

Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes: Teacher Stories. Stories of Teachers. School Stories. Stories of Schools

Author(s): D. Jean Clandinin and F. Michael Connelly

Source: *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Apr., 1996), pp. 24-30

Published by: [American Educational Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1176665>

Accessed: 11-09-2015 20:08 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Educational Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Educational Researcher*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes: Teacher Stories—Stories of Teachers—School Stories—Stories of Schools¹

D. JEAN CLANDININ F. MICHAEL CONNELLY

Educational Researcher, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 24–30

Gary Fenstermacher, in *The Knower and the Known: The Nature of Knowledge in Research on Teaching* (1994), reviewed conceptions of knowledge in the literature of research on teaching. His philosophical interest was an epistemological one, an interest in how “notions of knowledge are used and analyzed in a number of research programs that study teachers and their teaching” (p. 3). Fenstermacher structured his review around four questions that he assumed facilitated his epistemological scrutiny:

- What is known about effective teaching?
- What do teachers know?
- What knowledge is essential for teaching?
- Who produces knowledge about teaching?

The review is informative on the four questions and raises important epistemological issues. We have no quarrel with the way various bodies of work were classified by his use of the questions. We wish to point out that the success of the use of the questions in facilitating his inquiry rests on the acceptability of the questions in the literature of research on teaching. One way or another, these are the questions that govern this literature. It is those four questions that are in question for us in this paper.

Though not stated as such, the review, and the work surveyed, implies that valid, reliable, knowledge on the four questions will make possible better educated teachers. This, of course, was not Fenstermacher's concern². However, it might seem that one could hardly deny this implication. Having reliable answers to these questions would surely do that. What alternative social justifications, after all, might be offered in defense of such research? But we think that answers to these questions are only partially capable of creating understandings that might justify the implication in its full-blown sense. We think the narrative context for the ongoing development and expression of teacher knowledge in schools is also of importance. In response to Fenstermacher's review, we would, therefore, like to raise a fifth question that might be worded, “How is teacher knowledge shaped by the professional knowledge context in which teachers work?” We want to make the case that it is not only an understanding of teacher knowledge and the education

of teachers that will make a difference but attention to the professional knowledge context in which teachers live and work. We believe that the professional knowledge context shapes the answers that may be given to Fenstermacher's four questions. The professional knowledge context shapes effective teaching, what teachers know, what knowledge is seen as essential for teaching, and who is warranted to produce knowledge about teaching.

To demonstrate this, we draw on an earlier argument for understanding the context for teacher knowledge in terms of the idea of a professional knowledge landscape (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). Following a brief description of the idea of a professional knowledge landscape, we recount three sets of stories and interpret each in terms of that landscape.

The Professional Knowledge Landscape

We cast the argument for understanding the context for teacher knowledge in terms of individual teacher knowledge, the working landscape, and the ways in which this landscape relates to public policy and theory. On this view, we imagined the professional knowledge landscape to be positioned at the interface of theory and practice in teachers' lives. We argued that the professional knowledge landscape inhabited by teachers creates epistemological dilemmas that we understand narratively in terms of secret, sacred, and cover stories. Conceptualizing a professional knowledge landscape provides a way to contex-

D. JEAN CLANDININ is a Full Professor and Director at the Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development at the University of Alberta, 633 Education South, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2G5. Her specialties are teacher knowledge, teacher education, classroom practice, narrative inquiry, collaboration, and professional knowledge contexts.

F. MICHAEL CONNELLY is a Full Professor at the Joint Centre for Teacher Development at the University of Toronto, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6; telephone: 416/923-6641, ext. 2630; e-mail: mconnelly@oise.on.ca His specialties are teacher education, teacher knowledge, classroom practice, narrative inquiry, collaboration, professional knowledge, contexts, and science education.

tualize teachers' personal practical knowledge. The discussion of secret, sacred, and cover stories provided a map useful for studying the dynamics of the relations between teachers' personal practical and professional knowledge. But the map is not an answer to the question, "How is teacher knowledge shaped by the professional knowledge context in which teachers work?" In this paper, we begin to answer the question by analyzing selected teacher stories in terms of their professional context.

As we talked to teachers, made field texts of our work in schools, and wrote about our own lives, we realized that teachers spend part of their time in classrooms and part of their time in other professional, communal places. These are two fundamentally different places on the landscape: the one behind the classroom door with students and the other in professional places with others. Teachers cross the boundary between those places many times each day.

The place on the landscape outside of our classrooms is a place filled with knowledge funneled into the school system for the purpose of altering teachers' and children's classroom lives. Teachers talk about this knowledge all the time. We all make reference to "what's coming down the pipe"; "what's coming down now"; "what they will throw down on us next." In these metaphorical expressions, we hear teachers express their knowledge of their out-of-classroom place as a place littered with imposed prescriptions. It is a place filled with other people's visions of what is right for children. Researchers, policy makers, senior administrators, and others, using various implementation strategies, push research findings, policy statements, plans, improvement schemes, and so on down what we call the conduit into this out-of-classroom place on the professional knowledge landscape. We characterize this theory-driven view of practice shared by practitioners, policy makers, and theoreticians as having the quality of a sacred story (Crites, 1971).

