

Educational Researcher

<http://er.aera.net>

Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry

F. Michael Connelly and D. Jean Clandinin
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER 1990 19: 2
DOI: 10.3102/0013189X019005002

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://edr.sagepub.com/content/19/5/2>

Published on behalf of



American Educational Research Association

and



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Educational Researcher* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://er.aera.net/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://er.aera.net/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.aera.net/reprints>

Permissions: <http://www.aera.net/permissions>

Citations: <http://edr.sagepub.com/content/19/5/2.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jun 1, 1990

[What is This?](#)

Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry

F. MICHAEL CONNELLY

D. JEAN CLANDININ

Although narrative inquiry has a long intellectual history both in and out of education, it is increasingly used in studies of educational experience. One theory in educational research holds that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives. Thus, the study of narrative is the study of the ways humans experience the world. This general concept is refined into the view that education and educational research is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories; learners, teachers, and researchers are storytellers and characters in their own and other's stories. In this paper we briefly survey forms of narrative inquiry in educational studies and outline certain criteria, methods, and writing forms, which we describe in terms of beginning the story, living the story, and selecting stories to construct and reconstruct narrative plots. Certain risks, dangers, and abuses possible in narrative studies are discussed. We conclude by describing a two-part research agenda for curriculum and teacher studies flowing from stories of experience and narrative inquiry.

Educational Researcher, Vol. 19, No. 5, pp 2-14

What matters is that lives do not serve as models; only stories do that. And it is a hard thing to make up stories to live by. We can only retell and live by the stories we have read or heard. We live our lives through texts. They may be read, or chanted, or experienced electronically, or come to us, like the murmurings of our mothers, telling us what conventions demand. Whatever their form or medium, these stories have formed us all; they are what we must use to make new fictions, new narratives. (Heilbrun 1988, p. 37, *Writing a Woman's Life*.)

Narrative inquiry is increasingly used in studies of educational experience. It has a long intellectual history both in and out of education. The main claim for the use of narrative in educational research is that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of the ways humans experience the world. This general notion translates into the view that education is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories; teachers and learners are storytellers and characters in their own and other's stories.

It is equally correct to say "inquiry into narrative" as it is "narrative inquiry." By this we mean that narrative is both phenomenon and method. Narrative names the structured

quality of experience to be studied, and it names the patterns of inquiry for its study. To preserve this distinction we use the reasonably well-established device of calling the phenomenon "story" and the inquiry "narrative." Thus, we say that people by nature lead storied lives and tell stories of those lives, whereas narrative researchers describe such lives, collect and tell stories of them, and write narratives of experience.

Perhaps because it focuses on human experience, perhaps because it is a fundamental structure of human experience, and perhaps because it has a holistic quality, narrative has an important place in other disciplines. Narrative is a way of characterizing the phenomena of human experience and its study which is appropriate to many social science fields. The entire field of study is commonly referred to as *narratology*, a term which cuts across such areas as literary theory, history, anthropology, drama, art, film, theology, philosophy, psychology, linguistics, education, and even aspects of evolutionary biological science. One of the best introductions to the scope of this literature is Mitchell's book *On Narrative*.¹

Most educational studies of narrative have counterparts in the social sciences. Polkinghorne's history of "individual psychology" (1988, pp. 101-105) from the mid-1800's described narrative-related studies that have educational counterparts. His categories of case history, biography, life history, life span development, Freudian psychoanalysis, and organizational consultation are represented in the educational literature. These categories of inquiry tend, as Polkinghorne noted, to focus on *an individual's* psychology considered over a span of time. Consider, for example, the long standing regular use of anecdotal records in inquiry into child development, early childhood education, and school counselling. This focus sets the stage for one of the most frequent criticisms of narrative, namely, that narrative unduly stresses the individual over the social context.

Narrative inquiry may also be sociologically concerned with groups and the formation of community (see Carr's narrative treatment of community, 1986). Goodson's (1988) historical discussion of teachers's life histories and studies

F. MICHAEL CONNELLY is at the Joint Centre for Teacher Development, University of Toronto and Ontario Institute Studies in Education. D. JEAN CLANDININ is at the University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4.

of curriculum in schooling gave a sociologically oriented account of life history in sociology, anthropology, and educational studies. Goodson saw autobiography as a version of life history. However, given recent educational developments in works such as *Teacher Careers* (Sikes, Measor, & Woods, 1985), *Teachers Lives and Careers* (Ball & Goodson, 1985), and *Teacher Careers and Social Improvement* (Huberman, 1988) in which the focus is on professionalism, it would appear reasonable to maintain a distinction between biography/autobiography and life history. Goodson assigned to the Chicago school the main influence on life history work through sociologists such as Park and Becker. Polkinghorne emphasized Mead's (also Chicago school) philosophical theories of symbolic interaction.

Berk (1980), in a discussion of the history of the uses of autobiography/biography in education, stated that autobiography was one of the first methodologies for the study of education. Shifting inquiry from the question "What does it mean for a person to be educated?" to "How are people, in general, educated?" appears to have led to the demise of autobiography/biography in educational studies. This decline paralleled the decline of the study of the individual in psychology as described by Polkinghorne. Recently, however, Pinar (1988), Grumet (1988), and Pinar and Grumet (1976) developed with their students and others a strong autobiographical tradition in educational studies.

Three closely related lines of inquiry focus specifically on story: oral history and folklore, children's story telling, and the uses of story in preschool and school language experiences. Dorson (1976) distinguished between oral history and oral literature, a distinction with promise in sorting out the character and origins of professional folk knowledge of teaching. Dorson named a wide range of phenomena for narrative inquiry that suggest educational inquiry possibilities such as material culture, custom, arts, epics, ballads, proverbs, romances, riddles, poems, recollections, and myths. Myths, Dorson noted, are the storied structures which stand behind folklore and oral history, an observation which links narrative to the theory of myth (e.g., Frye, 1988). The best known educational use for oral history in North America is the Foxfire project (Wigginton, 1985, 1989).

Applebee's (1978) work is a resource on children's story telling and children's expectations of story from teachers, texts, and others. Sutton-Smith's (1986) review of this literature distinguished between structuralist approaches, which rely on *schema* and other cognition theory terms (e.g., Mandler, 1984; Schank & Abelson, 1977), and meaning in a hermeneutic tradition (e.g., Erwin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan, 1977; Gadamer, 1982; McDowell, 1979). A curricular version of this literature is found in the suggestion (Egan, 1986; Jackson, 1987) that school subject matter be organized in story form. Jackson wrote that "even when the subject matter is not itself a story, the lesson usually contains a number of narrative segments all the same" (p. 307) and Egan suggested a model that "encourages us to see lessons or units as good stories to be told rather than sets of objectives to be obtained" (p. 2).

Applebee's work is an outgrowth of the uses of story in language instruction, a line of enquiry sometimes referred to as the work of "the Cambridge group." Much of this work has a curriculum development/teaching method focus (e.g., Britton, 1970) but there are also theoretical (e.g., Britton, 1971; Rosen, 1986) and research traditions (e.g., Applebee, 1978;

Bissex & Bullock, 1987; Wells, 1986). Lightfoot and Martin's (1988) book in honor of Britton gives an introduction to this literature. Recently this work has begun to establish a counterpart in studies of adult language and second language learning (Allen, 1989; Bell, in press; Conle, 1989; Cumming, 1988; Enns-Connolly, 1985, in press; Vechter, 1987). In our work on curriculum, we see teachers's narratives as metaphors for teaching-learning relationships. In understanding ourselves and our students educationally, we need an understanding of people with a narrative of life experiences. Life's narratives are the context for making meaning of school situations. This narrative view of curriculum is echoed in the work of language researchers (Calkins, 1983) and general studies of curriculum (B. Rosen, 1988; Lightfoot & Martin, 1988; Paley, 1979).

