In the Classroom

Artefacts as "Co-Participants" in Duoethnography

Patrick Huang & Michael Karas

Duoethnography is an emerging methodology in English language teaching (ELT)/applied linguistics where two or more participants critically examine a shared phenomenon or experience as a way to challenge assumptions and develop new understandings of critical events (Lowe & Lawrence, 2020). It is a flexible tool with an emphasis on interaction, both between people, and people and various physical or digital artefacts (e.g., documents, academic literature). In this paper, we outline our duoethnography on our experience with the Certificate for English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA) with a focus on how academic literature and social media pervaded our inquiry. We highlight how academic articles and social media were used as artefacts in our study and how their role as "co-participants" enhanced our investigation.

La duoethnographie est une méthodologie émergeante dans l'enseignement de l'anglais (ELT)/en linguistique appliquée dans laquelle deux participants ou plus examinent de façon critique un phénomène ou une expérience partagée comme manière de remettre en question les hypothèses et de créer de nouvelles voies pour comprendre des événements critiques (Lowe & Lawrence, 2020). Il s'agit d'un outil souple qui met l'emphase sur l'interaction, à la fois entre les personnes, ainsi qu'entre les personnes et divers artefacts physiques ou numériques (par exemple, des documents, des écrits universitaires). Dans cet article, nous exposons notre duoethnographie dans notre expérience du Certificat pour l'enseignement de l'anglais aux adultes (CELTA), en portant une attention particulière à la façon dont les écrits universitaires et les médias sociaux ont imprégné notre enquête. Nous soulignons la manière dont les articles universitaires et les médias sociaux ont été utilisés comme artefacts dans notre étude et de quelle façon leur rôle de « coparticipants » a mis notre enquête en valeur.

Introduction to Duoethnography

Duoethnography involves dialogue between (two or more) people as a way to reflect and question the meanings they give to social phenomena and themes (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). In English language teaching (ELT) and applied linguistics, it is an emerging methodology that breaks away from traditional research norms and allows participants to be both investigators and the sites of research (Lawrence & Lowe, 2020). Broadly, duoethnographers engage in dialogue about a common experience or construct and critically examine the phenomenon under question, allowing them to tell their own story, as opposed to researchers doing it for them (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). It can serve as an empirical research tool (e.g., Lowe & Lawrence, 2018), but also as a method of reflective practice (Lowe & Lawrence, 2020), as participants examine how they acquired certain beliefs, how these beliefs may impact their behaviour, and the meanings they ascribe to these thoughts (Norris, 2008). In duoethnography, participants are not seeking a generalizable truth; rather, participants critically investigate their experiences with a phenomenon with the acknowledgement that beliefs are dynamic and fluid and can emerge from social interactions (Lowe & Kiczkowiak, 2016). A key facet of duoethnography is that it is a flexible tool that does not follow a linear path to completion, as it blends the traditional research phases (e.g., data collection, data analysis, etc.) (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Dialogue lies at the heart of duoethnographic inquiries, but interactions can occur in a variety of forms (e.g., face-to-face, online, etc.), and also be complemented by the use of artefacts (e.g., pictures, academic articles, etc.). In this article, we discuss our own duoethnography focusing on our experience with the Certificate for English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA), with special attention to how we used academic literature and social media to enhance our investigation.

Duoethnographic "Methods" in ELT/Applied Linguistics

In its simplest form, duoethnographic data comes from critical conversations between people as participants critically challenge one another to generate new understandings of common phenomena (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). These dialogues should be recorded in some way, allowing them to be revisited, reconsidered, and analyzed later, followed by some form of write up (Lawrence & Lowe, 2020). Along with dialogues, duoethnographers can also use artefacts to enhance their investigation, such as photos, documents, and even academic literature (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Looking at studies in ELT and applied linguistics, duoethnographers have enacted studies in various ways. Some studies rely on face-to-face dialogues as the sole source of data (Gagné et al., 2015), but other studies have moved beyond this and generated data in creative ways. Lowe and Lawrence (2018) generate data for their duoethnography on native speakerism and "hidden curricula" in

