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This study shows, through examples from preservice teachers’ practicum experiences, the pivotal role that teachers’ narrative knowledge plays in how curriculum is lived in classrooms. By listening to preservice teachers’ stories, I arrived at a holistic understanding of their practicum experiences. The student teachers negotiated, with some difficulty, their own curriculum narratives within the cooperating teachers’ narratives that were in place. I observed that by making spaces for narrative enquiry, spaces to make explicit and examine individual curriculum stories, cooperating teachers and preservice teachers can prompt growth and change within the practicum experience.

Since the late 1980s, the work of Canadian scholars in narrative enquiry, most notably Clandinin and Connelly, has fostered a promising research approach for examining curriculum and teaching issues from the perspectives of the participants. In this article, I show the complexity, centrality, and individuality of teachers’ narrative knowledge in curriculum implementation through examples from a two-year narrative enquiry with preservice teachers. I share examples of practicum stories of three preservice teachers – Pat, Meredith, and Emily – as they attempted to author their own curriculum stories with students. Each student teacher had to negotiate her emerging curriculum stories within curriculum stories already in progress in her cooperating teacher’s classroom. Their collective stories help us see how teachers’ narratives of experience uniquely and profoundly shape curriculum stories constructed in classrooms; they also show that, for the most part, this narrative knowledge is ignored. I conclude by commenting on the value of narrative enquiry for creating opportunities to examine and restory lived curriculum.
PARADIGMATIC AND NARRATIVE VIEWS OF CURRICULUM

When curriculum is understood as a course of study, views of what counts as knowledge and decisions about what is important to learn reside outside individual learners. In this traditional, pervasive version of curriculum, people other than students determine what is important to learn. An example of such a curriculum is one written for students and teachers in the form of prepackaged documents and resources given to teachers to implement with their students. The underlying historical assumption in this version of curriculum is that knowledge can be transmitted through teachers from those who know to those who do not, a version of the “conduit” metaphor (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995; Craig, in press) in which ideas are funnelled into classrooms from out-of-classroom places. As Clandinin and Connelly (1998) pointed out, this metaphor is only part of the curriculum story:

From our point of view what is missing is an understanding of knowledge, not so much as something given to people, but as something narratively embodied in how a person stands in the world. Knowledge as attribute can be given; knowledge as narrative cannot. The latter needs to be experienced in context. (p. 157)

When curriculum is understood as narratively constructed and reconstructed through experience, the stories lived and told by students and teachers of what is important, relevant, meaningful, or problematic for them are valued. This does not, however, imply that educators can ignore curriculum as a course of study. The complexity of creating educative situations that enable students and teachers to interweave curriculum as a course of study and curriculum as narrative experience is beginning to surface through narrative enquiries of several Canadian scholars.

CURRICULUM AS NARRATIVE

The view of curriculum as narrative emerges from Dewey’s (1938) conception that learners construct and reconstruct knowledge through the individually continuous and socially interactive nature of experience. Each individual’s continuity of experience, filled with unique past memories, present actions, and future intentions, is always in interaction with the social and physical environment. When it is understood that meaning is continually constructed and reconstructed by each individual within a social context as past memories and future intentions of different individuals come together in present actions, the complexity of curriculum interactions becomes apparent. From a narrative perspective, curriculum comes
to life within classrooms as teachers and students create lived curriculum texts. Curriculum, then, is what they experience situationally and relationally, each person constructing and reconstructing his or her narrative knowledge in response to interactions. Although plot outlines prescribed in curriculum documents shape classroom curriculum stories, individuals uniquely author these outlines within each classroom, according to personal and situational particulars. In this way, the paradigmatic nature of curriculum as a course of study is woven into and transforms individuals’ narratives of experience. As Conle (1999) stated, “it is possible to pull theory into an ongoing experiential narrative and expand a story into another spiral of telling, this time by incorporating theory as it is transformed by experience” (p. 22). These lived curriculum texts contain a variety of characters, settings, and plot lines that shift and change over time. When curriculum is understood as a dynamic interplay of multiple, ongoing, experiential narratives that are continually reconstructed over time through interactive situations, the value of narrative enquiry for examining stories of practice is apparent.