Because of its focus on experience and the qualities of life and education, narrative is situated in a matrix of qualitative research. Eisner's (1988) review of the educational study of experience implicitly aligns narrative with qualitatively oriented educational researchers working with experiential philosophy, psychology, critical theory, curriculum studies, and anthropology. Elbaz's (1988) review of teacher-thinking studies created a profile of the most closely related narrative family members. One way she constructed the family was to review studies of "the personal" to show how these studies had an affinity with narrative. Another entry point for Elbaz was "voice" which, for her, and for us (Clandinin, 1988), aligns narrative with feminist studies (e.g., Personal Narratives Group, 1989). Elbaz's principal concern is with story. Using a distinction between story as "primarily a methodological device" and as "methodology itself," she aligned narrative with many educational studies which, although specific researchers may not be conscious of using narrative, report data either in story form or use participant stories as raw data.² There is also a collection of educational literature that is narrative in quality but which is not found in review documents where it might reasonably appear (e.g., Wittrock, 1986). We call this literature "Teachers's Stories and Stories of Teachers". This name refers to first- and second-hand accounts of individual teachers, students, classrooms, and schools written by teachers and others.³

In this paper we see ourselves as outlining possibilities for narrative inquiry within educational studies. The educational importance of this line of work is that it brings theoretical ideas about the nature of human life as lived to bear on educational experience as lived. We have not set out to contribute to the long tradition of narrative in the humanities, nor to bridge the gap between the humanities and the social sciences in educational studies, desirable as that clearly is. In the remainder of the paper we explore various methodological issues of narrative inquiry.

Beginning the Story: The Process of Narrative Inquiry

Many accounts of qualitative inquiry give a description of the negotiation of entry into the field situation. Negotiating entry is commonly seen as an ethical matter framed in terms of principles that establish responsibilities for both researchers and practitioners. However, another way of understanding the process as an ethical matter is to see it as a negotiation of a shared narrative unity. We wrote about it (Clandinin & Connelly, 1988) in the following way:

We have shown how successful negotiation and the application of principles do not guarantee a fruitful study.

The reason, of course, is that collaborative research constitutes a relationship. In everyday life, the idea of friendship implies a sharing, an interpenetration of two or more persons' spheres of experience. Mere contact is acquaintanceship, not friendship. The same may be said for collaborative research which requires a close relationship akin to friendship. Relationships are joined, as MacIntyre (1981) implies, by the narrative unities of our lives. (p. 281)

This understanding of the negotiation of entry highlights the way narrative inquiry occurs within relationships among researchers and practitioners, constructed as a caring community. When both researchers and practitioners tell stories of the research relationship, they have the possibility of being stories of empowerment. Noddings (1986) remarked that in research on teaching "too little attention is presently given to matters of community and collegiality and that such research should be construed as research for teaching" (p. 510). She emphasized the collaborative nature of the research process as one in which all participants see themselves as participants in the community, which has value for both researcher and practitioner, theory and practice.

Hogan (1988) wrote about the research relationship in a similar way. "Empowering relationships develop over time and it takes time for participants to recognize the value that the relationship holds. Empowering relationships involve feelings of 'connectedness' that are developed in situations of equality, caring and mutual purpose and intention" (p. 12). Hogan highlighted several important issues in the research relationship: the equality between participants, the caring situation, and the feelings of connectedness. A sense of equality between participants is particularly important in narrative inquiry. However, in researcher-practitioner relationships where practitioners have long been silenced through being used as objects for study, we are faced with a dilemma. Practitioners have experienced themselves as without voice in the research process and may find it difficult to feel empowered to tell their stories. They have been made to feel less than equal. Noddings (1986) is helpful in thinking through this dilemma for narrative inquiry. She wrote that "we approach our goal by living with those whom we teach in a caring community, through modeling, dialogue, practice and confirmation. Again, we see how unfamiliar this language has become" (p. 502).

In this quotation, Noddings was speaking of the teaching-learning relationship, but what she said has significance for thinking about researcher-practitioner relationships as well. She drew attention to the ways we situate ourselves in relation to the persons with whom we work, to the ways in which we practice in a collaborative way, and to the ways all participants model, in their practices, a valuing and confirmation of each other. What Hogan and Noddings highlighted is the necessity of time, relationship, space, and voice in establishing the collaborative relationship, a relationship in which both researchers and practitioners have voice in Britzman's (in press) sense. Britzman wrote:

Voice is meaning that resides in the individual and enables that individual to participate in a community.... The struggle for voice begins when a person attempts to communicate meaning to someone else. Finding the words, speaking for oneself, and feeling heard by others are all a part of this process.... Voice suggests relationships: the individual's relationship to the meaning of her/his exper-

ience and hence, to language, and the individual's relationship to the other, since understanding is a social process.

In beginning the process of narrative inquiry, it is particularly important that all participants have voice within the relationship. It implies, as Elbow (1986) noted, that we play the "believing game," a way of working within a relationship that calls upon connected knowing in which the knower is personally attached to the known. Distance or separation does not characterize connected knowing. The believing game is a way of knowing that involves a process of self-insertion in the other's story as a way of coming to know the other's story and as giving the other voice. Elbow emphasized the collaborative nature of the believing game when he wrote "the believing game... is essentially cooperative or collaborative. The central event is the act of affirming or entering into someone's thinking or perceiving" (p. 289).

In narrative inquiry, it is important that the researcher listen first to the practitioner's story, and that it is the practitioner who first tells his or her story. This does not mean that the researcher is silenced in the process of narrative inquiry. It does mean that the practitioner, who has long been silenced in the research relationship, is given the time and space to tell her or his story so that it too gains the authority and validity that the research story has long had. Coles (1989) made a similar point when he wrote "but on that fast-darkening winter afternoon, I was urged to let each patient be a teacher: hearing themselves teach you, through their narration, the patients will learn the lessons a good instructor learns only when he becomes a willing student, eager to be taught" (p. 22). Narrative inquiry is, however, a process of collaboration involving mutual storytelling and restoring as the research proceeds. In the process of beginning to live the shared story of narrative inquiry, the researcher needs to be aware of constructing a relationship in which both voices are heard. The above description emphasizes the importance of the mutual construction of the research relationship, a relationship in which both practitioners and researchers feel cared for and have a voice with which to tell their stories.

Living the Story: Continuing the Process of Narrative Inquiry

What should be clear from the previous description is an understanding of the process as one in which we are continually trying to give an account of the multiple levels (which are temporally continuous and socially interactive) at which the inquiry proceeds. The central task is evident when it is grasped that people are both living their stories in an ongoing experiential text and telling their stories in words as they reflect upon life and explain themselves to others. For the researcher, this is a portion of the complexity of narrative, because a life is also a matter of growth toward an imagined future and, therefore, involves retelling stories and attempts at reliving stories. A person is, at once, engaged in living, telling, retelling, and reliving stories.

Seeing and describing story in the everyday actions of teachers, students, administrators, and others requires a subtle twist of mind on behalf of the enquirer. It is in the tellings and retellings that entanglements become acute, for it is here that temporal and social, cultural horizons are set and reset. How far of a probe into the participants's past and future is far enough? Which community spheres should be

probed and to what social depth should the inquiry proceed? When one engages in narrative inquiry the process becomes even more complex, for, as researchers, we become part of the process. The two narratives of participant and researcher become, in part, a shared narrative construction and reconstruction through the inquiry.

Narrative inquiry in the social sciences is a form of empirical narrative in which empirical data is central to the work. The inevitable interpretation that occurs, something which is embedded even in the data collection process, does not make narrative into fiction even though the language of narrative inquiry is heavily laced with terms derived from literary criticism of fiction. A number of different methods of data collection are possible as the researcher and practitioner work together in a collaborative relationship. Data can be in the form of field notes of the shared experience, journal records, interview transcripts, others's observations, story telling, letter writing, autobiographical writing, documents such as class plans and newsletters, and writing such as rules, principles, pictures, metaphors, and personal philosophies. In our later discussion of plot of scene, the importance of the narrative whole is made clear. The sense of the whole is built from a rich data source with a focus on the concrete particularities of life that create powerful narrative tellings. In the following we draw small excerpts from several narrative studies. These excerpts are illustrative of the variety of narrative data sources and ways of collecting narrative data.

Field Notes of Shared Experience

Field records collected through participant observation in a shared practical setting is one of the primary tools of narrative inquiry work. There are numerous narrative studies (Clandinin, 1986, 1989; Hoffman, 1988; Kroma, 1983) that make use of field notes. An example of field notes taken from a narrative study with an intern teacher (Clandinin & Connelly, 1987) is given below.