ELT training through dialogues via online messaging services. They enhance and confirm this data using training evaluations and course feedback from their ELT training, and then corroborate this information with previous colleagues and course participants. Online tools feature prominently in other studies. Lowe and Kiczowiak (2016) use virtual spoken and written dialogues on Facebook and Skype for their study on native speakerism. Adamson and Muller (2018) also use Skype in addition to Google Drive as they analyzed data via "memoing" as a methodological tool to interact with one another's reflections. Discussing plurilingual graduate student writing, Corcoran and colleagues (2018) utilize Skype conversations as well as email chains and comments in Google Documents. Other studies have used online documents (Hooper et al., 2020), classroom observations (Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020), pictures, music and websites (Nagashima & Hunter, 2020), narrative writing (Warren & Park, 2018), and other various tools, to support their duoethnographic studies. In these studies, researchers move beyond face-to-face dialogues and find creative ways to have critical and in-depth interactions both with fellow duoethnography participants and various physical and digital artefacts (Lowe & Lawrence, 2020). While these tools are used to "collect" data, it is important to reiterate that the lines between data collection, data analysis, and write up can be blurred as duoethnography does not follow a linear research pattern. Data write up is also a form of data as "new insights and commentary can be inserted into text during the writing-up stage" (Lawrence & Nagashima, 2020, p. 45).

In the following paragraphs, we outline our own duoethnography about our experiences with the CELTA. We outline our methodology and offer one theme that emerged from our study, but with a special focus on how our use of various artefacts, specifically literature on the CELTA, and Patrick, the first author's engagement with social media, impacted our investigation, pushing our duoethnography beyond our face-to-face conversations.

Participants in Duoethnography

The Certificate for English Language Teaching to Adults, commonly known as the CELTA, is one of the most widely recognized ELT qualifications in the world (Anderson, 2018a). As an initial qualification, the CELTA generally runs for 120 hours across 4 weeks with courses offered across the globe. However, its place within ELT is somewhat controversial as researchers argue that it promotes a native speakerist perspective (Anderson, 2016; Lowe & Lawrence, 2018), takes an overly reductionist and mechanistic approach to teaching (Brandt, 2006), and prepares uncritical teachers (Block & Gray, 2016) in part due to the brevity of the course (Ferguson & Donno, 2003).

The intensive CELTA course figures prominently in our careers; we both completed the CELTA as candidates early in our careers and Patrick is currently a course tutor. As such, we were interested in exploring our

perspectives, not just from our direct experiences, but also in relation to each other's, through our lens as researchers in ELT. Patrick took his CELTA course in Canada after finishing his MA in music in the United Kingdom and had no prior ELT experience before the course. After 4 years of full-time teaching, he went on to complete the diploma-level course, the DELTA, and became an accredited CELTA tutor 3 years later. Michael, the second author, took his CELTA course after having completed his MA TESOL in Australia, with some prior ELT experience in South Korea. After the course he went to China for more ELT work, and returned to Canada to begin his PhD studies, which he completed recently (Karas, 2019). Patrick was one of two CELTA tutors on Michael's course, and we have kept in touch ever since Michael's return to Canada. During this period, we maintained contact and had occasional meetings to discuss topics surrounding English language teaching and education, CELTA training, as well as the journey of doctoral work, which Patrick recently started.

Over the years a sense of trust and confidence developed between us as our career paths unfolded, giving rise to our differential positions at various junctures—e.g., Michael now as a PhD graduate while Patrick continues his studies, and Patrick as an experienced CELTA tutor, having provided Michael with guidance on the course. This relationship led us to explore ways to examine our experiences with CELTA and how we might make sense of our subjective views, beliefs, and values in relation to each other's (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). This trust we have developed, first and foremost, constitutes one of the tenets of duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). As we first conceived of this study, we realized that our shared yet varied perspectives of the intensive CELTA course—as candidates, tutor, and researchers—were also informed by our layered identities developing over time (Sawyer & Norris, 2013), and as such they would allow us to reflect, comment on, and even critique each other's views while we converse and share our thoughts as what Breault (2016) calls "trusted and trusting critical friends" (p. 785). This dialogic engagement with each other and our identities enabled us to be critical in our conversation as we recounted our narratives, and to have the possibility and space to reinterpret and reconceptualize our experiences and views of CELTA.