The Centrality of Teachers’ Narratives in Curriculum

Teachers are at the nexus of curriculum implementation. They are entrusted daily with bringing the curriculum to life in their classrooms and they are seen by themselves and their students as central characters in shaping curriculum situations. Therefore, “the more we understand ourselves and can articulate reasons why we are what we are, do what we do, and are headed where we have chosen, the more meaningful our curriculum will be” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, p. 11).

Stories of the way teachers “should be” abound. Weber and Mitchell (1995) explored “the ways in which the images of teachers enculturated in childhood affect the work and professional self-identity of teachers” (p. 5). Others (e.g., Clandinin, 1986; Cooper & Olson, 1996; Jalongo & Isenberg, 1995; MacDonald, 1993; Whelan, 1999) used narrative enquiry to explore factors influencing the construction and reconstruction of individuals’ professional identities and their influence on teachers’ curriculum narratives. Craig’s (1995, 1998) work with beginning teachers examined how their professional knowledge is shaped and reshaped by their professional contexts. Bell and Millen (1997) emphasized the importance of teachers looking inward to examine their own teaching practice. During a conference presentation, Bell pointed out that teachers have learned to be other-directed. Yet, Bell said, the longer she taught, the more she came to realize that within an educational landscape, in which contexts, students, and curriculum are always changing, she was the only continuing presence
in the varying situations of her practice. It is in this complex, dynamic, multistoried landscape that teachers’ (and students’) curriculum narratives are individually and collectively situated.

Multiple Positions, Multiple Stories

The metaphor of a “professional knowledge landscape” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, p. 4) helps us imagine a complex array of relationships among a wide variety of people, places, things, and events. Several authors (e.g., Craig, 1995; Davies, 1995; Huber, 1995) have examined some of the conflicting and competing curriculum stories teachers find themselves living, stories between in-classroom and out-of-classroom places on the professional knowledge landscape. Inside classrooms, teachers’ sense of agency in authoring curriculum stories with students is paramount. The curriculum stories created in classrooms often appear at odds with those prescribed by people positioned in out-of-classroom places. Tension between curriculum stories written for teachers in out-of-classroom places and curriculum stories lived by teachers in their own classrooms “creates the dilemmas that gnaw at [the] soul” (Craig, 1995, p. 24).

The metaphor of a professional knowledge landscape is generative. Seen expansively it includes such individuals as teachers, students, school administrators, and parents; university professors, and preservice teachers; and curriculum consultants, school board members, and people on provincial regulatory bodies. Each of these individuals may at any one time or at different times fill more than one of these positions. Each position leads to different vantage points from which to view curriculum issues. In her longitudinal work with Benita, the subject of a longitudinal study of a journey from preservice to beginning teacher, Craig (1998) illuminated how working with different teachers in different contexts shaped Benita’s understanding of implementing curriculum in team-teaching situations. When I myself moved from the position of classroom teacher to university teacher, I experienced several narrative tensions. At that time I wrote:

I must continually stay awake to multiple communities. I cannot forget my place as a classroom teacher on the landscape since that is the place for which I am educating my students. Yet I must also be attentive to the university landscape where my students and I presently dwell. (Olson, 1998a, p. 167)

Preservice teachers are uniquely positioned on the professional knowledge landscape. Their landscape, and their role in that landscape, is perpetually shifting (Olson, 1998b) as they move from the university context, in which they are students learning to become teachers, to school classrooms, in
which they are expected to be teachers of students. They simultaneously
live teacher-education curriculum as students and school curriculum as
teachers. This duality places them at the interface of in-classroom and out-
of-classroom places as well as at the interface of the curriculum of teacher
education and the curriculum of schools. Their stories of shifting back and
forth from university classrooms to school classrooms can help us examine
the complexities of and disjunctures between multiple curriculum stories
written for and by preservice teachers.

