Innovative Teaching and Learning
http://doi.org/10.4208/itl.20240105

Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 40-54
Dec 2024

The Autoethnographic Eye (I): Teaching Literature in College Writing

Ruixue Zhang

Department of Languages and Culture
Beijing Normal University-Hong Kong Baptist University, United International College

Abstract

How can college education, especially language and literature studies, help students better understand themselves and the world they live in? How does a language or literature teacher connect reading and writing activities with the broader society beyond class? This autoethnographic essay reflects upon these two questions through a critical examination of my use of autoethnography in college writing courses. Drawing from communication theories and my own teaching experience, I will demonstrate how teaching autoethnography develops students' critical thinking skills and motivates them to connect their learning with broader social issues. The paper will first share my struggles as a literature scholar and college writing teacher. Then I will discuss how my autoethnography teaching bridges teaching with research and helps students better understand language.

Keywords: autoethnography, college writing, embodied teaching, critical thinking

Corresponding author: Ruixue Zhang. Email: zhangruixue@uic.edu.cn

The Autoethnographic Eye (I): Teaching Literature in College Writing

On August 25, 2021, the very first day of my postdoctoral fellowship at the English Department of Emory University, a pre-business first-year student in my writing class visited me during my office hours. After discussing her first writing assignment, she did not leave immediately but turned to me with curious eyes. “May I ask you a personal question?” She said this in a nervous tone, “Why did you choose to study and teach English?” I was a little surprised though this is not the first time I was asked by people who don’t work in the humanities or who have little understanding of what English literature studies do. “I guess I am good at nothing but reading and writing.” I was joking, “Just kidding. I love reading literature and believe it can help us think of the world more critically.” From her face, I saw how pale my answer was. At that moment, I didn’t quite help her see what literature could do, or rather I myself couldn’t have an insight into the subject I have been studying for a long time. For “outsiders,” literature appears sophisticated and, at the same time, “useless.” As a scholar and teacher of this subject, I share such questions with that student: why does literature matter? What is the use of literature studies? How does literature help me professionally and more than professionally?

I want to explore these questions through writing an autoethnography of teaching college writing as a literature scholar. The reason I use this genre is primarily because of its transgression of boundaries between personal experience and theoretical analysis. Stacy Holman Jones, Tony Adams, and Carolyn Ellis (2013) argue that autoethnographic texts “typically feel more self and socially conscious than autobiographic works” (p. 23). While “auto” emphasizes an introspective look at one’s own experience, “ethno” points this self-writing towards a larger social or historical context. An autoethnography about teaching English enables me to critically reflect upon the development of my pedagogy and relate it to a general concern about the value of literature in language education. Another reason for choosing this genre is because I use it as the pedagogical framework and major assignment for my college writing courses. Writing in this genre, I can better showcase students’ learning goals and demonstrate the effects of this type of writing on integrating personal experience into public debates on social issues.

In Modern Fiction, Virginia Woolf (1984) warns writers and readers not to “take it for granted that life exists more

fully in what is commonly thought big than in what is commonly thought small" (p. 161). Autoethnographic writing is this "modern fiction" that explores the intersection between the "small", personal world and the "big", social context. Drawing from communication theories and my own teaching experience, my "modern fiction" about teaching English shows a way to incorporate literature into college writing courses through teaching autoethnography. I will first share my struggles as a literature scholar and college writing teacher. Then I will discuss how my autoethnography teaching bridges the two roles and helps students learn language through literature reading and critical self-writing.

The Teaching I/Eye vs. The Living I/Eye

I have been teaching first-year college composition courses since I started my PhD studies in the U.S. in 2016. As a person whose academic background is literature and whose undergraduate program offers no such similar courses, I felt very uncomfortable about my role as a teacher of academic writing in English. The reason is not because I had no teaching experience but because I didn't know how to integrate what I care about into what I teach. A bigger challenge facing me is how to motivate those young people to literally write in a multimedia age where reading and writing have become increasingly unpopular. Back when I was doing my master studies in Peking University, I was asked to teach the course "Extensive Listening" for English majors. I felt quite confident about designing scaffolding activities and enjoyed students' works, because the course materials and activities were closely related to English language and literature studies. Students cared about what they were asked to listen to, read, or write in class. I didn't have to think too much about the relationship between literature and other disciplines when I talked about Romanticism or Modernism. It was when I started teaching the composition courses in the US that I began to realize the difficulty of teaching a language course for a wider group of students that may not be interested in language learning. Very few of those first-year students are humanities majors, not to mention English majors who are usually exempted from taking such language courses.