Our Duoethnography

Data collection lasted approximately 6 months. Over this period, we conducted three audio-recorded conversations that yielded approximately 6 hours of material. When conversing, we took a casual approach and allowed the conversation to develop naturally. After each conversation, we individually listened to the audio recordings, took notes, and identified and coded themes that emerged and recurred. We shared our notes by posting them in a shared Google Doc and compared similarities and differences

in what we noticed or indicated as noteworthy and annotated them with comments. These dialogues formed the base of our investigation.

Other data sources were also utilized. Beyond our interactions with each other, we also "interacted" with academic literature on the CELTA (e.g., Anderson, 2016; 2018a; 2018b; Block & Gray, 2016; Mackenzie, 2019), reading articles and sharing our notes and perspectives again on the Google Docs platform. In duoethnography, academic literature is used to contextualize investigations, as is common in other research, but it also serves as a cultural artefact and co-participant as duoethnographers draw on literature both before and during investigations (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Initially, our conversations with each other and interactions with literature were going to be the data utilized for our study, but as we progressed throughout our 6-month data collection, an unexpected artefact emerged: social media. While we used various online communication forums to discuss with each other, as other studies have done (e.g., Adamson & Muller, 2018; Hooper et al., 2020), Patrick's use of prominent social media platforms (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, etc.) became part of the duoethnography as his interactions brought about new understandings of the topics discussed. An example is Patrick's engagement in an online discussion group for CELTA tutors on the topic of reflective practice (discussed below).

After data collection, we wrote our manuscript. Writing a duoethnography can be done in numerous ways—collaboratively in a face-to-face environment (e.g., Nagashima & Hunter, 2020), or as done here, individually as we each wrote up portions of the manuscript and then exchanged the document with one another (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Below, we present a reconstructed dialogue from our study. Written duoethnographies can take many forms, but a common way is for researchers to reconstruct dialogues based on their data, which emphasizes the dialogic nature of duoethnography and "allows for greater audience accessibility" (Lawrence & Lowe, 2020, p. 13).

Sample Dialogue

Our duoethnography uncovered three main themes: capability of CELTA to prepare teachers for diverse settings, candidates who take the CELTA course, and reflective practice. Here, we present a reconstructed dialogue based on our third theme, reflective practice, as an example of a duoethnographic dialogue. Similar to other duoethnographies in ELT (e.g., Lowe & Lawrence, 2018), references to literature are included in the dialogue to highlight its impact on our dialogues and its role as a co-participant.

Patrick: When providing feedback to candidates, I try to get them to think about what they are doing. I'm much more explicit with this now than before; I take things further and make sure they consider the "why" of what they

are doing, getting them to think metacognitively. When you were doing the CELTA, how much reflective practice did you engage in?

Michael: The problem for me was that there was just so much going on (when doing the CELTA). I don't think I did much deep reflection to be honest. I did some reflection-in-action which gets at "thinking on your feet" as you teach, but really deep reflection that is outlined by some authors (e.g., Farrell, 2015), I don't think I did that.

Patrick: For you, you already had a lot of knowledge. What value does the course provide if someone like you can't get into deeper reflective practice? How can someone like me make sure that happens for teacher candidates?

Michael: Part of the problem was that I was still inexperienced. I think it just takes time. For the CELTA, you can push it and emphasize it, but it has to happen naturally. On the CELTA, I think tutors need to emphasize reflective practice and plant the seeds for future reflection, but you can't force people to deeply reflect. They need to do it on their own. When I started teaching full time, that's when I really started doing it. It wasn't necessarily going through reflective steps like some people outline, but I was definitely reflecting on what I was doing in the classroom, even if I wasn't thinking about it as being specifically reflective practice. The problem with teacher education programs is that you can give student teachers reflective assignments, and I do for my students, but it is a bit perfunctory. They are just going through the motions sometimes it feels like. It's an assignment they have to do so they are going to do it because it's a course requirement.