NARRATIVE ENQUIRY

Given that teachers are at the nexus of curriculum implementation and that
the ways in which they implement curriculum are profoundly influenced
by their unique narratives of experience, it is important that teachers be
able to examine how their narratives of experience shape curriculum as a
course of study. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) told us:

The process of making meaning of our curriculum, that is, of the narratives of our
experience, is both difficult and rewarding. It, too, has a curriculum in that nar-
ratives of experience may be studied, reflected on, and articulated in written form.
(p. 11)

Like other educative experiences, the process of narrative enquiry has
continued to evolve as different researchers have shared their narrative
enquiries informally in conversations and presentations and formally in
published texts. In their synoptic work, Clandinin and Connelly (2000)
used terms for thinking about narrative enquiry “closely associated with
Dewey’s theory of experience, specifically with his notions of situation,
continuity, and interaction” (p. 50). They further stated that:

with this sense of Dewey’s foundational place in our thinking about narrative
inquiry, our terms are personal and social (interaction): past, present, and future
(continuity); combined with the notion of place (situation). This set of terms creates
a metaphorical three-dimensional narrative inquiry space, with temporality along one
dimension, the personal and the social along a second dimension, and place along
a third. Using this set of terms, any particular inquiry is defined by this three-
dimensional space: studies have temporal dimensions and address temporal
matters; they focus on the personal and the social in a balance appropriate to the
inquiry; and they occur in specific places or sequences of places. (p. 50)

Several Canadians have used narrative enquiry to explore the multi-
storied complexity of curriculum. For example, Huber (1999) and Huber
and Whelan (1995) focussed on creating space for and making sense of
children’s curriculum stories within their classrooms. Bell (1997) examined literacy and language development through conflicting stories about literacy from members of different cultures, including herself as a participant. However, until teachers’ narrative knowledge of curriculum is valued more widely by themselves and others as a legitimate component of curriculum development, this narrative knowledge will continue to implicitly drive teachers’ curriculum decision making in unexamined ways.

MY NARRATIVE ENQUIRY WITH PRESERVICE TEACHERS

The examples cited in this article come from a narrative enquiry I conducted with six preservice teachers during the two years of their Bachelor of Education program. Two questions that shaped the overall enquiry were “What stories are written by preservice teachers?” and “What stories are written for preservice teachers?” Because I wanted to know how these preservice teachers were interpreting their experiences and how their interpretations might shift over time and place, I collected data monthly through individual, audio-taped conversations. Other sources of data included university assignments, practicum log books, and my classroom observations as faculty advisor. I used these supplementary data sources not to verify whether the stories told in conversation were true but rather to add depth and breadth to these stories. I wanted to develop a holistic understanding of the experiences of these preservice teachers from their perspectives.

Although the stories told to me already constituted one level of interpretation of experience from the participants’ perspectives, I wanted the participants to have the opportunity to remain involved in further data interpretation and analysis. First, I had them use narrative enquiry to reflect systematically on their experience over time, looking for narrative threads as well as shifts over time and place. Second, I used ongoing discussions of their interpretations, as well as my own, to identify and articulate threads and shifts that were not initially apparent to either them or me. Two participants also worked as research assistants, transcribing the audio-taped conversations and noting ideas that came to them as they were transcribing or re-reading the transcripts. The other participants were invited to write responses on transcripts given to them and to discuss these issues during subsequent taped conversations. I continually shared drafts of emerging research texts with the participants, asking for input to ensure that I was adequately representing their interpretations of experience.

Although the cooperating teachers’ curriculum narratives were fundamental to the preservice teachers’ experiences, the stories presented in this article emerged from the preservice teachers’ interpretations of the
curriculum stories they authored in their cooperating teachers’ classrooms. Their stories are one possible telling. Their cooperating teachers would have very different versions to tell. My account highlights the profoundly different versions of curriculum stories constructed through each pre-service teacher’s narrative knowledge.