Though I tried many ways to design meaningful prompts for the required writing projects and many of my students followed the instructions, their papers usually turned out too formulaic and sometimes even boring to read. These writings did not show the joy of their creators, nor did they come across as endearing or enlightening to readers. This sense of boredom pervad-

ed me when I started to teach literature courses two years later. I remember in the "Introduction to World Literature" class in the fall semester of 2019, I led students to closely read some important passages in Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient* (1993). No matter how much information about the Second World War I had provided for them, students still couldn't get the author's fragmented narrative on exile, loneliness, and loss. I could have shared my similar experience as an international scholar with my students, if at that time I had not believed that personal experience should not appear in academic discourses whereas private feelings could not be connected with a so-called objective examination of a given text. As a result, I built up a wall between myself and my students while ironically I was teaching a novel about the painful yearning for breaking the walls, for crossing boundaries, and for dissolving all differences. The outcome of such a wall is that my students' papers on the novel read well enough, but they simply repeated other scholars' ideas or my lectures in class.

I see in my students' writings on literature the same struggle I have had as a scholar of literature studies for years: the writings don't sound exciting, motivating, or provocative just as their writers might not be excited, motivated, or provoked to write on such topics. There is the teaching or learning eye (or I) on the one side and something restrained, repressed, and excluded on the other. I remember in the first year of my PhD studies, I took the course "Nineteenth-Century British Poetry," as I planned to focus my doctoral research on Victorian literature and culture. When I was writing the term paper on Robert Browning's dramatic monologues, I could not feel any excitement but only treated it as a required task. The writing process was painful, and I almost ended up hating Browning. I forgot the reason why I wanted to write about his poems about those painters that have high ambitions but struggle with socially defined success. It is the reverberation I felt between my own experience and those struggles embodied in the poems. My paper didn't show such a relatedness but only read like a summary of other scholars' works. My language sounded dry and mechanical. I hardly recognized this scholarly eye (or "I") who claimed to be enthusiastic about Victorian poets, just as I did not get any enlightenment in reading my students' works.

Today's college writing and even literature courses still require students to write analytical papers and set up rules about what or how they should write. Meanwhile, critical thinking and intellectual independence are regarded as the most im-

portant purposes of higher education. Such goals are rarely met when students are still trained to produce or rather recycle similar ideas. Academic work or the people who perform such work become mass-produced products. In *Teaching to Transgress*, bell hooks (1994) borrows from Paulo Freire's "banking system" to describe such an education: "all students need to do is [to] consume information fed to them by a professor and be able to memorize and store it" (p.14). She reflects upon her own experience as a college student: "Knowledge was suddenly about information only. It had no relation to how one lived, behaved" (p.7). Neither the teacher nor the students feel like wholesome human beings in this learning environment. In his deconstructionist analysis of teaching, Roland Barthes (1978) observes that the teacher "speak[s], in front of and for someone who remains silent" and "under cover of *setting out* a body of knowledge, *puts out* a discourse, *never knowing how that discourse is being received* and thus forever forbidden the reassurance of a definitive image—even if offensive—which would *constitute* me" (p. 194). Barthes' psychoanalytical reading of the teaching position could help explain the dilemma of higher education: students and teachers are enmeshed in the banking system of education that merely recycles information without sincere communication. This kind of knowledge production excludes personal, emotional factors. There is no substantial transformation of learning experience into useful or practical knowledge but only disciplined reproduction. The learning or teaching "I" is never fully integrated into the living "I."

The Living and Leaking I: Autoethnographic Writing and Self Reorientation

I was drawn to autoethnography by pure accident. I joined a reading group co-organized by the English Department and the Medical School in Emory University in March, 2021. That year they focused on Riva Lehrer's memoir *Golem Girl* (2020). Working as an instructor in medical humanities at Northwestern University, Lehrer is also an artist and curator that focuses on the socially challenged body. Our reading group organizers held a small welcome meeting for her when she was invited to give a talk on campus. Before meeting us, Lehrer asked whether we could write a reflection journal on our understanding of monsters. As a nineteenth-century literature scholar, I could think up so many monster images in Victorian poetry and novels, but reading her memoir inspired me to talk about my own monstrosity. Here is my journal:

I cannot help but think of what monster means in our Chinese culture. In Chinese, the word "monster" consists of two characters: "guai wu" [怪 物], which literally means "strange things." I translate the second character into "thing" rather than "object," because "thing" is always used to refer to the undefinable, the non-appropriable, or the unidentifiable that disturbs well-drawn boundaries. While the first character could mean "strange," I always think that "alien" could better convey the meaning of otherness and isolation. Whenever the word "guaiwu" is brought up in the Chinese context, it usually conjures up a sense of abhorrence, warning, and even disgust rather than mere curiosity. One wants to keep a physical and psychological distance from the "alien thing".