Patrick: That connects to Mackenzie's (2019) article on strategic versus authentic reflection. Basically, what you just said, candidates will reflect in a way that they think the tutor wants them to, but not necessarily in an authentic way.

Michael: Yeah, I think it's hard to overcome that. When on a course, there will always be a strategic aspect of what they are doing. When you're on a CELTA, you can't force it. There is limited time, they may have an assignment to do, and that strategic reflection is something I've done.

Patrick: I think it also depends on at what point the candidates are on a course. Just the other day someone on my Facebook group mentioned candidates' reflection on the CELTA. The person brought up Mann and Walsh (2017) and noted that earlier on the course, and even into their early careers, candidates tend not to be ready to reflect too deeply since they haven't developed a lot of experience with the teaching and learning process yet—both their own and

their learners'. But you're right about reflecting "strategically"—we all do it to some extent, I think.

Michael: Yeah, and there is still some value to it. They are putting their ideas down on paper, but it gets back to one of the common criticisms of the CELTA that it's just too short. It's interesting to hear from CELTA tutors in your group and you about the distinction between teachers early in their careers versus later in their careers, even early in the course versus later in the course. I'm not even sure if you added more time to the CELTA that it would enhance candidates' ability to reflect. I think it's just one of those things that develops when you are teaching full-time and have a bit more experience, but it might be different for each individual.

Patrick: With the in-service professionals I work with, they have the wherewithal and see the value of going further with their reflection without having to be told. For newer teachers, it is a slower process. The assessment criterion for reflection is there for the CELTA, but it is only one of many. Practically speaking as a tutor, being aware of the importance of reflection is important, and there are strategies we can use to get candidates to think more deeply about their own decision making process in planning and teaching, but how much more we can push, I don't know.

Artefacts as "Co-Participants" in Duoethnography

In the previous section, we present a reconstructed dialogue as data, as is common in duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). The dialogue shows the emergent potential of duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013) as we discussed reflective practice and our roles as teacher educators, but also, Michael's (lack of) reflective practice while taking the CELTA. The exchange highlights how our duoethnography reaffirmed our beliefs about the importance of reflective practice, even with the challenges presented by teacher education programs. However, it also pushed us to consider our own reflections as teacher candidates, and for Patrick, how to best help teachers reflect on the CELTA and how their previous experiences may impact this reflection. Some of these issues emerged during our conversations themselves, while others came about as we engaged with the various types of texts being produced as part of our tandem commentary and writing process. In other words, as researchers we "generate[d], expose[d], and revise[d] meaning together" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 18) in this process, during which there was a "synergy of data collection and analysis" (p. 43), whereby new issues and directions arose and led us to explore additional areas and ideas. These emergent elements then led us to engage further with the literature we encountered (e.g., Farrell, 2015; Mackenzie, 2019). These contemporaneous connections with the literature lent some of these emergent ideas present

relevance, as the literature took on the role of "a third partner or discussant in a duoethnography" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 84–85). Our engagement with the literature as a "partner" shows this "synergy" is an omnipresent potential that pervades this process of inquiry. Duoethnography allowed us to frame this literature within our own experiences, moving beyond the notions of reflective practice as a panacea, as our experiences and perspectives converged and diverged with the literature.

As another example of this emergent potential, Patrick's social media interactions became part of our inquiry. In duoethnography, readers of a written duoethnography and audience members of a presented one are considered "active coparticipants and meaning makers in the emergent process" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 24). In our study, this role of reader or audience member was partially realized through Patrick's social media interactions. Patrick is a member of a private discussion group for CELTA tutors on Facebook, and he saw a new posting on reflective practice, in which the original poster cited from Mann and Walsh (2017) concerning how candidates during the CELTA course tend to engage in reflective practice only at a superficial level. He responded, noted our duoethnographic project, and posted some possibilities a tutor may have to encourage more reflective practice for candidates. These online interactions had an impact on our face-to-face and online dialogues with each other, as reflective practice became a key area of focus. Patrick's virtual, asynchronous engagement with colleagues as members in a worldwide community of practice coheres with another one of the tenets of duoethnography, where (prospective) readers—or even stakeholders—can inform us in our process of inquiry, data collection, and writing as we keep in mind how our study might similarly resonate with readers and stakeholders as "co-participants" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). This triangular relationship between the text, writers/presenters, and (prospective) readers/audience members, which is explicitly acknowledged in duoethnography, enhances the nonlinearity of the duoethnographic process and allows for, and acknowledges, the meaning-making potential of stakeholders who may consume, and engage with, duoethnographies. Also, as many people—ourselves included—use social media to connect with members of their professional community, duoethnography can make this association and its cogency explicit. The impact of Patrick's Facebook group, both on our study as a whole and our thinking about our roles as teacher educators, illustrates the role our professional community can have on our thinking, and thus, our work via the mediation of technology.