The subtle phrase “But it’s not my classroom” emerged again and again throughout the study. By focusing attention on this oft-repeated phrase, I show that enacting curriculum decisions within classrooms is a complex, multistoried narrative in a dynamic process of continual negotiation. Because preservice teachers enter an ongoing narrative in progress, finding their place within this story can be confusing and frustrating. Finding space to create their own curriculum story with students is difficult. MacIntyre (1984) reminded us that:

we enter upon a stage which we did not design and we find ourselves part of an action that was not of our making. Each of us being a main character in his [her] own drama plays subordinate parts in the dramas of others, and each drama constrains the others. (p. 199)

In the following stories, I provide glimpses of how Pat, Meredith, and Emily struggled to make sense of their own emerging stories while situated in someone else’s classroom within larger, unfamiliar stories already in progress.

Webs, Chunks, and Shifting Temporal Borders – Pat

Pat came to her practicum with an imagined story of curriculum enactment based on previous experience as an artist, a day-care worker, and a mother. She believed that learning happens best when students make connections among a variety of subjects and concepts. For her, this “three-dimensional learning lifted concepts off the page and made them real.” Pat’s holistic view of life and learning led her to imagine curriculum as a process of “weaving concepts together.” In her practicum, Pat entered a curriculum story in which each subject was taught separately within allotted time slots, a process Pat described as “chunked.”

During her placement, Pat struggled to create a space for her holistic image of teaching within the temporal borders already in place.

I just couldn’t get into her clock. Like, I was always looking up to see that I only had 30 seconds left of this time block or that she was getting ready to do the next chunk and I wasn’t where I wanted to be. And so I often wrapped things up unfinished. Didn’t have any follow-up. Very hard to do.
As a preservice teacher entering a curriculum story already in progress, it was difficult for Pat to find a place within the curriculum story being authored by her cooperating teacher. She found the temporal shift of who was to be the teacher in the classroom curriculum story to be a gradual process.

I found that my cooperating teacher really didn’t want to give up very much time of her schedule. And it was a real slow gradual move to be able to get even like 10 minutes to be able to teach. And then, maybe 15 minutes and then a half an hour. You know, it was very gradual.

Pat was first encouraged to enter the ongoing story by taking a part in the curriculum version constructed by her cooperating teacher. Being given the script or part of the plot to be covered, Pat was not initially able to construct her own version of authoring curriculum stories with students.

I was a little frustrated at first because I was never able to say “I would really like to cover this” or “I’d really like to do this.” It was, “This is what I plan to do from ten to eleven. If you’d like, you can do it.” You know, it wasn’t my thing that I was allowed to do. I found that a little restrictive but she was just watching out for the children. Like she has things, I guess, that she wants to cover.

Rather than separate “chunks” of time for isolated subjects, Pat’s version of curriculum narratives was an interwoven, connected one. Once she got a sense of how her cooperating teacher structured time, Pat began to shift the temporal boundaries to create more space and time for authoring her version of curriculum stories with students. For example, her cooperating teacher often gave Pat a story to read to the class. She described how she began to reconstruct the part given to her into a curriculum story to fit her image of teaching.

One day the book was about spiders. So, I coaxed a spider from my porch into a jar and brought it in a paper bag and we talked about spiders and we made a spider web out of a ball of string that we rolled back and forth and taped together and made our own spider web. And we did lots of fun things. The book was just like a little seed of whatever we did. I don’t know how my cooperating teacher felt. She just nodded and said you know, “That’s very nice.” If I had told her beforehand, “This is what I want to do,” I think she would have said no. But I just said, “Okay, I’ll do the book and maybe I’ll expand on it a little.”