The word "alien" then makes me think of the term "resident alien"—an oxymoronic term that blurs identity boundaries. Why does living in one place means "not belonging" and "separated"? The monster is made "the resident alien," which exists with others and meanwhile stays separated, singled out, excluded, and pushed to the other side. As a Chinese who works in the English Department (instead of those departments that usually have more Asian people) in an English-speaking place (which seems to be inclusive but still implicitly racialized), I am made highly aware of my "monstrousness." A more fearsome thing is to internalize such a fear. I think I am the most severe critic of myself—my way of speaking English, of writing in English, and of moving in an English-dominant world. I so much wanted to blend in and get rid of my "alienness"—my monstrosity.

This reminds me of a similar discussion I had with my literature students last week when we were reading A. C. Swinburne's grotesque poetry and John Ruskin's theory of Gothic architecture. Both writers fight fiercely against the notion that what is unsightly, "imperfect", or "abnormal" should not be embodied in arts. The imperfect makes art and makes life, according to Ruskin. To alienate the different, the undefinable, the "unconventional," is to alienate oneself. For me, a monster should be feared, because it contains an inspiring and regenerating force, which shows that differences mean good and mean intensely (if I "distort" some lines from Robert Browning's "Fra Lippo Lippi," a medieval painter who appreciates all kinds of earthly bodies.)

> Reading this memoir makes me think more about monstrosity and normality, about beauty and representation, and about writing and teaching. I have read different theories about identity struggles, but this is for the first time that I feel and truly understand those struggles from reading a memoir, which turns one's "monstrosity" into arts and knowledge.

It is not a long journal, but I spent a week drafting it, going back and forth to find my living, genuine voice. I was also challenged by linking my lived experience with my readings in this small essay. It took more time for me to write down these words than producing a short academic article. I realize how hard it is to acknowledge one's monstrosity—one's differences, fears, and even struggles—and then turn it into a form of knowledge to be shared with others.

Later in our meeting, the group members asked Lehrer how she could render her experience into beautiful, thought-provoking, and touching words. She referred to her 'leaky' method of painting which her memoir also described in great detail. I was very impressed by those paintings in the book when I was reading it: the subjects of the portrait are usually surrounded by and even interwoven with words, symbols, or images that are not left by Lehrer but by themselves. This is Lehrer's way to invite the subject for portrait into the painting activity so that there is no hierarchical separation between the observer and the observed. She would paint for two hours and then leave the subject alone so that she or he could think up something to add to the picture. Lehrer would alter nothing afterwards nor would she ask the subject why any changes had been made. After the painting was finished, both she and the subject would sign their names on it. She calls these pictures "risk pictures", because they involve a risk that is posed to both the painting eye (or "I") and the subject for portrait. In her website gallery, Lehrer (n.d.) explains why she wants to create and take such a risk:

> This series comprises a refutation of the traditional relationship between artist and subject. Sitting for a portrait is a vulnerable experience, during which the subject agrees to be stared at for hours at a time. The traditional dynamic of portraiture infers that the artist, as examiner, wields more power than the subject. Conversely, if the portrait is a commission, the subject holds the economic power. It's rarely an equal dynamic.

Lehrer's painting is deconstructive or reconstructive. In the process, the observing

eye (or "I") is reconstructed through letting others in and through opening up to others. Meanwhile, the observed becomes the observer too.

Lerher's memoir strikes me as having the same leakiness. She boldly confesses her physical conditions, desire, and frustrations. Such a brave, generous, and detailed confession invites readers to face their own monstrosity—their shortsightedness, their prejudice against other bodies, and their vulnerabilities as human beings. More importantly, her words and paintings lead readers to critically think about why they have such prejudices, limitations, or even self-censoring tendencies. This leaky method transforms one's experience, including pains and doubts, into an alternative form of knowledge or a counternarrative against socially-constructed discourses on body, gender, arts, and life. In the same semester I happened to co-chair an anti-racist pedagogy workshop with two visiting assistant professors in the English Department of Emory University. Paul Corrigan, a friend who works as a teaching assistant professor of writing and English in the University of Tampa, introduced to me a writing assignment in his "Native American Literature" course— "autocritography", which combines critical analysis of literary texts with personal reflection on one's experience. I immediately associated this assignment with Lehrer's leaky narrative that opens oneself to others and integrates lived experience into one's learning. Inspired by Lehrer and Corrigan, I started to gather more materials and scholarly works on writings, especially autoethnographical writings that connect the personal with the public and examine social issues through individual struggles.