Classrooms are, for the most part, safe places, generally free from scrutiny, where teachers are free to live stories of practice. These lived stories are essentially secret ones. Furthermore, when these secret lived stories are told, they are, for the most part, told to other teachers in other secret places. When teachers move out of their classrooms into the out-of-classroom place on the landscape, they often live and tell cover stories, stories in which they portray themselves as experts, certain characters whose teacher stories fit within the acceptable range of the story of school being lived in the school. Cover stories enable teachers whose teacher stories are marginalized by whatever the current story of school is to continue to practice and to sustain their teacher stories. We do not wish to imply that either secret stories or cover stories are necessarily good or bad³.

The following thumbnail sketch taken from some of our writings may help initiate readers into the assumptions embedded in the text. Conceptualizing the professional knowledge context as a landscape is particularly well-suited to our purpose. It allows us to talk about space, time, and place. It has a sense of expansiveness and the possibility of being filled with diverse people, things, and events in different relationships. Because we see the professional knowledge landscape as composed of relationships among people, places, and things, we see it as both an intellectual and a moral landscape.

With the ideas of secret, sacred, and cover stories firmly in mind, we want to show how teachers' stories unfold on

the landscape. We use these ideas along with a further distinction among teacher stories, stories of teachers, school stories, and stories of schools⁴. We begin with our first set of stories by revisiting earlier field texts⁵ at Bay Street School.

First Set of Stories—Bay Street School

In our early work at Bay Street School, we spent a great deal of time working collaboratively with Stephanie, a primary division teacher. We wrote about Stephanie as living and telling her teacher story with a plot line constructed, in part, around an image of classroom as home. Stephanie's teacher story found expression in her practices of decorating the classroom with student work, of celebrating all children's holidays as well as her own, and of making the classroom comfortable with her own and children's possessions. For example, Clandinin wrote:

Entering Stephanie's classroom was like entering a place different from any other in the school. Her classroom was full of treasured objects made by her and her students. The effect of the "full" classroom on me was of a warm and pleasantly cluttered place. . . . (Clandinin, 1986, p. 120)

And later:

The emphasis is on creating an environment within which she can establish relationships with children and children can establish relationships with each other. (Clandinin, 1986, p. 124)

But even as we paid close attention to Stephanie's personal practical knowledge expressed in these classroom practices, we were mindful of the school stories told about Stephanie, school stories hinted at in comments such as "Stephanie's classroom is messy," "Stephanie doesn't throw anything out," and "Stephanie focuses too much on celebrations." We heard these school stories, stories shared by people on staff at Bay Street.

As we participated in Stephanie's classroom and in the school, we were also mindful of stories of the school—stories of Bay Street School as a racially mixed school, a racially troubled school, a school of poor achievement. These stories of Bay Street School were told by school board officials, by principals in neighboring schools, by parents in the neighborhood who chose or chose not to send their children to Bay Street, and by some teachers at Bay Street. The stories of the school were well known.

It was these stories of school that prompted the appointment of Phil Bingham as principal. The school board's senior administrators were concerned about these stories of the school. They wanted a retelling of Bay Street school and, in their appointment of Phil Bingham, let him know they wanted him to live and tell a story of school he had lived and told in other schools. For example, even before we met Phil, we heard about him. We wrote:

Thus, when we first came to know Phil, his reputation was twofold: a community principal and an exemplary inner-city principal. These can be seen as the two main themes in his narrative. (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992, p. 272)

In the appointment of Phil Bingham, the senior administrators were sketching out a new story of Bay Street School.

The new story of school that they wanted and for which they had selected Phil as principal was to be a story of school constructed around a plot line of a project school in which language learning programs, teacher professional development programs, and community involvement were to result in higher student achievement. Furthermore, the retold story of Bay Street School was as a lighthouse school for the board's new race relations policy. Clearly, a new story of school was composed by those who appointed Phil Bingham.

We began our research shortly after Phil's arrival at Bay Street School. We spent a great deal of time living on the in and out of classroom places on the school's professional knowledge landscape. That work is well documented (Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992). What is important to point out here is the way in which the shifting story of school began to take hold and shape Stephanie's teacher stories and the school stories in which she figured as a character.

As Phil began to live out the new story of school at Bay Street, new professional development practices began. Curriculum leaders were appointed for the first time, and study sessions on language learning began. In these sessions, Stephanie began to be seen as an important, knowledgeable person about classroom-home relationships. Growing up and living in the Bay Street community, she had personal knowledge that some other teachers did not have. As a member of a minority group, she was respected as insightful about her experiences. In these project settings, her teacher stories, particularly those constructed around her image of classroom as home and the image of teacher as maker, were heard and responded to.

And, as her teacher stories were heard, the school stories about her began to be retold in ways that were congruent with the story of school Phil was trying to live out with the children, teachers, parents, and community surrounding Bay Street. The school stories about Stephanie, told first by Phil and other project leaders and later by other teachers and parents, were restoried into ones of establishing connections through celebrating children's holidays, of forging closer links with children and their parents, and of making children comfortable in school.