However, Pat explained, she was unable to shift the temporal boundaries as much as she wanted:

I would have appreciated having the morning to do it and to be able to read more books about spiders and for them to be able to do their own search about
spiders and be able to make a spider book and illustrate it with an insect compared to a spider and things like that. There were so many ways that I could have expanded it.

Pat also became aware that factors determine outside the classroom framed the in-classroom time; still, she hoped that in her own classroom she would have more control to shape the temporal boundaries.

I felt very constricted time-wise and that’s the reality of living in a school. I mean, there are external time clocks, there’s the bell that rings and there’s lunch. There’s the music teacher that comes at a certain time and stuff. I’m hoping that if I ever had a class of my own that I would be able to use the other times more fluidly than right now.

As Pat struggled to articulate her move toward living a curriculum that would honour her narrative sense of time for learning, I was reminded of Connelly and Clandinin’s (1999a) statement “that the different concepts of curriculum, the different curricular stories to live by, give rise to different temporal borders” (p. 111). Pat commented,

I think because there’s different sort of time continuums happening there. I think initially when I was thinking about writing a lesson, I was thinking about the 45-minute block. Write a lesson that would fit. Start at zero and end at 45 minutes or start at zero and end at one hour or whatever. But a lesson can be a complete thought, a complete process that goes full circle and shows learning or whatever, but it can be spread over a couple of days or whatever. It’s a different time frame, like a different set of time.

Shifting Authority – Meredith

Clandinin and Connelly (1995) remarked on the sense of ownership teachers feel in their classrooms. During her practicum, Meredith hoped to achieve this tacit understanding of her role as the primary author of the curriculum story with students. However, when Meredith began her practicum, she became aware that she was entering a story already in progress – one in which the students and teacher had already negotiated particular practices and expectations of each other, one that was very different from the curriculum story Meredith hoped to author.

Meredith wanted to become a secondary science teacher who could pass her own passion and curiosity for science on to her students. During her time at the university she had constantly sought resources and ideas to make science come alive for her students. Meredith entered her practicum with a clear vision of the kind of secondary science curriculum story she
wanted to enact with her students, and she was given the opportunity to teach full periods. However, she soon found that there was much more to authoring curriculum stories with students than subject content. Meredith had been concerned about having enough variety in resources and teaching strategies to create engaging lessons for all students, but she had not thought about other components of authoring the classroom story nor about the difficulties of working within or changing the plot lines of a story already in progress.

I realize that for all my students, it is a huge culture shock when I come in the classroom, that my teaching style and my cooperating teacher’s style are so entirely different. That it truly is an adjustment for them.

Throughout her placement, Meredith attempted to shift the curriculum story to fit more closely the one she wanted to author as a teacher. However, in several areas the curriculum story established between her cooperating teacher and the students conflicted with Meredith’s intended story. When Meredith entered her practicum classroom, students were permitted to listen to their Walkmans while doing their work. Although Meredith was adamantly opposed to this practice, she found it extremely difficult to change. Her imagined story of teaching in which she would have the students’ undivided attention conflicted with the existing classroom story. She was astounded both that students were allowed to listen to their Walkmans during class and that they were so resistant to her changing this practice.

Regardless, there’s still those silly constraints that exist in just the running of the classroom. The way I wouldn’t do things in the classroom, but are habits that they have been sort of conditioned for. So, the rules that exist in classrooms that I’ve been in may not be rules that I agree with. But you have to follow those same rules, classroom rules, not necessarily teaching rules but classroom rules, as to what behaviour is acceptable or not. I mean, last year with the Walkman incident when I tried to change that, that was 10 times harder than it should have been.

The curriculum story Meredith was attempting to author about how assignments were valued also differed from her cooperating teacher’s. Meredith said, “I do tend to like to give them assignments to do. I try to make them short. I probably would like to make that worth a sizeable portion instead of focus so much on tests.” However, the students were used to marks for tests being more highly valued than those for assignments. Meredith felt that as a student teacher, even though she did most of the teaching, her students did not take her authority seriously. She felt caught between the story she was attempting to author and the story the
students authored, a story that valued the cooperating teacher’s curriculum story as the real version:

My Grade 11s liked to remind me that their real teacher was coming back, that my marks didn’t count. The marks I collected didn’t count. I think they really believed that he [would] reteach it, but he says not.