Marie sent them off to get started in the haunted house. She gave the other children their choice of centers and then they walked over and watched the students at the haunted house. They had built a haunted house with the large blocks. They had made a number of masks that they moved up and down. The walls moved which they said was the Poltergeist. They showed this for two or three minutes and the other students clapped. Then they went off to their centers and the children at the block center continued to work on their haunted house. (notes to file, October 22, 1985)

These notes are a small fragment of the notes used in a narrative study, which explored the ways in which the intern teacher (Marie) constructed and reconstructed her ideas of what it meant to teach using themes in a primary classroom setting. The researcher participated in the situation with the children, the intern teacher, and in recording the field notes. The researcher's notes are an active recording of her construction of classroom events. We term this *active recording* to suggest the ways in which we see the researcher expressing her personal practical knowing in her work with the children and the intern teacher, and to highlight that the notes are an active reconstruction of the events rather than a passive recording, which would suggest that the events could be recorded without the researcher's interpretation.

Journal Records

Journals made by participants in the practical setting are another source of data in narrative inquiry. Journal records can be made by both participants, researcher or practitioner. The following journal excerpt is taken from Davies (1988). Davies, a teacher, has kept a journal of her ongoing classroom practice for a number of years as a participant in a teacher researcher group. In the following journal excerpt she wrote about her experiences with one of her student's journals in which Lisa, the student, figures out her writing.

This episode with Lisa makes me realize that we're still moving forward in the "gains" of this experience. I've been wondering about when the natural "peak" will occur, the moment I feel we've gone as far as we can without the downside effect—the loss of momentum. I just have to watch for the natural ending. I see time as so critical. Kids need and get the time with each other—kid to kid time responding is so important—they make their connections just as we make ours in the research group. (p. 20)

In this journal entry, Davies is trying to make sense of her work with the children in her classroom as they work in their journals. Yet she is also trying to understand the parallels between her experiences of learning through participating in the teacher researcher group with the work that is going on with the children in her classroom.

Interviews

Another data collection tool in narrative inquiry is the unstructured interview. Interviews are conducted between researcher and participant, transcripts are made, the meetings are made available for further discussion, and they become part of the ongoing narrative record. There are many examples of interviews in narrative inquiry. Mishler (1986) has completed the most comprehensive study of interview in narrative inquiry. We have chosen to highlight a sample of an interview from the work of Enns-Connolly (1985). The following excerpt is taken from her case study with a language student in her exploration of the process of translation.

Brian, Student: The situation about which he was talking I've thought about a lot.

Esther, Researcher: Mhmm.

B: Mainly because, um, I've often been concerned that my own political beliefs might lead me in certain situations into a similar kind of thing.

E: Yeah, that's interesting because um you're thinking of it politically—as a political—as a consequence of politics which um, well this background—do you recall the background of this particular author? Like I'm sure that's probably a real factor in, in his writing. He's writing immediately after the Second World War after coming back from Russia and his war experiences and everything, and uh—For me, though, I don't know—I guess that just for me it's not political—I'm not focusing on the fact that it's the consequences of a political situation, but I'm focusing on the whole idea of a human being being alone and probing into himself and coming to terms with himself, and I see it more as somebody in the face of death. Like, for me death was really—like the presence of impending death was a really big thing that I was concerned about and I saw him as a person in the face of death and trying to—as reacting to impending death.

B: I saw him as a person who was just desperately trying

to survive. Not survive in the face of death, but survive in the face of his own, his own capacity to break down mentally, I guess (pp 38-39)

What Enns-Connolly explores in her work with the German student are the ways in which translator's personal practical knowledge is shaped by and shapes the translation. The above interview segment is one in which both participants narratively come to understand the ways in which their narrative experiences shape their translation of a particular text.

Story Telling

There are many powerful examples of the uses of individual's lived stories as data sources in narrative inquiry. These are as diverse as Paley's (1981, 1986) work with children's stories to Smith, Prunty, Dwyer, and Kleine's (1987) Kensington Revisited project. The following is an example of a story drawn from Connelly and Clandinin's (1988) work with a school principal, Phil. Phil told the following story of his experiences as a child as a way of explaining one of his actions as principal at Bay Street School.

He had been sent to school in short pants. He and another boy in short pants were caught by older students who put them in a blanket. Phil had escaped while the other boy was trapped. He went home saying he was never going to go back to that school again. He said he understood about being a member of a minority group but he said he didn't look like a minority. He said you understood if you've had the experience. (notes to file, April 15, 1981)

This story is part of Phil's storying and restorying of the ways in which he administers an inner-city school. Many stories are told by participants in a narrative inquiry as they describe their work and explain their actions. The tendency to explain through stories can easily be misinterpreted as establishing causal links in narrative inquiry. We later discuss this matter under the heading of the illusion of causality in narrative studies.

Letter Writing

Letter writing, a way of engaging in written dialogue between researcher and participants, is another data source in narrative inquiry. For many narrativists, letter writing is a way of offering and responding to tentative narrative interpretations (Clandinin, 1986). The following, another way of thinking about letter writing, occurs within the narrative study of a group of practitioners. The practitioners are exploring the ways in which they work with children in language arts. The following example is taken from Davies (1988), one of the teacher researchers.

I really realized just how important written response is to all of us in the research group. That made me think of the same thing for kids, which is what I'm doing now with their logs/journals of thinking. I have a reason to do these journals and that acts to focus my teaching and their learning. I really see the value, it's a lifelong one, for them as well as me. (p. 10)

Another participant in the group responds to Davies's comment in the following way in a written response similar to a response to a letter.

The notion of trusted friends has been built in your classroom since the beginning of the year. These journals are part of your evolving curriculum and as such they come into the curriculum at exactly the right time for the children

to make the best possible use of them. They are working so well because they are a natural outgrowth of everything that has gone before. These kids are so open, so trusting, so sensitive, so caring, so everything! The usual kid school journals are an activity that the teacher comes up with to address some part of the mandated curriculum. Kids treat the activity like any of the regular sorts of assignment—for the teacher. This latest "chapter," the journal writing, really highlights the similarities between our group and what goes on in your classroom—the empowerment, validation, voice, sense of community, caring, connectedness are all there (p. 10)

The exchange is drawn from a two-year study that narratively looks at teachers's experiences with writing and the ways in which their ways of knowing are expressed in their classroom practices.

Autobiographical and Biographical Writing

Another data source in narrative inquiry is autobiographical and biographical writing. Autobiographical writing sometimes appears in stories that teachers tell or in more focused autobiographical writing. We see an example of such writing in Conle's (1989) work.

To mind comes the image of a young teenager standing by a row of windows in a classroom which has become more spacious by open folding doors which usually separate it from the adjoining room. It is gym period in a small Ontario high school in the mid 50's and two grade 10 classes are enjoying a break in routine, a snowball dance. It started with one couple who then each asked a partner and so on. The girl by the window has been waiting. No one asked her yet. The crowd around her is getting smaller and smaller. Finally she is the only one left. She stays until the bell rings and everyone files out. "perhaps no one noticed," she thinks, but a friend remarks, "Oh, you didn't dance!"

I have never forgotten the incident. Many years later a colleague and I talked about it in a discussion about my early years in Canada as an immigrant teenager. We wondered how those early experiences might have shaped my interest in teaching English as a second language? What did I remember of this episode and why did I remember it at all? (p. 8)

What Conle draws attention to is the ways in which her experience shapes her interest in, and ways of constructing, particular research and teaching interests. Other research references to autobiographical/biographical writing as a data source for narrative inquiry are, for example, Rose (1983) on the parallel lives in the marriages of well-known Victorian writers, Grumet (1988) on women's experiences, and Pinar (1988), Olney (1980), and Gunn (1982) on method.

Other Narrative Data Sources

There are other data sources that narrative inquirers use. Documents such as class plans and newsletters (Clandinin, 1986), writing such as rules and principles (Elbaz, 1983), picturing (Cole, 1986), metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), and personal philosophies (Kroma, 1983) are all possible data sources for narrative inquiry. See Connelly and Clandinin (1988) for a more extended discussion of these various resources.

Writing the Narrative

At the completion of a narrative study, it is often not clear when the writing of the study began. There is frequently a sense that writing began during the opening negotiations with participants or even earlier as ideas for the study were first formulated. Material written throughout the course of the inquiry often appears as major pieces of the final document. It is common, for instance, for collaborative documents such as letters to be included as part of the text. Material written for different purposes such as conference presentations may become part of the final document. There may be a moment when one says "I have completed my data collection and will now write the narrative," but even then narrative methodologies often require further discussion with participants, such that data is collected until the final document is completed. Enns-Connolly's (1985) letters to her student in the German language is an example where data collection and writing were shared through final drafts, thesis hearing, and subsequent publication. It is not at all clear when the writing begins.