The Autoethnographic Eye (I): Multiplied Narrators and Opened Selfhood

The next semester in my first-year writing course "Monstrosity and Modernity", I introduced autoethnography as both a genre and a research method. I led students to read Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (2012) as an autoethnographic study of the social making of monsters. Rather than talking about the multiple narrators as if I was teaching literary analysis, I led students to discuss how their own experience could be related to the thoughts or the feelings of different characters. I remember the second week when we reached the end of Captain Walton's narrative where Victor Frankenstein begs him to "listen to my history" (Shelley, 2012, p. 68), I asked students why the novel is written in this way. "Why cannot Mary Shelly just let Victor directly tell us what happens from the

beginning of the novel? Or why cannot a third-person omniscient narrator do the job for all these different first-person narrators ?" I put these questions on my slides and they were repeated when we reached the part where the creature requests Victor to "listen to my tale" (Shelley, 2012, p. 139). Those tales by Walton, Victor, and the creature can be read as parallel autoethnographic narratives on individual struggles with social norms, especially in terms of gender expectations, individual education, and knowledge production. The multiple narrators offer various and different perspectives on the same issue—the definition of monstrosity, or rather, the definition of humanity.

After discussing the novel, students were expected to first produce a reading journal that related their learning from it to their own experience. Then they would extend the journal into an autoethnographic essay that linked personal reflections to social issues. Though students were eager to share their thoughts on the novel, they found it difficult to make valid connections between the personal and the fictional, not to mention writing an autoethnographic narrative on monstrosity. I saw at the beginning of our class my students' struggle to have a personal voice. Even though they wanted to talk about their personal feelings about certain passages in the novel, they could not shake off their academic, formulaic way of talking. They started to doubt about such a self-writing that sounded subjective. When I organized students into small groups to talk about their journal topics, one student brought up the doubt: "I am sorry, but I was not trained to write in this way. We were told that we shouldn't use a lot of 'I's in our writing and exposing one's emotions is not proper. How could such a writing help us in our college learning?" I smiled and pointed them to their free writings on monstrosity throughout half of the semester. Students reviewed their own change of opinions along with reading the novel. They recognized a parallel between their own writings and those characters' experience of others' narratives. The "I" or eye is never and cannot be purely objective, unchangeable, or fully enclosed. When they wrote down their thoughts about the characters and the plot from time to time, they already started an autoethnographic study of selfhood with different "I"s at different moments.

To deepen their understanding of using a multiplied "I" in their writing, I showed my students the Nigerian writer Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's TED Talk *The Danger of a Single Story* (2019), which demonstrates the power dynamics in storytelling. In the talk, she associated her own experience in both Nigeria and in the US

with colonialism, empire discourse, and cultural misunderstanding. The talk itself could be regarded as an autoethnography of cultural shocks and identity politics. Students were struck by Adichie's great sense of humor and by the compelling power in her narrative. After watching it, many students actively shared their "single story" experience and started to get the point of writing one's own story with the first-person "I." They also realized how the self is shaped by and continuously shaping the language. Leon Anderson and Bonnie Glass-Coffin (2013) argue that "autoethnographers are self-consciously involved in the construction of meaning and values in the social worlds they investigate, and the data they collect or create in the course of inquiry should reflect this personal connection" (p. 72). Writing an autoethnography becomes a process of learning or unlearning about oneself through language. Those that are ruled out as the "other" in our academic training—emotions, bodily experiences, and seemingly non-important details—are actually integral parts of our self-fulfillment and social relationships, or rather, are indispensable from the so-called useful knowledge.