The different curriculum stories being authored and the apparent belief that there was room for only one authorized version led Meredith to feel that her authority was being undermined. For one assignment she gave, two students handed in identical papers. Meredith chose to deal with this situation by “giving them two assignments separately that were different, but on the same material. They were allowed to complete that instead.” Because Meredith was also living a story of one voice of authority within the classroom, she did not approach nor was she approached by her co-operating teacher to discuss how this story could unfold. The students were quick to pick up on the two conflicting versions.

The other thing was that when I said “zero,” and I was going to stick to zero, they went and talked to my cooperating teacher. He said, “No, we’ll give you your mark.” So, he went over me, which also gives that shadow of doubt that I am not the real teacher. I didn’t think I had to ask his permission to give a zero on an assignment.

Creating Space for Students’ Multiple Versions, Shifting Perspectives – Emily

Emily entered her practicum searching for a story of teaching that she could feel comfortable living. She wanted to use her science background to enable students to understand the complexity of relationships in the environment. She was aware that things always looked different, depending on the perspective of the viewer. She struggled to make sense of and integrate the stories she was creating as a teacher with those stories written for and by students. She wanted to see as many curriculum stories enacted by teachers and students as possible. She wanted to know how students and teachers saw particular curriculum stories from their unique perspectives as well as how others perceived her own actions. She hoped her practicum would be a time to learn more about teaching by experiencing a variety of curriculum stories to examine and understand. The version of practicum as a time to practise what she knew did not fit with Emily’s need to learn through collecting multiple stories from others.

In her first placement, in a Grade 2 classroom, Emily’s cooperating teacher gave her subtle but strong messages about the kind of teaching expected of her. This advice and modelling led Emily to feel uncomfortable
with her own sense of uncertainty in a classroom where professional certainty appeared to be lived. Emily believed her cooperating teacher provided an excellent role model for her because the curriculum story followed the plot line of master teacher and apprentice. Although this story of teacher preparation did not fit her intuitive desire for an enquiry-based, exploratory approach, Emily could not name the source of her discomfort.

I don’t know if I’d feel differently if it [were] my own classroom. I think I would. I think where it’s not my classroom, I’m kind of resisting it sometimes. I start saying, “Why am I here?” I start that and then I get frustrated.

Although Emily valued what she was learning and often commented on the effectiveness of her cooperating teacher, she also knew her own way of teaching would be different. She had difficulty identifying examples of her tentatively emerging teaching narrative in that of her cooperating teacher’s. The way students worked together in small groups or individually to actively construct their own knowledge impressed Emily. At the same time, the cooperating teacher’s model, in which she gave clear direction and expectations to her Grade 2 students and led them carefully through guided practice to ensure success, made Emily hesitate to attempt anything different from her cooperating teacher’s model.

Not every teaching style is the same. No matter what, it’s just not identical. And I’m wondering if my teacher’s watching me, just because it might not be exactly the same as what she does. She might think it’s not good just because it’s not the same way that she does it, but maybe it would be good for someone else. I don’t know what she thinks. You know, how do you know?

Emily’s awareness of being a temporary guest in someone else’s space made her hesitant to try to alter the story in place.

I think I feel that way because it’s not my classroom. Just like if I went into somebody’s house and they said, “Use whatever you want, you’re here for a week, look after the house.” You’d still feel that it’s not your territory. So, you just don’t want to take over. I think she’d let me go ahead and do whatever I want. She told me that, but I still feel like maybe I’m disrupting her schedule.