It is important, therefore, for narrative researchers to be conscious of the end as the inquiry begins. The various matters we describe below are, of course, most evident in one's writing. But if these matters have not been attended to from the outset, the writing will be much more difficult.

What Makes a Good Narrative? Beyond Reliability, Validity and Generalizability

Van Maanen (1988) wrote that for anthropology, *reliability* and *validity* are overrated criteria whereas *apparentness* and

**Like other qualitative methods,
narrative relies on criteria
other than validity,
reliability, and generalizability.
The language and criteria
for narrative inquiry
are under development.**

verisimilitude are underrated criteria. The sense that the mainstay criteria of social science research are overrated is shared by Guba and Lincoln (1989), who reject the utility of the idea of generalization and argue that it "be given up as a goal of inquiry" and replaced by "transferability." Van Maanen, in discussing the origin of his book, writes that "the manuscript I imagined would reflect the quirky and unpredictable moments of my own history in the field and likely spoof some of the maxims of the trade. The intent was to be less instructive than amusing. Along the way, however, things grew more serious" (pp. xi-xii). This is a telling remark coming as it does as a story in a researcher's own narrative of inquiry. It is a helpful reminder to those who pursue narrative studies that they need to be prepared to follow their nose and, after

the fact, reconstruct their narrative of inquiry. For this reason books such as Elbaz's (1983) *Teacher Thinking* and Clandinin's (1986) *Classroom Practice* end with reflective chapters that function as another kind of methods chapter. What are some of these more serious matters that guide the narrative writer in the creation of documents with a measure of verisimilitude?

Like other qualitative methods, narrative relies on criteria other than validity, reliability, and generalizability. It is important not to squeeze the language of narrative criteria into a language created for other forms of research. The language and criteria for the conduct of narrative inquiry are under development in the research community. We think a variety of criteria, some appropriate to some circumstances and some to others, will eventually be the agreed-upon norm. It is currently the case that each inquirer must search for, and defend, the criteria that best apply to his or her work. We have already identified apparentness, verisimilitude, and transferability as possible criteria. In the following paragraphs we identify additional criterion terms being proposed and used.

An excellent place to begin is with Crites' (1986) cautionary phrase "the illusion of causality" (p. 168). He refers to the "topsy-turvy hermeneutic principle" in which a sequence of events looked at backward has the appearance of causal necessity and, looked at forward, has the sense of a teleological, intentional pull of the future. Thus, examined temporally, backward or forward, events tend to appear deterministically related. Because every narrativist has either recorded classroom and other events in temporal sequence (e.g., field notes) or has solicited memory records, which are clearly dated (e.g., stories and autobiographical writing), and intentional expectations (e.g., goals, lesson plans, purposes, and time lines), which often tend to be associated with temporal targets, the "illusion" can become a powerful interpretive force for the writer. Adopting what might be called "the principle of time defeasibility," time may be modified to suit the story told. We make use of this notion in graduate classes, for example, in which students are often encouraged to write their own narrative by beginning with present values, beliefs, and actions and then to move to their childhood or early schooling experiences. Narrative writers frequently move back and forward several times in a single document as various threads are narrated. Chatman (1981) makes use of temporal defeasibility in his distinction between "storied-time" and "discourse-time." His is a distinction between events-as-lived and events-as-told, a distinction central to the writing of good narratives and for avoiding the illusion of causality.

If not causality, what then? Narrative explanation derives from the whole. We noted above that narrative inquiry was driven by a sense of the whole and it is this sense which needs to drive the writing (and reading) of narrative. Narratives are not adequately written according to a model of cause and effect but according to the explanations gleaned from the overall narrative or, as Polkinghorne (1988) said, on "change from 'beginning' to 'end'" (p. 116). When done properly, one does not feel lost in minutia but always has a sense of the whole. Unfortunately, this presents a dilemma in the writing because one needs to get down to concrete experiential detail. How to adjudicate between the whole and the detail at each moment of the writing is a difficult task for the writer of narrative.

One may fulfill these criterial conditions and still wonder if the narrative is a good one. Crites wrote that a good narrative constitutes an "invitation" to participate, a notion similar to Guba and Lincoln's (1989) and our own (Connelly, 1978) idea that case studies may be read, and lived, vicariously by others. Peshkin (1985) noted something similar when he wrote, "When I disclose what I have seen, my results invite other researchers to look where I did and see what I saw. My ideas are candidates for others to entertain, not necessarily as truth, let alone Truth, but as positions about the nature and meaning of a phenomenon that may fit their sensibility and shape their thinking about their own inquiries" (p. 280). On the grounds suggested by these authors, the narrative writer has an available test, that is, to have another participant read the account and to respond to such questions as "What do you make of it for your teaching (or other) situation?" This allows a researcher to assess the invitational quality of a manuscript already established as logically sound.

What are some of the marks of an explanatory, invitational narrative? Tannen (1988) suggested that a reader of a story connects with it by recognizing particulars, by imagining the scenes in which the particulars could occur, and by reconstructing them from remembered associations with similar particulars. It is the particular and not the general that triggers emotion and moves people and gives rise to what H. Rosen (1988) called "authenticity" (p. 81). This theme is picked up as integral to plot and scene in the next section.

Robinson and Hawpe (1986), in asking the question What constitutes narrative thinking? identify three useful writing criteria: *economy*, *selectivity*, and *familiarity* (p. 111-125). With these criteria they argue that stories stand between the general and the particular, mediating the generic demands of science with the personal, practical, concrete demands of living. Stories function as arguments in which we learn something essentially human by understanding an actual life or community as lived. The narrative inquirer undertakes this mediation from beginning to end and embodies these dimensions as best as he or she can in the written narrative.

Spence (1982) writes that "narrative truth" consists of "continuity," "closure," "aesthetic finality," and a sense of "conviction" (p. 31). These are qualities associated both with fictional literature and with something well done. They are life criteria. In our studies we use the notions of *adequacy* (borrowed from Schwab, 1964) and *plausibility*. A plausible account is one that tends to ring true. It is an account of which one might say "I can see that happening." Thus, although fantasy may be an invitational element in fictional narrative, plausibility exerts firmer tugs in empirical narratives.

We can understand the narrative writer's task if we examine significant events in our lives in terms of the criteria here described. Life, like the narrative writer's task, is a dialectical balancing act in which one strives for various perfections, always falling short, yet sometimes achieving a liveable harmony of competing narrative threads and criteria.

Structuring the Narrative: Scene and Plot

Welty (1979) remarks that time and place are the two points of reference by which the novel grasps experience. This is no less true for the writing of empirical narratives. Time and place become written constructions in the form of plot and scene respectively. Time and place, plot and scene, work together to create the experiential quality of narrative. They

are not, in themselves, the interpretive nor the conceptual side. Nor are they on the side of narrative criticism. They are the thing itself.

Scene: Place is where the action occurs, where characters are formed and live out their stories and where cultural and social context play constraining and enabling roles. Welty writes the following on the construction of scene:

Place has surface, which will take the imprint of man—his hand, his foot, his mind; it can be tamed, domesticated. It has shape, size, boundaries; man can measure himself against them. It has atmosphere and temperature, change of light and show of season, qualities to which man spontaneously responds. Place has always nursed, nourished and instructed man; he in turn can rule it and ruin it, take it and lose it, suffer if he is exiled from it, and after living on it he goes to it in his grave. It is the stuff of fiction, as close to our living lives as the earth we can pick up and rub between our fingers, something we can feel and smell (p. 163).

It may be that place and scene (rather than time and plot) is the more difficult construction for narrativist researchers. Documents frequently contain brief character sketches and brief descriptions of classrooms, principal's offices, and the like. Setting these scenes in interesting relief is a puzzling writing task because these matters are "as close to our living lives as the earth we can pick up and rub between our fingers" and depend, therefore, on writing talents for making the plain and prosaic, interesting and invitational.

It is less customary to set the scene in physical terms than in character terms. To describe seating arrangements, pictures, and layouts on classroom walls in a way that helps tell the narrative and enhance its explanatory capability is no easy task. The necessary field records for the construction of scene are often missing at the time of writing as one tends, during data collection, to focus on people rather than things.