Apart from using multiplied narrative "I"s, autoethnography is also marked by its open-endedness—its leakiness and *disorientedness*. It disturbs the heteronormative-capitalist form of linear temporality and deconstructs the apparently stable selfhood. Time in the writing doesn't have to always progress forward, just as the "I" is never uniform and the narrative can have emotional twists. In order to help students open themselves in their writing, I created a class space where people sat in a circle and talked face to face with one another. I attempted to decenter the learning space by moving around the classroom and sitting with my students rather than always standing behind a podium. In her articulation about the split between body and mind in teaching, hooks (1994) argues that "when you leave the podium and walk around…you bring with you a certain kind of potential, though not guaranteed, for a certain kind of face-to-face relationship and respect for 'what I say' and 'what you say' (p. 97). I also shared with my students a non-native speaker's experience of living in Atlanta and teaching at one of the elite schools in the US: "I sometimes would feel very bodily constrained when first entering a space dominated by native speakers although I have lived in the US for more than six years." In a conventional classroom, teachers are not supposed to share their vulnerable moments, but I treat my teaching as if writing an autoethnographic essay to my students, who could share my achievements as well as my "failures." I

want to create a space in my classroom that students start rethinking their experience and reorienting their eyes or "I"s in the writing.

The multiple narrators and open-ended discussion in autoethnography not only challenge students' habits of writing academic essays but also disorient their concepts of selfhood, of social identities, and of use of language in embodying the self. In her phenomenological study of race, gender, and sexuality, Sara Ahmed (2006) defines orientation as "line alignment" and body extension, which derives from repetitious movements (p. 58). Therefore, what bodies tend to do are effects of historical repetitions (p. 56). Disorientation then means "things not in place, bodies brought together where they should stay apart" (p. 178). She relates our way of communication with our body movement in the space:

> Things as well as bodies appear "the right way up" when they are "in line," which makes any moment in which phenomenal space does "line up" seem rather queer. Importantly, when one thing is "out of line," then it is not just that thing that appears oblique but the world itself might appear on a slant, which disorients the picture and even unseats the body. (p. 66-7)

Writing is also a way of putting things and bodies in certain places, especially considering that academic training is about drawing lines between what to say and what to unsay. Nowadays both print and digital modes of writing influence how writers and readers follow socially normalized ways of writing.

What my students were worried or confused about in this autoethnography project is to step over the academic or socially normalized lines, to break the temporal linearity of thinking, and to express feelings that are excluded from academic writing or socially recognized modes of knowledge production. In other words, they feel disoriented in writing "off line." Disorientation could be risky but it could also be reformative and transformative, as those habitual lines "that direct us, as lines of thought as well as lines of motion, are in this way performative: they depend on the repetition of norms and conventions, of routes and paths taken, but they are also created as an effect of this repetition" (Ahmed 2006, p. 16). Autoethnographic writing could take us off the old lines and discover something new about writing, about ourselves, and about others.

It is through the "disorienting" class discussion and practice that my students gradually unmasked themselves and actively engaged with class discussion. Both living and writing can be non-linear,

open-ended, and resistant to routines. This effect of opened selfhood also derived from the peer review session where I asked students to read to one another their drafts and reflected upon their writing process. Most of them stated that they gained insight into social issues about race, gender, sexuality, and ableism by reading their peers' sincere reflection on personal experiences. Whereas others' narratives bridge abstract knowledge with something more concrete and embodied, writing about one's own experience is "catharsis" –a "healing and therapeutic" process, according to one of my students.

By the end of the semester, students turned in very touching and insightful autoethnographic narratives based on their reading journals of *Frankenstein*. One student talked about Caribbean immigrants' difficulty in passing language tests in the US and even conducted a campus survey on the English language learning lessons immigrant students have received. A Chinese student shared her painful experience of anti-Asian hatred amid the COVID pandemic and discussed unfair treatment Asians have faced every day in the US. Another Chinese student challenged the social definition of abled bodies through sharing her own experience of being regarded as a disabled person because of her hearing impairment. A Malaysian student wrote a beautiful and touching narrative on his overcoming of bias against queer people after coming to study in the States. In these autoethnographic narratives, students pulled out certain passages from the novel, talked about their feelings about these passages, and then traced these feelings to their own experience of being made "monsters" or seeing others as "monsters." Compared with the beginning weeks' writings, their autoethnographic essays became more sincere, self-critical, and emotionally and intellectually provocative.

Meanwhile, I felt strengthened by such a teaching mode. Reading students' papers becomes a process of learning or unlearning about myself as I see similar questions, struggles, and limitations my students shared in their writings. This writing assignment also drew me closer to my students who wrote as emotionally intelligent and intellectually informed individuals. Teaching then becomes conversational, communal, and fun. My own scholarly work also benefits from teaching autoethnographic writing. After teaching it in my class, I started looking for intersections between myself and those nineteenth-century figures I always adore—Charlotte Brontë, Christina Rossetti, and Algernon Charles Swinburne. I have discovered more shared grounds between my experi-

ence and these writers' struggle with socially-defined success. I recognize in their works my own conflicts between a yearning for being recognized by society and a self-chosen status as "aliens" that could not easily blend in the surroundings. Reading their works through a more intimate, personal lens, I have acquired something new—a more perceptive insight than what my academically trained "I" or eye used to possess.

