted in journal references such as *tandfonline* and *ScienceDirect* that it was correct with that spelling. My supervisor also suggested I not worry about that, and I went on the writing.

The challenges came my way. I did not know it until I was in try-error activity in conducting auto-ethnography. The first thing I did was asked my supervisor to give me a preview of the narrative approach as it was something new for me. After I read several references and got feedback from my supervisor, I realized that auto-ethnography consisted of many things in life, so I was not sure which experience I should select to focus on. I did not have many examples of auto-ethnography in my college. There were many examples of the narrative approaches, yet there were not mentioned explicitly as auto-ethnography. Then I looked for the samples from the sources that my supervisor gave to me. Unfortunately, I could not find many examples in that, and mostly, the narrative inquiry is ethnographic style (from the authorities) until my supervisor gave me the research master's to learn. That research was written by Jonathan Lake, entitled *Autoethnography and reflective practice: reconstructing the doctoral thesis experience* (Lake, 2015). That study discussed the author's confusion about his research, whether it is an auto-ethnography or not. This showed me that writing a thesis does not always base on the phenomena or problems in society, or I just realized that I used to ignore the fact that I was a part of society. He inspired me that with appropriate methods and analysis, we could conduct the research only based on his experiences and anxiety. I got the idea from it and selected the exact item as I felt confused. Although he reviewed his previous research, not the same research, I considered my research reviewed my experience in writing auto-ethnography would be interesting. In doing so, I needed to focus only on my experiences in writing and give a result on the type of my writing was considered auto-ethnography research or not.

The chronology of events (Table1):

| No | Date                             | Event                                      |
|----|----------------------------------|--|
| 1  | November 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2019  | Selecting the guiding lecturer             |
| 2  | December 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2019 | Proposed the first title but failed        |
| 3  | March 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2020     | Proposed the second title but failed       |
| 4  | August 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2020    | Proposed the third title but failed        |
| 5  | April 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2021    | Proposed the fourth title but failed       |
| 6  | October 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2021  | Given advice by the lecturer to conduct an |

| No | Date  | Event                       |
|----|---|-----------------------------|
|    |   | autobiography               |
| 7  | October 12 <sup>th</sup> , – December 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2021 | Looking at the reference up |
| 8  | January 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2022 – May 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2022  | Making Journal review       |
| 9  | May 11 <sup>th</sup> , - June 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2022         | Conducting auto-ethnography |

### 3.1.2. The Difficulty Conducting Auto-ethnography Research

Conducting auto-ethnography research as my undergraduate thesis contained specific challenges for me. It was like something new in my life, and I had never known before that writing about experiences could be made as research. However, I found some barriers there. I could not find many references about auto-ethnography from my seniors, even in college. I tried to surf to the internet about auto-ethnography. Unfortunately, many of them were about ethnography research which needed some participants.

Finally, I got the primary reference that I needed from my lecturer. That research was auto-ethnography and showed the writer's experiences when he conducted his previous study and had a confused feeling about whether his analysis was auto-ethnography or not. That was another problem for me. He reviewed his previous study so that the instruments were precise; meanwhile, I did not have that thing. My lecturer suggested I conduct the auto-ethnography research about my experiences writing this research and my anxiety about whether it was auto-ethnography research or not as the primary research. In doing so, I needed to present scientific narrative text and provide theories to support my writing as auto-ethnography research.

The first one to be concerned with is the definition of auto-ethnography itself. I want to deliver Holman's definition of auto-ethnography. Holman stated:

*Autoethnography is the utilization of individual experience, and individual composition to (1) reason ultimately remark on/evaluate rehearses; (2) make commitments to existing examination; (3) embrace weakness with reason; and (4) make a corresponding relationship with crowds to constrain a reaction (Sikes, 2015)*

In that definition, we can assume that auto-ethnography requirements consist of four. The first one is purposefully commenting on/critiquing practices. It means that auto-ethnography must give comments critically on what the author' did in conducting research.

I considered my writing suitable for this aspect due to I always gave my observations and thoughts in video recording after I finished the step processes. I delivered the barriers and how to overcome them in that video so that the outcome of the comments could be identified. When I thought some steps were not easy, I stated how I felt about doing that process. The way to solve the barriers, for instance, from the lecturer's guidance, finding inspiration from the journal mentor, and even other resources, I stated clearly.