Character and physical environment need, in the writing of narrative, to work in harmony with a third feature of scene, namely, context. Context may consist of characters and physical environments other than the classroom. For instance, department heads, principals, school, and community all bear on a classroom scene and need, depending on the inquiry, to be described. Setting the context of scene may be more troublesome to the writer than the other two features because context is "out of sight" and requires active searches during data collection. Nevertheless, difficult as it may be to write scenes composed of character, physical environment, and context, they are essential to narrative and are "as informing as an old gossip" (Welty, p. 163).

Plot. Time is essential to plot. If time were not insubstantial, one might say that time is the substance of plot. Welty develops this point in a metaphorical way. She says that "many of our proverbs are little nut shells to pack the meat of time in" (p. 164) and proceeds to give incipient plot examples such as "pride goeth before destruction" and "he that diggeth a pit shall fall into it". These temporal constructions which she calls "ingots of time" are also "ingots of plot" (p. 164). They are both story containers and conveyors of stories, expressions that "speak of life-in-the-movement" with a beginning and an end. They mark what Kermode (1967) calls the tick-tock structure of story. With the addition of the middle, a basic explanatory plot structure of beginning, middle, and end is in place.

From the point of view of plot, the central structure of time is past-present-future. This common-sense way of thinking about time is informative of the temporal orientation taken in various lines of narrative and narratively oriented work. For example, narrative data sources may be classified according to their relative emphasis on the past, present, and future. Story telling and autobiography, for instance, tend to be located in the past; picturing and interviewing tend to be located in the present; and letter writing, journals, and participant observation tend to be located in the future. From the point of view of the narrative writer, then, different kinds of data tend to strengthen these different temporal locales.

In addition to these methodological consequences of the three-part structure of time, Carr (1986) relates the structure to three critical dimensions of human experience—significance, value, intention—and, therefore, of narrative writing. In general terms the past conveys significance, the present conveys value, and the future conveys intention. Narrative explanation and, therefore, narrative meaning, consists of significance, value, and intention. By virtue of being related to the structure of time, these three dimensions of meaning help a writer structure plots in which explanation and meaning themselves may be said to have a temporal structure. Furthermore, this structure helps convey a sense of purpose on the writing as one deals with various temporal data and fits them into past, present, or future oriented parts of the narrative.

We use an adaptation of this temporal plot structure as a device to initiate data collection. The device is based on White's (1981) distinction between annals, chronicles, and narratives in the narrative study of history. Annals are a dated record of events in which there is no apparent connection between the events. A person might, for example, simply search their memory for important life events with no particular interpretive agenda in mind. As events emerge, their date of occurrence is recorded and the event described. The same may happen in the ongoing record of participant observation where one may have no clear idea of the meaning of the events described but in which one makes dated records nonetheless.

Chronicles somewhat resemble Welty's ingots of time and plot in which events are clearly linked as, for example, a series of events from one's elementary school years or, perhaps, a series of events from one's years as a sports fan, or from a marriage, or during the time of a particular government with a particular educational policy, and so forth. Although it is clear that the events in a chronology are linked, the meaning of the events, and the plot which gives the explanatory structure for linking the events, is unstated. It is these matters which, when added to the chronology, make it a narrative. There is, of course, no clear separation of each of these ways of linking events. Nevertheless, the distinction is a useful one both in data collection and in the writing of the narrative.

In our own work, especially in teaching but also in research, instead of asking people at the outset to write a narrative we encourage them to write a chronology. We avoid asking people to begin by writing biographies and autobiographies for the same reason. People beginning to explore the writing of their own narrative, or that of another, often find the chronology to be a manageable task whereas the writing of a full-fledged autobiography or narrative, when one stresses plot, meaning, interpretation, and explanation,

can be baffling and discouraging. Looked at from another point of view, many amateur biographies are often more akin to chronologies than narratives. The linking themes that transform the annal into a chronology are often mistaken for an account of plot and meaning. In the end, of course, it is of no real theoretical significance what the writing is called because all chronicles are incipient narratives and all narratives reduce to chronicles as one pursues the narrative, remembers and reconstructs new events, and creates further meaning. For inquiry, the point is that a heartfelt record of events in one's life, or research account of a life, does not guarantee significance, meaning, and purpose.

The creation of further meaning, which might be called "the restorying quality of narrative," is one of the most difficult of all to capture in writing. A written document appears to stand still; the narrative appears finished. It has been written, characters' lives constructed, social histories recorded, meaning expressed for all to see. Yet, anyone who has written a narrative knows that it, like life, is a continual unfolding where the narrative insights of today are the chronological events of tomorrow. Such writers know in advance that the task of conveying a sense that the narrative is unfinished and that stories will be retold and lives relived in new ways is likely to be completed in less than satisfactory ways. Furthermore, even when the writer is personally satisfied with the result he or she needs always to remember that readers may freeze the narrative with the result that the restorying life quality intended by the writer may become fixed as a print portrait by the reader.

Multiple "I's" in Narrative Inquiry

In an earlier section, we wrote about the multiple levels at which narrative inquiry proceeds. We described each participant, researcher and teacher, as engaged in living, telling, retelling, and reliving their stories as the narrative inquiry proceeds.

Part of the difficulty in writing narrative is in finding ways to understand and portray the complexity of the ongoing stories being told and retold in the inquiry. We are, as researchers and teachers, still telling in our practices our ongoing life stories as they are lived, told, relived and retold. We restory earlier experiences as we reflect on later experiences so the stories and their meaning shift and change over time. As we engage in a reflective research process, our stories are often restoried and changed as we, as teachers and/or researchers, "give back" to each other ways of seeing our stories. I tell you a researcher's story. You tell me what you heard and what it meant to you. I hadn't thought of it this way, am transformed in some important way, and tell the story differently the next time I encounter an interested listener or talk again with my participant.

As researchers writing narratively, we have come to understand part of this complexity as a problem in multiple "I's." We become "plurivocal" (Barnieh, 1989) in writing narratively. The "I" can speak as researcher, teacher, man or woman, commentator, research participant, narrative critic, and as theory builder. Yet in living the narrative inquiry process, we are one person. We are also one in the writing. However, in the writing of narrative, it becomes important to sort out whose voice is the dominant one when we write "I".

Peshkin (1985) addressed an aspect of this problem in writing about the researcher's personal qualities elicited in

the research process. Although Peshkin's reference was to the data collection process, his comments are also helpful in thinking about the writing of narrative:

Thus fieldworkers each bring to their sites at least two selves—the human self that we generally are in everyday situations, and the research self that we fashion for our particular research situations...participant observation, especially within one's own culture, is emphatically first person singular. The human I is there, the I that is present under many of the same political, economic, and social circumstances as when one is being routinely human and not a researcher....Behind this I are one's multiple personal dispositions...that may be engaged by the realities of the field situation. Because of the unknown and the unexpected aspects of the research field, we do not know which of our dispositions will be engaged. (p. 270)

Although in this quotation Peshkin addressed a dual "I," researcher and person, he suggested that the issue of multiple "I's" in writing narrative is more complex. There are more "I's" than person and researcher within each research participant. Peshkin acknowledged what he calls the personal dispositions as drawn out by the situation. In narrative inquiry we see that the practices drawn out in the research situation are lodged in our personal knowledge of the world. One of our tasks in writing narrative accounts is to convey a sense of the complexity of all of the "I's" all of the ways each of us have of knowing.

We are, in narrative inquiry, constructing narratives at several levels. At one level it is the personal narratives and the jointly shared and constructed narratives that are told in the research writing, but narrative researchers are compelled to move beyond the telling of the lived story to tell the research story. We see in Clandinin's (1986) work her story with Stephanie and Aileen as an expression of teacher images as well as a research story of a way of understanding classroom practice. In Enns-Connolly's (1985) work there is her story with Brian as well as a story of understanding the translation process as an expression of the personal practical knowledge of the translator as it is drawn forth in the experience of reading the text. This telling of the research story requires another voice of researcher, another "I."

In this latter endeavor we make our place and our voice as researcher central. We understand this as a moving out of the collaborative relationship to a relationship where we speak more clearly with the researcher "I." In the process of living the narrative inquiry, the place and voice of researcher and teacher become less defined by role. Our concern is to have a place for the voice of each participant. The question of who is researcher and who is teacher becomes less important as we concern ourselves with questions of collaboration, trust, and relationship as we live, story, and restore our collaborative research life. Yet in the process of writing the research story, the thread of the research inquiry becomes part of the researcher's purpose. In some ways the researcher moves out of the lived story to tell, with another "I," another kind of story.