Emily later took the opportunity to spend three weeks in a junior high school, where she hoped to see a variety of teaching styles in science classes. At that point in her practicum, Emily was able to compare the junior-high curriculum story with the Grade 2 story. This experience led her to want to see more stories as she struggled to accommodate what she thought she might be supposed to do within her desire to include students in her story.
I feel she [the junior-high teacher] goes very fast as compared to elementary [teachers], meaning, “Okay, either you know it or you don’t. I’m not going to stop and wait for everyone to get it and understand it because I don’t have time.” Meanwhile, I know I’d be making sure that everyone understood what I was talking about. Maybe for this age group you don’t do that. That’s why I wanted to go around and see.

In the story of teaching Emily had begun to create for herself, partially gathered in the Grade 2 classroom, students worked in small groups and she and the teacher circulated to assist students in constructing and re-constructing what they knew. She found that in the junior-high class, the teachers and students did not value this curriculum story as a teaching story.

Yesterday, I mentioned after school that [my faculty advisor] was coming in. [My cooperating teacher] looked at me and said, “I have no reason to see her. What would I say? You never did any teaching. So, why would I need to talk to her?” That did not make my day. I find they think that teaching here is just doing the lecture bit. To me, helping out with the students and group work is teaching them also, but it seems that my cooperating teacher doesn’t think so.

MULTIPLE CURRICULUM STORIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The curriculum stories Pat, Meredith, and Emily attempted to author were as different from each other as they were from those of their cooperating teachers. These differences are not surprising when it is acknowledged that teachers’ narrative experiences profoundly affect the curriculum stories they create with students. In my study, there was no space in the practicum experience for preservice students and their cooperating teachers to discuss, and make explicit, their narrative understandings of how they chose to author curriculum stories with students. What is more ironic, given the unique and profound influence each teacher had on shaping the curriculum, is their lack of awareness that they were authoring curriculum stories or that they could create a space for discussing their curriculum choices.

When teachers believe they know what needs to be done and how to do it, they possess only one version of curriculum enactment. They have no need to discuss the possibility of different versions. Such a lack of awareness of the interactive and personal construction of curriculum stories can lead to conflicting versions that can turn into competing versions (Davies, 1995) of curriculum enactment and of curriculum reform in schools.

That teaching is individual – with teachers expected to “go it alone” – is a story that pervades classrooms, schools, and the narrative knowledge of teachers and students (Graham, 2000). Teachers talk about “my classroom”
and “my students” in ways that point to their sense of ownership, agency, and responsibility for creating and enacting curriculum texts with students. Preservice teachers echo this underlying phrase by stating “but it’s not my classroom.”

In my narrative enquiry with preservice teachers, stories that should be appeared to preclude stories that could be. Conle (1999) described how stories can become “stuck or frozen” when teachers ignore the temporal and interactive nature of curriculum narratives: “At times the stories we live can themselves become prisons of sorts when we forget that they are stories in which we are characters and authors at the same time” (p. 20).

Preservice teachers traditionally learn about teaching in their university classrooms and then practise what they have learned in school classrooms. In this version of teacher education, the two parallel curriculum plot lines seldom if ever meet. Conversations between university teachers and classroom teachers seldom occur, leaving preservice teachers on their own to make sense of these often conflicting or competing stories of teaching. The role of cooperating teacher as well as teacher adds another layer of complexity. Teachers base their individual stories of what it means to be a student teacher or cooperating teacher on their own experience as a student teacher (Cameron, 1999; Olson, 1995). These often-tacit beliefs greatly affect the stories created for and by preservice teachers.

In this study, I found no evidence of teachers making connections between curriculum requirements set out in curriculum documents and curriculum narratives that preservice or cooperating teachers constructed. Shared stories of how teachers can interweave curriculum as a course of study and curriculum as narrative experience, though sparse on the professional knowledge landscape, are becoming more frequent. Narrative enquiry spaces on the landscape provide places that can transform stories written for and by individuals into collaborative stories written with individuals from different positions.