The second aspect is contributing to current research. This aspect makes me confused because I do not know whether it will contribute to existing research or not. I do not feel comfortable that others will read my research since I am only a college student and do not have many achievements. In the reference I choose, I understand why the author claims that his research contributes because he is a doctoral student who has done much research before. However, I consider that my study can deliver something beneficial to the readers that were writing an undergraduate thesis does not always need hundreds of pages, tons of theory, and any other aspect that less critical aspect. I consider my writing can contribute to the readers because I deliver unique research for college students.

The third aspect is embracing vulnerability with purpose. An auto-ethnography must include exposure such as gaining awareness, becoming honest, accepting it, and breaking free. I am aware of what I am doing and understand it. I realize that this kind of research has many risks, especially to be accepted as autoethnography research. However, I know myself, and I believe in my work. I am candid in delivering my feeling and thinking to this thesis and can be proven with stimulated recall or the videos that contain my comments in conducting research. I embrace these vulnerabilities to deliver auto-ethnography analysis so that it can inspire the readers.

The fourth aspect is creating a reciprocal relationship with audiences to compel a response. I considered my research would get this aspect since this is unique research for undergraduate thesis writing. I expected to have suggestions and feedback from the readers as my supervisor told me it would be something new in our college.

As far as I might be concerned, apparently, the fundamental parts of autoethnographic work are the public piece of individual thoughts and speculations to additional information through examination and discourse with 'others'. Fourie (2021) proposes that auto-ethnographic exploration can involve a situation on a continuum between 'suggestive' and 'logical' (Fourie, 2021). The evocative and analytic poles of auto-ethnography are such in this table (Table 2):

| No | Evocative                                       | Analytic                                     |
|----|---|--|
| 1  | A meaningful commitment to social understanding | Be a whole part of the gathering under study |

| No | Evocative                     | Analytic  |
|----|-------------------------------|---|
| 2  | Stylish merit                 | Be apparent in the specialist's distributed texts                           |
| 3  | Reflexivity                   | Display scientific reflexivity  |
| 4  | Profound and scholarly impact | Engage in exchange with witnesses past oneself                              |
| 5  | Express a reality             | Improving hypothetical comprehension of more extensive social peculiarities |

While reevaluating my writing, I feel more ready to present a defence for my work meeting the analytic criteria than the evocative ones. Analytic auto-ethnography is simply an auto-ethnography which is constructed by theoretical developments (Anderson & Austin, 2012). This research does not only show my reflection on my experiences in conducting an undergraduate thesis but also analyzes reflexivity by giving the critical accident. The essential aim of evocative auto-ethnography is to call up an emphatic emotional response from the readers (Anderson & Austin, 2012). I use hypotheses, writing, and information from my diary survey in my work to 'participate in an exchange with sources past oneself'. Notwithstanding, I was less sure that I had the standards about 'be a full part in the gathering under study' because I am only a student and do not enter any research group. What I can count as an argument from that aspect is that I am part of a social group, and I was researching myself, which means I was exploring the role of a social group.

When reconsidering evocative criteria, I am skeptical that this research is auto-ethnography. I am less convinced that my thesis can substantially contribute to social understanding. I am also unconvinced with the criteria 'stylish merit' as I feel my writing style is far from the word aesthetic. The example of aesthetic value is like what Hunt (2009) draws upon the terms of St Augustin by evoking the essence of auto-ethnographic work from a different perspective:

*Individuals travel to stand amazed at the level of the mountains; at the immense rushes of the oceans; at the long course of the streams; at the considerable compass of the sea; at the roundabout movement of the stars; but they pass without help from anyone else without pondering. (Hunt-SCUTREA 2009, n.d.).*

Stylish merit seems appropriate to suggest some criteria that distinguish academic autoethnography from artistic practice for me. In summary, those criteria create difficulty for me as a college student who conducts an undergraduate thesis. Not many specimens

from my seniors show this type of research, so it is hard for me to make and conclude that my theory is auto-ethnography. However, I feel a stronger case for my view as a piece of analytic autoethnography could be made than for it as a piece in evocative style.