Risks, Dangers and Abuses of Narrative

The central value of narrative inquiry is its quality as subject matter. Narrative and life go together and so the principal attraction of narrative as method is its capacity to render life experiences, both personal and social, in relevant and meaningful ways. However, this same capacity is a two-edged in-

quiry sword. Falsehood may be substituted for meaning and narrative truth by using the same criteria that give rise to significance, value, and intention. Not only may one "fake the data" and write a fiction but one may also use the data to tell a deception as easily as a truth.

In this section we do not give a complete listing of possible deceptions nor a list of devices for revealing unintentional and intentional deceptions. Rather, we simply remind potential narrative inquirers to listen closely to their critics. Our view is that every criticism is valid to some degree and contains the seed of an important point.

Take, for example, one of the central tenets of narrative, that is, the intersubjective quality of the inquiry. To dismiss criticisms of the personal and interpersonal in inquiry is to risk the dangers of narcissism and solipsism. Narrative inquirers need to respond to critics either at the level of principle or with respect to a particular writing. It is too easy to become committed to the whole, the narrative plot, and to one's own role in the inquiry and to lose sight of the various fine lines that one treads in the writing of a narrative.

One of the "multiple I's" is that of the narrative critic. Empirical narrativists cannot, as Welty claims fictional writers can, avoid the task of criticism. She writes that "story writing and critical analysis are indeed separate gifts, life spelling and playing the flute, and the same writer proficient in both is doubly endowed. But even he can't rise and do both at the same time" (p. 107). Empirical narrativists cannot follow this dictum but must find ways of becoming "I, the critic." To accomplish this, Dalley (1989) experimented with different tenses, uses of pronoun, and text structure in an autobiographical study of bilingualism.

A particular danger in narrative is what we have called "the Hollywood plot," the plot where everything works out well in the end. "Wellness" may be a thorough and unbending censure, such as is sometimes found in critical ethnographies, or a distillation of drops of honey, such as is sometimes found in program evaluations and implementations. Spence (1986) called this process "narrative smoothing." It is a process that goes on all the time in narrative both during data collection and writing. The problem, therefore, is a judicial one in which the smoothing contained in the plot is properly balanced with what is obscured in the smoothing for narrative purposes. To acknowledge narrative smoothing is to open another door for the reader. It is a question of being as alert to the stories not told as to those that are. Kermode (1981) called the untold stories "narrative secrets" to which a careful reader will attend. Unlike the case in fiction, which is Kermode's topic, the empirical narrativist helps his or her reader by self-consciously discussing the selections made, the possible alternative stories, and other limitations seen from the vantage point of "I the critic."

Selecting Stories to Construct and Reconstruct Narrative Plots

Because collaboration occurs from beginning to end in narrative inquiry, plot outlines are continually revised as consultation takes place over written materials and as further data are collected to develop points of importance in the revised story. In long-term studies, the written stories, and the books and papers in which they appear, may be constructed and reconstructed with different participants depending on the particular inquiry at hand. Our work in Bay Street School is illustrative. There are many computer disks

of field records and interview transcripts. There are also file cabinets full of memoranda; school, board of education, and government documents; and newspaper clippings. It is obvious that only a small portion of it may be used in a paper, report, or even a book. We cannot summarize in formats that condense the volume in a way that data tables condense survey results. Because we know that a sense of the entire inquiry is useful context for readers, a descriptive overview is required. A "narrative sketch," something like a character sketch except that it applies to the overall inquiry, is useful. It is primarily a chronicle of the inquiry. Like the notes playgoers receive as they are escorted to their seats, it has broad descriptions of scene and plot and a number of sub-sketches of key characters, spaces, and major events that figure in the narrative. A narrative sketch might be called an ingot of time and space.

In selecting how to use the data, there are choices of form and substance. Choices of substance relate to the purposes of the inquiry which, at the time of writing, may have evolved from the purposes originally conceived for the project and in terms of which much of the data was collected.

**Because collaboration occurs
from beginning to end
in narrative inquiry,
plot outlines are
continually revised
as consultation takes place
over written materials
and as further data
are collected to develop
points of importance
in the revised story.**

Once again our work at Bay Street School is illustrative. The original purpose defined in our National Institute of Education grant proposal was to better understand policy utilization from the participant's points of view. The current purpose is to understand, through narrative, something of a school's cultural folk models (see Johnson, 1987) and to link these to a participant's personal knowledge and to the policy and community context. Thus, data collected and, therefore, shaped by one purpose is to be used for another. Our first task is to satisfy ourselves that the data is suitable to our new purpose.

The broad outlines of plot are contained in statements of narrative purpose. Which records are most telling? No matter how familiar they are with their data, narrative writers need to search their memories, both human and computer,

for significant events preparatory to writing in much the same way that individuals search their memories and files for important life events in preparation for writing a biography. If one has worked as a team the process is richer as events can be brought to mind, discussed, and refreshed in detail with reference to field records.

Practical considerations of space and imagined audience eventually determine the quantity of data contained in the written narrative. Some narrative researchers deal with detailed accounts of experience whereas others prefer theory and abstraction. As noted earlier, both are important and a balance needs to be struck.

Another influence on the selection of data used in the final document is the form of the narrative. Eisner (1982) has stressed the need to experiment with "forms of representation." Narratives may be written in a demonstration mode or in an inductive mode, the former adopting more standard social scientific forms and the latter opening up possibilities imagined by Eisner. In the demonstrative mode, data tend not to speak for themselves but instead are used in exemplary ways to illustrate the thoughts of the narrative writer. In an inductive mode, data more clearly tell their own story. It is in this latter mode that researchers such as Beattie (in press) and Mullen (in press) are experimenting with different literary forms.

Our final section refers again to the restorying quality of narrative. Once a writer selects events it is possible to do at least three very different things with them. The first, which we have termed *broadening*, occurs when we generalize. An event recalled will be used in a chronicle or incipient narrative to make a general comment about a person's character, values, way of life or, perhaps, about the social and intellectual climate of the times. These generalizations appear as character and social descriptions, long-hand answers to the questions What sort of person are you? or What kind of society is it? Although these are interesting questions, they are not, as stated, narrative ones. A useful rule of thumb is to avoid making such generalizations and to concentrate on the event, in a process we have termed *burrowing*. We focus on the event's emotional, moral, and aesthetic qualities; we then ask why the event is associated with these feelings and what their origins might be. We imagine this to be somewhat like Schafer's (1981) narrative therapy. This way of approaching the event is aimed at reconstructing a story of the event from the point of view of the person at the time the event occurred. The third thing to do with the story follows from this. The person returns to present and future considerations and asks what the meaning of the event is and how he or she might create a new story of self which changes the meaning of the event, its description, and its significance for the larger life story the person may be trying to live. These questions often emerge at the point of writing, after the data are collected. Thus, whether one feels that the appropriate task is broadening, burrowing, restorying, or all three, additional data collection is a likely possibility during the latter stages of writing. In long-term studies, where the inquiry purpose has evolved (as it has in our Bay Street work), and where some participants may have retired or moved to other positions, maintaining collaboration on the construction and reconstruction of plots may become a task requiring special ingenuity.

This observation brings us to our final point on narrative inquiry, which is that it is common in collaborative ventures

to either work with participants throughout the writing, in which case records of the work itself constitute data, or to bring written documents back to participants for final discussions. Thus, the process of writing the inquiry and the process of living the inquiry are coincident activities tending, perhaps, to shift one way or the other and always to work in tandem.

Concluding Observations

Recently we have tried to make sense of narrative inquiry for school curricula and for possible altered and new relations among curriculum researchers and teacher participants (Clandinin & Connelly, in press). Jackson (1987) wrote a telling paper on the first topic, the uses of narrative for school curricula. We plan to use our few remaining paragraphs to comment on the researcher-participant topic. These comments may be of interest to some who are not in curriculum studies or who work with participants other than teachers. Basically, we see that what is at stake is less a matter of working theories and ideologies and more a question of the place of research in the improvement of practice and of how researchers and practitioners may productively relate to one another. Narrative and story as we imagine them functioning in educational inquiry generate a somewhat new agenda of theory-practice relations. One part of the agenda is to let experience and time work their way in inquiry. Story, being inherently temporal, requires this. By listening to participant stories of their experience of teaching and learning, we hope to write narratives of what it means to educate and be educated. These inquiries need to be soft, or perhaps *gentle* is a better term. What is at stake is the creation of situations of trust in which the storytelling urge, so much a part of the best parts of our social life, finds expression. Eisner (1988) wrote that this spirit of inquiry is already taking root. Researchers, he said, are "beginning to go back to the schools, not to conduct commando raids, but to work with teachers" (p. 19).