**CONCLUSION: LINKING NARRATIVE ENQUIRY SPACES**

Several researchers are working to create narrative links among individuals positioned in diverse places on the professional knowledge landscape. Clandinin, Davies, Hogan, and Kennard (1993) created narrative spaces among preservice and practicing teachers. McPhie (1995) and Bach and Mickelson (1997) showed some of the complexity of acknowledging and valuing experiential narratives of different participants in teacher education programs. Christiansen, Goulet, Krentz, and Maers (1997) shared the work of more than 30 Canadians who have attempted to create collaborative enquiry spaces in multiple positions on the landscape. These
people, individually and collectively, are creating new “stories to live by” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999b, p. 114).

Although researchers are making narrative enquiry a legitimate teacher-education curriculum story within some university classrooms (Conle, 1996; Knowles, Cole, & Presswood, 1994; Olson, 2000) and in professional development with inservice teachers (Beattie, 1995; Bell & Millen, 1997; Jalongo & Isenberg, 1995; Orr, 1997; Schulz, 1997), few researchers are looking at links between these preservice and inservice stories (Craig & Olson, in press).

When teachers see curriculum as prescribed by people outside classrooms, whether in curriculum documents or in stories created by others, they often see curriculum as irrelevant to the narrative experiences of teachers and students in classrooms. As more conversations occur among people in different positions on the landscape, teachers and researchers are transforming competing and conflicting stories into complementary stories (Orr, 1997). Such complementary stories enable growth and change to occur through restorying curriculum narratives with others (Olson & Craig, 2001). In this way, multiple stories inform and enrich each other rather than compete for sole authority. Although curriculum writers are developing curriculum documents as frameworks for narrative engagement of teachers and students, many teachers still read these curriculum texts as prescriptions. Those who see these documents as prescriptive describe them as vague, ambiguous, irrelevant, or meaningless, often choosing to ignore them completely. As individuals learn to value their narrative knowledge constructed and reconstructed through experience as a vital force in shaping the curriculum stories lived in their classrooms, they are then able to bring a narrative reading to curriculum documents. These teachers can envision curriculum documents as story starters in which their own and their students’ lived curriculum stories come to life in context. Each teacher and each student has a unique life story constructed and reconstructed through their narratives of experience. When these are acknowledged as such, curriculum as a course of study and curriculum as the construction and reconstruction of lived experience can complement each other in ways that are educative (Dewey, 1938) for both teachers and students.

Several implications for practice have become apparent through this research. Teachers seldom have the opportunity to see how other teachers create lived curriculum with students. Although teachers tell stories of their practice informally, they have little time or opportunity to examine how and why they constructed them or imagine how they could reconstruct them in new ways. Creating and legitimizing professional development spaces that emphasize the valuing, sharing, and examination of teachers’ curriculum narratives as an integral part of implementing curriculum as a
course of study can assist teachers to better understand their own practices and the practices of their colleagues. When teachers have the opportunity to value, articulate, and examine their curriculum stories with others, they also become able to do this with preservice teachers who enter their classrooms. If cooperating teachers explicitly articulate their curriculum choices and acknowledge that there are multiple ways to enact curriculum, they can then create spaces for preservice teachers to feel comfortable in developing and examining their own curriculum narratives. University professors also need to acknowledge the multiple ways in which curriculum is constructed and enacted in context by themselves as well as by preservice and cooperating teachers. Once these personnel take curriculum narratives seriously as having value and being open to revision, individuals’ curriculum stories can become complementary, each individual can learn from the other, “frozen stories” (Conle, 1999, p. 23) can become unstuck, and everyone can acknowledge curriculum as a multistoried process.
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NOTES

1. The following excerpt explains briefly how the terms story and narrative tend to be used in narrative enquiry.

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 . . . Narrative names the structured quality of experience to be studied, and it names the patterns of inquiry for its study . . . [W]e 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 narrative of experience. (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2)
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