Conclusion

In this paper, we briefly outline our duoethnography on our experiences with the CELTA, with a focus on how academic literature and social media served as cultural artefacts and co-participants in our inquiry. Duoethnography is an

emerging methodology in ELT and applied linguistics (see Lowe & Lawrence 2020; Sawyer & Norris, 2013 for full methodological information). Interaction will always be a key facet of duoethnography, but these interactions can take place in many forms, with different people and even with different artefacts. We highlight the impact of academic literature and social media on our study to demonstrate the impact of these "co-participants" and the nonlinearity of the duoethnographic process.

For those seeking a flexible research methodology, or an engaging reflective practice method, duoethnography is ideally suited. ELT professionals often enact overlapping and multiple roles as language teachers, teacher educators, researchers, among other possibilities. For practicing teachers, reflection remains an important professional endeavour (Farrell, 2015). Duoethnography moves away from isolating and more traditional forms of reflective practice (e.g., narrative writing) and allows participants to engage with their colleagues and address issues of immediate importance in their teaching. For researchers, there is the constant need to publish. Duoethnography enables researchers to engage in research and reflection with colleagues, but also produce publishable articles that can further their research profiles. Finally, for language teacher education programs, the duoethnographic method can be enacted by pre-service teachers during their teacher education. Duoethnography can serve as a unique assignment, breaking away from traditional research papers, and can be enacted amongst pre-service teachers themselves, but also potentially with the teacher educator, allowing pre-service teachers to produce their own scholarly research and potentially lessening the power disparity between teacher educators and pre-service teachers (Tjandra et al., 2020). In our roles as teacher educators and novice researchers, our duoethnography began as an investigation into the CELTA, which led to discussions on reflective practice and how Patrick can enhance reflection for his CELTA candidates, offering new understandings, but also something publishable, which we explicitly acknowledge as part of our motivation to use duoethnography.

We highlight artefacts here because of their impact on our own inquiry and also the immense possibilities they provide for duoethnographers. There is an expansion of methods in applied linguistics/ELT (Gass & Plonsky, 2020), and while less heralded, duoethnography can certainly be considered part of this movement as researchers seek new ways to investigate research questions. The artefacts in this study include not only academic articles as a formal written medium of references, but also social media communications as a more spontaneous and widely accessible mode of idea exchange. The multiple facets and modes of these artefacts, including the engagement with technology and social media, lend a robustness to the data sources of duoethnography in their variety, flexibility, and range; together, in our view, these qualities make the duoethnographic inquiry an engaging, unique, and worthwhile endeavour. These artefacts were impactful for our

duoethnography, and we hope readers will enact their own and embrace the (potential) multimodality of duoethnography with artefacts uniquely meaningful to their inquiry.

Acknowledgement

The Authors

Patrick is a PhD candidate at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. His research interests include teacher identity and emotions, language teacher education, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis. He is also a tutor and assessor for the Cambridge Certificate for English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA) qualification. He can be reached at pmh1225@gmail.com.

Michael completed his PhD in Applied Linguistics at the University of Western Ontario. He currently teaches at Renison University College, University of Waterloo. His research interests include teacher self-efficacy, learner silence, pronunciation instruction, and duoethnography. He can be reached at m3karas@uwaterloo.ca.