The second part of a possible agenda crept up on our awareness as we worked at stilling our theoretical voices in an attempt to foster storytelling approaches in our teaching and school-based studies. We found that merely listening, recording, and fostering participant story telling was both impossible (we are, all of us, continually telling stories of our experience, whether or not we speak and write them) and unsatisfying. We learned that we, too, needed to tell our stories. Scribes we were not; story tellers and story lovers we were. And in our story telling, the stories of our participants merged with our own to create new stories, ones that we have labelled *collaborative stories*. The thing finally written on paper (or, perhaps on film, tape, or canvas), the research paper or book, is a collaborative document; a mutually constructed story created out of the lives of both researcher and participant.

We therefore think in terms of a two-part inquiry agenda. We need to listen closely to teachers and other learners and to the stories of their lives in and out of classrooms. We also need to tell our own stories as we live our own collaborative researcher/teacher lives. Our own work then becomes one of learning to tell and live a new mutually constructed account of inquiry in teaching and learning. What emerges from this mutual relationship are new stories of teachers and learners as curriculum makers, stories that hold new possibilities for both researchers and teachers and for those

who read their stories. For curriculum, and perhaps for other branches of educational inquiry, it is a research agenda which gives "curriculum professors something to do" (Schwab, 1983).

Notes

¹Narrative inquiry may be traced to Aristotle's *Poetics* and Augustine's *Confessions* (See Ricoeur's, 1984, use of these two sources to link time and narrative) and may be seen to have various adaptations and applications in a diversity of areas including education. Dewey's (1916, 1934, 1938a, 1938b) work on time, space, experience, and sociality is also central. Narrative has a long history in literature where literary theory is the principal intellectual resource (e.g., Booth, 1961, 1979, Frye, 1957; Hardy, 1968, Kermode, 1967; Scholes & Kellogg, 1966). The fact that a story is inherently temporal means that history (White, 1973, 1981) and the philosophy of history (Carr, 1986; Ricoeur, 1984, 1985, 1988) which are essentially the study of time, have a special role to play in shaping narrative studies in the social sciences. Therapeutic fields are making significant contributions (Schafer, 1976, 1981; Spence, 1982). Narrative has only recently been discovered in psychology although Polkinghorne (1988) claims that closely related inquiries were part of the field at the turn of the century but disappeared after the second world war when they were suffocated by physical science paradigms. Bruner (1986) and Sarbin (1986) are frequently cited psychology sources. Among the most fundamental and educationally suggestive works on the nature of narrative knowledge is Johnson's philosophical study of bodily knowledge and language (1981, 1987, 1989, and Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Because education is ultimately a moral and spiritual pursuit, MacIntyre's narrative ethical theory (1966, 1981) and Crites's theological writing on narrative (1971, 1975, 1986) are especially useful for educational purposes.

The first broadly conceived methodologically oriented book on the use of narrative in the social sciences came out of the therapeutic fields, such as Polkinghorne's *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences* (1988). This book was preceded by Mishler's more narrowly focused *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative* (1986). Van Maanen's 1988 publication, written from the point of view of anthropology, gives a critical introduction to the ethnography of story telling both as subject matter and as ethnographers's written form. Reason and Hawkins (1988) wrote a chapter titled *Storytelling as Inquiry*. Undoubtedly others will follow.

²On this basis, for Elbaz, works such as Shulman's (1987) research on expert teachers, Schon's (1987, in press) reflective practice, Reid's (1988) policy analysis, Munby's (1986) study of teachers's metaphors, and Lincoln and Guba's (1985) naturalistic approach to evaluation qualify as narratively related work.

³Some illustrations of teachers's stories are those by Coles (1989), Barzun (1944), Rieff (1972), Booth (1988), Natkins (1986), Paley (1981, 1986), Calkin (1983), Steedman (1982), Armstrong (1980), Dennison (1969), Rowland (1984), and Meek, Armstrong, Austerfield, Graham, and Placenter (1983). Examples of "stories of teachers" are those by Yonemura (1986), Bullough (1989), Enns-Connolly (in press), selected chapters in Lightfoot and Martin (1988), several chapters in Graff and Warner (1989), Smith et al.'s *trilogy* (1986, 1987, 1988), Kilbourn (in press), Ryan (1970), and Shulman and Colbert (1988). Jackson's (1968) *Life in Classrooms* plays an especially generative role with respect to the literature of teachers's stories and stories of teachers.

References

- Allen, J. P. B. (1989) The development of instructional models in second language education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 179-192.
- Applebee, A. N. (1978). *The child's concept of story. Ages two to seventeen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Armstrong, M. (1980). *Closely observed children. Diary of a primary classroom*. London: Writers and Readers in association with Chameleon.