Another barrier was found when the author barely found the form example of undergraduate thesis in auto-ethnography. Because there was not example from his seniors, the author decided to make his study in journal form because he thought it would be easier to conduct in term of formation. The author selected *SALEE journal* as the platform which had SINTA 4 as the standard.

The author confidently proposed his study in *Thesis Defense*. I presented his study and his result in front of four examiners. In this occasion the author got many feedbacks and additional information about the auto-ethnography and SINTA 4. The first point to discuss was about the number of references I put in the study. The author only put ten references yet the examiners suggested I should deliver at least fifteen references SINTA 4. They said although it was an officially requirement for SINTA 4 but it is for the ethic. SINTA 4 had a quite good standard so that the study should be supported many references. The reason why the author only delivered ten references was because my supervisor only gave limited source to be put as the references. The examiners suggested the author put the resources from the *google scholar* yet the supervisor did not suggest the same thing due to she *thought google scholar* did not have good credibility as the main resources. However what the examiner's suggestion had strong points here to make the study stronger, the author needed to add the references.

The second point is the examiners criticized the author when I claimed this study was a kind of new study. The examiners stated that the auto-ethnography was not something new and had been used in 1970. The examiners also stated that as far as they knew the auto-ethnography only had been conducted by someone in Phd or doctoral level so that the outcome would have significant impacts for the readers. This makes sense when the author saw his all references were conducted Phd and doctoral levels. What the author meant as new was that his study discussed my experience in conducting the research which had been in processing not had been done before. That was true that the auto-ethnography was not a kind of new research yet most of them discussed the experiences in conducting the previous studies or the precious activities in certain jobs or specialization.

The third point was about the number of collected data. The examiners criticized the number of data the author had. The author firstly had four pages as journal review and three minutes thirty seconds video as the stimulated recall. The examiners stated that to conduct an auto-ethnography those data were not enough. I needed to add the journal review and described as detailed as possible to get the critical accidents. The amount of data indicated the wealth of reflection so that the results could be significantly impacted. I created journal review in very short language and short videos in stimulated recall to make it easier to get

critical incidents. However that was wrong. To get critical incidents the author should deliver more data as the examiners gave the example that generally auto-ethnography needed a lot of effort in writing diary, recording documentation, etc.

The last point was about the significance feature of this study. The examiners thought this study only had few significance features. Although auto-ethnography was a personal study, it did not mean that it did not give something to the readers. That was why adding the number of data was a must. Although this study was full of critics from the examiners, yet they gave the author credit as his bravery conducting auto-ethnography since normally an auto-ethnography was conducted by doctoral level. Thesis defence gave additional information about the ethics of SINTA 4 and especially the auto-ethnography.

The last one I could consider that my research is auto-ethnography is based on Jonathan's statement:

*Autoethnography is not a practice in like manner sense or narcissism, instead a chance for professionals to disclose their interests, and to help other people through this cycle. Autoethnography gives clinical teachers an alternate approach to seeing and doing clinical training research, which attracts customs of intelligent practice in new ways. Autoethnographic research doesn't approach specialists to have the response, yet to share, edify others and develop. Autoethnography addresses the selection of specialists to comprehend, not to make sense of just.*

It could be assumed that auto-ethnography does not need the author to answer the problem but, more importantly, to share, enlighten others and grow the problem with the author's experience. I could only transfer to the readers the trouble I got in conducting an undergraduate thesis and concluding whether my writing is autoethnography or not. I could not give precise answers to those. However, I begot the experiences I did and expected the readers to grow that kind of research with the feedback so that reciprocal relationships could be built well. In other words, auto-ethnography immaculately talks about the author's experiences in doing or conducting something with the right surprising moments as the critical accidents to get something.