References

Adamson, J., & Muller, T. (2018). Joint autoethnography of teacher experience in the academy: Exploring methods for collaborative inquiry. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *41*(2), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2017.1279139

Anderson, J. (2016). Initial teacher training courses and non-native speaker teachers. *ELT Journal, 70*(3), 261–274.

Anderson, J. (2018a). The role of initial teacher training courses in the professional development of experienced non-native-speaker English language teachers. *ELT Education and Development, 21*.

Anderson, J. (2018b). 'Buying in' to communicative language teaching—the impact of 'initial' certification courses on the classroom practices of experienced teachers of English. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *14*(1), 1–14.

Block, D., & Gray, J. (2016). 'Just go away and do it and you get marks': The degradation of language teaching in neoliberal times. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *37*(5), 481–494.

Brandt, C. (2006). Allowing for practice: A critical issue in TESOL teacher preparation. *ELT Journal*, *60*(4), 355–364.

Breault, R. A. (2016). Emerging issues in duoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(6), 777–794.

Corcoran, J., Gagné, A., & McIntosh, M. (2018). A conversation about "editing" plurilingual scholars' thesis writing. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 28, 1–25.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professionals*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ferguson, G., & Donno, S. (2003). One-month teacher training courses: Time for a change?. *ELT Journal*, *57*(1), 26–33.

Gagné, A., Chassels, C., & McIntosh, M. (2015). Plurilingual teachers and their experiences navigating the academy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *38*(3), 106–122.

Gass, S., & Plonsky, L. (2020). Introducing the SSLA methods forum. *Studies in Second Language*

Acquisition, *42*, 667–669. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000364

Hooper, D., Oka, M., & Yamazawa, A. (2020). Not all *Eikaiwas* (or instructors) are created equal: A trioethnography of 'native speaker' and 'non-native speaker' perspectives on English conversation schools in Japan. In R. J. Lowe & L. Lawrence (Eds.), *Duoethnography in English language teaching: Research, reflection and classroom application* (pp. 29–49). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Karas, M. (2019). *English language teacher self-efficacy beliefs*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Western University, London, ON, Canada.

Lawrence, L., & Lowe, R. J. (2020). An introduction to duoethnography. In R. J. Lowe & L. Lawrence (Eds.), *Duoethnography in English language teaching: Research, reflection and classroom application* (pp. 1–26). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lawrence, L., & Nagashima, Y. (2020). The intersectionality of gender, sexuality, race, and native-speakerness: Investigating ELT teacher identity through duoethnography. *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education*, *19*(1), 42–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1672173

Lowe, R. J., & Kiczkowiak, M. (2016). Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: A duoethnographic study. *Cogent Education 3*(1), Article 1264171.

Lowe, R. J., & Lawrence, L. (2018). Native-speakerism and 'hidden curricula' in ELT training: A duoethnography. *Journal of Language and Discrimination, 2*(2), 162–187.

Lowe, R. J., & Lawrence, L. (Eds.). (2020). *Duoethnography in English language teaching: Research, reflection and classroom application*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mackenzie, L. (2019). Investigating reflection in written assignments on CELTA courses. *ELT Journal, 73*(1), 11–20.

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective practice in English language teaching—Research-based principles and practices.* Routledge.

Nagashima, Y., & Hunter, C. (2020). Critical ELT in Japan: A duoethnographic exploration of origins, identities, obstacles and concerns. In R. J. Lowe & L. Lawrence (Eds.), *Duoethnography in English language teaching: Research, reflection and classroom application* (pp. 50–70). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Norris, J. (2008). Duoethnography. In L. M. Givens (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 234–236). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Tjandra, C., Corcoran, J., Gennuso, M., & Yeldon, A. R. (2020). Digital autobiographical identity texts as critical plurilingual pedagogy. *Journal of Belonging, Identity, Language, and Diversity*, *4*(1), 81–100.

Warren, A. N., & Park, J. (2018). "Legitimate" concerns: A duoethnography of becoming ELT professionals. In N. Rudolph & B. Yazan (Eds.), *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in)equity in ELT: Issues and implications* (pp. 199–217). Dordrecht, NE: Springer.