Conclusion: An Undisciplined Way of Writing and a Better Way of Living

Our academic training tends to disconnect personal experience from its social context or larger theoretical debates. Autoethnography as a research method and a writing genre enables us to re-humanize our scholarly-trained eyes and connect our research with our lived experience. This genre offers students and researchers a space for alternative ways of doing critical work and academic research. *In The Queer Art of Failure*, Jack Halberstam (2011) encourages scholars to "undiscipline" their studies, to deviate from the academic norms, and to "pick up some of the discarded local knowledge that are trampled underfoot in the rush to bureaucratize and rationalize an economic order that privileges profit over all kinds of other motivations of being and doing" (p.9). Autoethnographic writing achieves such goals and offers alternative methods for researchers to examine their daily encounter with social injustice, systematic unfairness, and ideological repression.

This undisciplined method of writing also challenges people to rethink their relationship with language and with the world embodied through language. Combined with one's own experience both in real life and in reading different texts, the autoethnographic writing process extends what Rita Felski (2008) calls "recognition": "an interplay between texts and the fluctuating beliefs, hopes, and fears of readers, such that the insights gleaned from literary works will vary dramatically across space and time" (p. 46). While reading offers writers and researchers novel ways of thinking about selfhood through multiple perspectives, autoethnographic writing leads them to fully recognize themselves in their past experience and learnings. It prompts them to imagine a better self and a better life.

In his newly published *New Yorker* article, the American writer Ted Chiang (2024) emphasizes human creativity in any art creations, including writing. Chiang firmly believes that artificial intelligence would not replace human creativity. He argues

> What you create doesn't have to be utterly unlike every prior piece of art in human history to be valuable; the fact that you're the one who is saying it, the fact that it derives from your unique life experience and arrives at a particular moment in the life of whoever is seeing your work, is what makes it new. We are all products of what has come before us, but it's by living our lives in interaction with others that we bring meaning into the world.

The autoethnographic writing is such a creation that reorients writers towards individual struggles and drives them to have a personal, living voice, impulses that are usually ruled out by academic writing and professional training. It also asks them to embody and critically reflect upon their personal or even most private experience in language, which AI, I believe, could not generate right now or even in a long time. This genre gives literature scholars a way to integrate their research into their teaching of other subjects, especially language learning. More importantly, it empowers us as writers to turn our personal experiences—sufferings, loss, failures, and growth—into useful knowledge about ourselves, others, and the world we live in.

References

Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi (2009). The danger of a single story [Video]. TED Global. https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?subtitle=en.

Ahmed, Sara (2006). *Queer phenomenology: orientations, objects, others.* Duke University Press.

Anderson, Leon, and Bonnie Glass-Coffin (2013). Learn by going: autoethnographic modes of inquiry. In Jones, Adams, And Ellis (Eds), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 57-83). Routledge.

Barthes, Roland (1978). *Image-music-text* (Stephen Heath, Trans). Macmillan.

Chiang, Ted (2024). Why A.I. isn't going to make art. *New Yorker*. https://www.newyorker.com/culture/the-weekend-essay/why-ai-isnt-going-to-make-art.

Felski, Rita (2008). *Uses of literature*. Blackwell.

Halberstam, Judith (2011). *The queer art of failure.* Duke University Press.

hooks, bell (1994). *Teaching to transgress: education and the practice of freedom. Routledge.*

Jones, Stacy Holman, Tony Adams, and Carolyn Ellis (2013). Introduction: coming to know autoethnography as more than a method. In Jones, Adams, And Ellis (Eds), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 17-47). Routledge.

Lehrer, Riva (2020). *Golem girl: a memoir.* One World.

Lehrer, R. (2024, October 1). The risk pictures. Riva Lehrer. https://www.rivalehrerart.com/the-risk-pictures.

Ondaatje, Michael (1993). *The English patient.* Random House.

Shelley, Mary (2012). *Frankenstein*. (D. L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf, Eds). Broadview (originally published in 1818).

Woolf, Virginia (1984). Modern fiction. In Andrew McNeille (Ed.), *The essays of Virginia Woolf* (Vol. 4, pp. 157-165). Hogarth (Original work published 1925).

Received October 18, 2024
Accepted November 15, 2024