#### **4. Conclusion**

It is stated that in social science, research cannot be critiqued against the standard set of natural science because the orientation and the aim are different but can be complementary. It means that I cannot use the standard set of natural science in this research as it is subjective. In an auto-ethnography, one of the narrative approaches, the item is the story (Lake, 2015). He also advises that the force of memory comes not from accuracy or precision but from how we connect with our developments and re-developments of the past as we are present. It will answer the dependability about how it is that I could rest assured that the occasions I recalled occurred with a specific goal in mind, and my version was

precise and reasonable for those included. Although a clear answer is almost impossible as the data is the memory and the memory is complex and subjective, it will be arduous to pin. The focus of auto-ethnography is not the generalizability, validity, and reliability, yet it shows the credibility of the research (Voorhees & Vorobel, 2021). However auto-ethnography tends to be self-reflective rather than consistently reflective (Tomaselli, 2013).

In the last part, I will conclude that I am sure this writing is auto-ethnography. Considering the trustworthiness, I would highlight my transparency about my encounters and my way of dealing with information examination as significant components of being reliable in this paper. For this situation, the possibility of 'reactant legitimacy' is one more marker of legitimacy in my work. My exploration has been a problem solver in myself, and maybe it may be so for other people (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Finally, the disclaimer is that this auto-ethnography is my current view of auto-ethnography, and it is not impossible to have more than one auto-ethnography.

### References

- Ai, B. (2015). A Study of the EFL Writing of Chinese Learners: A Critical Narrative. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, 22(3), 294–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2015.1056091>
- Alexander, B. K. (1999). Performing culture in the classroom: An instructional (auto) ethnography. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 19(4), 307–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10462939909366272>
- Anderson, L., & Austin, M. (2012). Auto-ethnography in leisure studies. *Leisure Studies*, 31(2), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2011.599069>
- Djatmiko, I. W. (2018). Strategi Penulisan Skripsi, Tesis, Disertasi Bidang Pendidikan. *UNY Press*, 160 hlm.
- Fourie, I. (2021). Analytic autoethnography. *Autoethnography for Librarians and Information Scientists*, 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003014775-4>
- Hess, M. E. (2010). Journal Keeping: How to Use Reflective Writing for Learning, Teaching, Professional Insight and Positive Change - By Dannelle D. Stevens and Joanne E. Cooper. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 13(4), 384–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9647.2010.00656.x>
- Hunt-SCUTREA 2009. (n.d.).
- Lake, J. (2015). Autoethnography and reflective practice: reconstructing the doctoral thesis experience. *Reflective Practice*, 16(5), 677–687. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2015.1071247>
- Larrivee, B. (2008). Development of a tool to assess teachers' level of reflective practice.

- 
- Reflective Practice*, 9(3), 341–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940802207451>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2nd Ed*, 163–189. [https://sabinemendesmoura.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/gubaelincoln\\_novo.pdf](https://sabinemendesmoura.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/gubaelincoln_novo.pdf)
- McLain, M. (2012). An (auto)Ethnographic Narrative of the Teaching of Designing within Design and Technology in the English Curriculum. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 45(December 2012), 318–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.568>
- Roy, R., & Uekusa, S. (2020). Collaborative autoethnography: “self-reflection” as a timely alternative research approach during the global pandemic. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 20(4), 383–392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-06-2020-0054>
- Sikes, P. (2015). Book Review: Stacy Holman Jones, Tony E. Adams and Carolyn Ellis (eds), *Handbook of Autoethnography*. *Qualitative Research*, 15(3), 413–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794114535048>
- Takhar-Lail, A., & Chitakunye, P. (2015). Reflexive introspection: Methodological insights from four ethnographic studies. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(11), 2383–2394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.03.020>
- Tomaselli, K. G. (2013). Visualizing Different Kinds of Writing: Auto-ethnography, Social Science. *Visual Anthropology*, 26(2), 165–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08949468.2012.718985>
- Tripp, D. (2011). *Critical Incidents in Teaching (Classic Edition)*. *Critical Incidents in Teaching (Classic Edition)*, July. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203802014>
- Voorhees, T. T., & Vorobel, O. (2021). Integrating Qualitative Research into the Community College Linguistics Course: An Autoethnographic Inquiry. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2(May), 100053. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100053>
- Walford, G. (2021). What is worthwhile auto-ethnography? Research in the age of the selfie. *Ethnography and Education*, 16(1), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2020.1716263>
- Ylijoki, O. H. (2001). Master’s Thesis Writing from a Narrative Approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070020030698>