- Ball, S. J., & Goodson, I. F. (1985). *Teachers' lives and careers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Barnieh, Z. (1989). *Understanding playwriting for children*. University of Calgary.
- Barzun, J. (1944). *Teacher in America*. New York: University Press of America.
- Beattie, M. (in press). *Teacher planning and inquiry as curriculum development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Bell, J. (in press). *Narrative self-study: The acquisition of literacy in a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Berk, L. (1980). Education in lives: Biographic narrative in the study of educational outcomes. *The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 2 (2), 88-153.
- Bissex, G., & Bullock, R., (Eds.) (1987). *Seeing for ourselves: Case-Study research by teachers of writing*. London: Heinemann.
- Bleich, D. (1988). *The double perspective: Language, literacy, and social relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Booth, W. C. (1961). *The rhetoric of fiction* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Booth, W. C. (1979). *Critical understanding*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Booth, W. C. (1988). *The vocation of a teacher: Rhetorical occasions 1967-1988*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Britton, J. (1970). *Language and learning*. London: Allen Lane.
- Britton, J. (1971). *Introduction to A. R. Luria, speech and the development of mental processes in the child*. London: Penguin.
- Britzman, D. (in press). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bullough, R. V. (1989). *First-Year teacher: A case study*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Calkins, L. M. (1983). *Lessons from a child: On the teaching and learning of writing*. Melbourne: Heinemann.
- Carr, D. (1986). *Time, narrative, and history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Chatman, S. (1981). What novels can do that films can't (and vice versa). In W. J. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *On narrative* (pp. 117-136). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practices: Teacher images in action*. London: Falmer Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Understanding research on teaching as feminist research*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Windsor, Ontario.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1989). Developing rhythm in teaching: The narrative study of a beginning teacher's personal practical knowledge of classrooms. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 19 (2), 121-141.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1987). *Narrative, experience and the study of curriculum*. Washington, DC: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 208)
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1988). Studying teachers' knowledge of classrooms: Collaborative research, ethics and the negotiation of narrative. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 22 (2A), 269-282.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (in press). *Narrative and story in practice and research*. In D. Schon (Ed.), *The Reflective turn: Case studies of reflective practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cole, A. L. (1986). *Teachers' spontaneous adaptations: A mutual interpretation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Conle, C. (1989). *Stories toward an interpretive thesis*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto.
- Connelly, F. M. (1978). How shall we publish case studies of curriculum development? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 8 (1), 78-82.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crites, S. (1971). The narrative quality of experience. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 39 (3), 391-411.
- Crites, S. (1975). Angels we have heard. In J. B. Wiggins (Ed.), *Religion as story* (pp. 23-63). Lanham: University Press of America.
- Crites, S. (1986). Storytime: Recollecting the past and projecting the future. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *The storied nature of human conduct*, (pp. 152-173). New York: Praeger.
- Cumming, A. (1988). *The orchestration of ESL performance*. Working paper, University of British Columbia.
- Dalley, P. (1989). *Mes langues, mes couleurs: A question of identity*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Davies, A. (1988). *Two caring communities: A story of connected empowerment and voice*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Calgary.
- Dennison, G. (1969). *The lives of children*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Capricorn Books.
- Dewey, J. (1938a). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Dewey, J. (1938b). *Logic: The theory of inquiry*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Dorson, R. M. (1976). *Folklore and fakelore: Essays toward a discipline of folk studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Egan, K. (1986). *Teaching as story telling: an alternative approach to teaching and curriculum in the elementary school*. London: Althouse Press, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario.
- Eisner, E. W. (1982). *Cognition and curriculum: A basis for deciding what to teach*. New York: Longman.
- Eisner, E. W. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method. *Educational Researcher*, 20, 15-20.
- Eisner, E. W. (in press). *The enlightened eye: On doing qualitative inquiry*. New York: Macmillan.
- Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. London: Croom Helm.
- Elbaz, F. (1988, September). *Knowledge and discourse: The evolution of research on teacher thinking*. Paper presented at the Conference of the International Study Association on Teacher Thinking meeting of the University of Nottingham, England.
- Elbow, P. (1986). *Embracing contraries: Explorations in teaching and learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Enns-Connolly, E. (1985). *Translation as interpretive act: A narrative study of translation in university-level foreign language teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Enns-Connolly, E. (in press). *Translation and the translator: A narrative study of personal practical knowledge in the construction of meaning*. *Curriculum Inquiry*.
- Erwin-Tripp, S., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1977). *Child discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of criticism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Frye, N. (1988). *On education*. Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1982). *Truth & method*. New York: Crossroad.
- Goodson, I. (1988). Teachers' life histories and studies of curriculum and schooling. In I. F. Goodson (Ed.), *The making of curriculum: Collected essays*, (pp. 71-92). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Graff, G., & Warner, M. (Eds.). (1989). *The origins of literacy studies in America: A documentary anthology*. New York: Rutledge, Chapman and Hall.
- Grumet, M. R. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Personal communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gunn, J. V. (1982). *Autobiography: Toward a poetics of experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hardy, B. (1968). Towards a poetics of fiction: An approach through narrative. *Novel*, 2, 5-14.
- Hoffman, L. (1988). *Teacher personal practical knowledge*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Calgary.
- Hogan, P. (1988). *A community of teacher researchers: A story of empowerment and voice*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Calgary.
- Huberman, M. (1988). Teacher careers and social improvement. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20 (2), 119-132.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Jackson, P. W. (1987). On the place of narration in teaching. In D. Berliner and B. Rosenshine (Eds.), *Talks to teachers* (pp. 307-328). New York: Random House.
- Johnson, M. (Ed.) (1981). *Philosophical perspectives on metaphor*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 19(4), 361-377.
- Kermode, F. (1967). *The sense of an ending: Studies in the theory of fiction*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Kermode, F. (1981). Secrets and narrative sequence. In W. J. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *On narrative* (pp. 79-97). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Kilbourn, B. (in press). *Constructive feedback. Learning the art*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Kroma, S. (1983). Personal practical knowledge of language in teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lightfoot, M. & Martin, N. (Eds.). (1988). *The word for teaching is learning: Essays for James Britton*. London: Heinemann.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- MacIntyre, A. (1966). *A short history of ethics*. New York: MacMillan.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mandler, J. M. (1984). *Stories, scripts and scenes: Aspects of schema theory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- McDowell, J. (1979). *Children's riddling*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press
- Meek, M., Armstrong, S., Austerfield, V., Graham, J., & Placetter, E. (1983). *Achieving literacy: Longitudinal studies of adolescents learning to read*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing. Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Mitchell, W. J. T. (Ed.) (1981). *On narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mullen, C. (in press). *The self I dream: A narrative reconstruction of a personal mythology*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Munby, H. (1986). Metaphor in the thinking of teachers. An exploratory study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 18, 197-209.
- Natkins, L. G. (1986). *Our last term. A teacher's diary*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56 (4), 496-510.
- Olney, J. (Ed.). (1980). *Autobiography: Essays theoretical and critical*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Paley, V. G. (1979). *White teacher*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Paley, V. G. (1981). *Wally's stories. Conversations in the kindergarten*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Paley, V. G. (1986). *Molly is three. Growing up in school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Personal Narratives Group. (1989). *Interpreting women's lives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Peshkin, A. (1985). Virtuous subjectivity: in the participant-observer's eyes. In D. Berg & K. Smith (Eds.), *Exploring clinical methods for social research* (pp. 267-281). Beverly Hills: Sage
- Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt
- Pinar, W. F. (1988). Whole, bright, deep with understanding: Issues in qualitative research and autobiographical method. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Contemporary curriculum discourses* (pp. 135-153). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Polknhorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Reason, P., & Hawkins, P. (1988). Storytelling as inquiry. In P. Reason (Ed.), *Human inquiry in action. Developments in new paradigm research*, (pp. 79-101). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Reid, W. A. (1988). Institutions and practices: Professional education reports and the language of reform. *Educational Researcher*, 17, 10-15
- Ricoeur, P. (1984). *Time and narrative: Vol. I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1985). *Time and narrative. Vol. II*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1988). *Time and narrative: Vol. III*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rieff, P. (1972). *Fellow teachers. Of culture and its second death*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Robinson, J. A. & Hawpe, L. (1986). Narrative thinking as a heuristic process. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology* (pp. 111-125). New York: Praeger.
- Rose, P. (1983). *Parallel lives*. New York: Vintage Books
- Rosen, H. (1986). The importance of story. *Language Arts*, 63 (3), 226-237
- Rosen, B. (1988). *And none of it was nonsense*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rosen, H. (1988). The autobiographical impulse. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context: Connecting observation and understanding* (pp. 69-88). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Rowland, S. (1984). *The enquiring classroom*. London: Falmer Press
- Ryan, K. (1970). *Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sarbin, T. R. (Ed.). (1986). *Narrative psychology. The storied nature of human conduct*. New York: Praeger.
- Schafer, R. (1976). *A new language for psychoanalysis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schafer, R. (1981). Narration in the psychoanalytic dialogue. In W. J. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *On narrative* (pp. 25-50). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding. An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Scholes, R., & Kellogg, R. (1966). *The nature of narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schon, D. (Ed.). (in press). *Case studies in reflective practice*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Schwab, J. J. (1964). The structure of the disciplines: Meanings and significances. In G. W. Ford & L. Pugno (Eds.), *The structure of knowledge and the curriculum*, (pp. 1-30). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Schwab, J. J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for curriculum professors to do. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 13 (3), 239-265.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57 (1), 1-22
- Shulman, J. H., & Colbert, J. A. (Eds.). (1988). *The intern teacher casebook*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Sikes, P. J., Measor, L., & Woods, P. (1985). *Teacher careers: Crises and continuities*. London: Falmer Press.
- Smith, L. M., Kleime, P. F., Prunty, J. P. & Dwyer, D. C. (1986). *Anatomy of educational innovation: A mid to long term re-study and reconstrual. Book 1: Educational innovators. Then and now*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Smith, L. M., Kleime, P. F., Prunty, J. P. & Dwyer, D. C. (1987). *Anatomy of educational innovation: A mid to long term re-study and reconstrual. Book 2: The fate of an innovative school: The history and present status of the Kensington School*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Smith, L. M., Kleime, P. F., Prunty, J. P. & Dwyer, D. C. (1988). *Anatomy of educational innovation: A mid to long term re-study and reconstrual. Book 3: Innovation and change in schooling. History, politics, and agency*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Spence, D. P. (1982). *Narrative truth and historical method*. New York: Norton & Company
- Spence, D. P. (1986). Narrative smoothing and clinical wisdom. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct*, (pp. 211-232). New York: Praeger Special Studies.
- Steedman, C. (1982). *The tidy house*. London: Virago Press.
- Sutton-Smith, B. (1986). Children's fiction making. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology. The storied nature of human conduct*, (pp. 67-90). New York: Praeger
- Tannen, D. (1988). Hearing voices in conversation, fiction, and mixed genres. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Linguistics in context: Connecting observation and understanding*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vechter, A. R. (1987). *Je Suis la langue: An alternative approach to second language curriculum*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Welty, E. (1979). *The eye of the story: Selected essays and reviews*. New York: Vintage Books.
- White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- White, H. (1981). The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. In W. J. T. Mitchell (Ed.), *On narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wigginton, E. (1985). *Sometimes a shining moment. The foxfire experience*. New York: Doubleday
- Wigginton, E. (1989, February). Foxfire Grows Up. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59 (1), 24-49.
- Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.). (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan
- Yonemura, M. V. (1986). *A teacher at work: Professional development and the early childhood educator*. New York: Teachers College Press