These retold school stories of Stephanie were congruent with the plot lines of the new story of Bay Street School as a project school for language learning and a lighthouse race relations school. As the story of school and the school stories shifted, Stephanie's teacher stories changed as she made children's language a more integral part of her language learning program.

Contextualizing the First Set of Stories

Before proceeding to the second two sets of stories, we want to return to this retold, contextualized story of Stephanie and Bay Street School in order to determine what it means in terms of teachers' professional knowledge landscapes. Specifically, we want to turn to our fifth question, "How is teacher knowledge shaped by the professional knowledge context in which teachers work?" To recap, our first set of writings on Stephanie several years ago focused on her personal practical knowledge. We looked at her narrative history as a personal and social context for her classroom practices and for the curriculum development activities she undertook as the school pursued the board's—and Phil

Bingham's—reform agenda. In our retelling above, we have tried to rethink those events in terms of the professional context in which they took place. As we did the retelling, we noted the complex nexus of Stephanie's teacher stories, Stephanie's stories of herself as teacher, school stories of Stephanie, and stories of Bay Street School. These stories are connected to the map of the professional knowledge landscape that we sketched out at the beginning of this account.

In the retelling, we immediately see the plot outlines of the sacred story. There was a story of Bay Street School unacceptable to school board officials; they moved to change the story in terms of existing board policies on racism, achievement, and language learning; and they selected and appointed a school principal, Phil Bingham, who they knew would support the desired changes and who had a reputation as an inner-city, reform-minded principal. The entire account of Stephanie's personal practical knowledge takes place within the context of the plot outlines of that sacred story in which the board had a plan and implemented it through the hiring of a principal with an eye toward changing school practices and, thereby, changing the story of the school.

Stephanie's teacher stories, which were the heart of an early account of her personal practical knowledge, take place in the retelling not only within the context of the sacred theory/practice story but also in terms of the other set of stories described above. To understand how the stories of Stephanie, school stories, and stories of school relate to the cover stories of the map, it is necessary to view Bay Street's history before we arrived on the scene and after Phil Bingham had begun the reform. Though we do not have detailed field texts for that period, what is clear is that as the reform began and progressed, Stephanie's teacher stories and the stories she projected to others about herself as teacher changed dramatically. The stories changed from ones in which she was a teacher who worked on the margins of what was acceptable in the school to that of a teacher whose work was congruent with the reform story of the school. But this change took place gradually. Her teacher stories, expressed in her classroom practices, fit within the reform story of school Phil was implementing.

The first evidence of this congruence came from the fact that she chose to stay in the school and was not asked to leave by Phil, who had a mandate to change the staff during the first year. The fact that the principal had a different story of her and the fact that he encouraged others to think of her as a teacher who fit the new way of doing things at Bay Street made it possible for her to project a different, more positive story of herself. She was able to tell a new story of herself in the out-of-classroom place on the landscape without changing her teacher stories expressed in her classroom practices. Eventually, however, her lived and told teacher stories also changed. The shifting professional knowledge context brought on by the reform shifted her story of herself and how she was storied by others. She took a different, more personally satisfying place on the landscape, and eventually she did things differently.

In summary, to connect this retelling with the map, it is interesting to note that her teacher stories and stories of herself as teacher fit better with the new reform story of school. Furthermore, her story of herself in the out-of-classroom place shifted more quickly than did her teacher stories expressed in her classroom practices.

Second Set of Stories—A Racial Incident

As the distinctions among teacher stories, stories of teacher, school stories, and stories of school began to take hold in our thinking, we began to observe not only how these distinctions could be seen in our earlier work but how they were lived out in our current studies.

Recently, in a school in one of the metropolitan Toronto school boards, a teacher was assaulted by two men who were not part of the school community. The teacher was confronted at the top of a concrete stairwell and was badly beaten and thrown down the stairs. When he regained consciousness, the teacher, a person of East Indian heritage, said the attackers had been white and that he had been receiving hate mail over a period of time demanding he leave the school because “colored teachers” were not wanted. The teacher contextualized his story with a story of the school and of the neighborhood. He said that his school was not that kind of school nor was his community one that would condone racist acts. While what happened was clearly racist, he did not want the assault to be taken as representative of the school or of the community.

The story the teacher told was picked up by the press and, undoubtedly to the dismay of both the teacher and school board officials, became a public issue discussed in print, on radio, and on television. It quickly became not only a teacher’s story and a story of the school, but also a story of the school system. It also became a story of the local community, a story of communities in urban settings, and a story of Canadian society as a whole with issues of multiculturalism, racism, immigration, language policies, and the like woven into the stories. From our outsider’s position, a teacher’s story quickly became a story of the school, a story of the school system, and a story of Canadian society.

While we, as outsiders, were not positioned inside the school to hear the school stories, we can imagine the various ways teachers, parents, and students told the school stories. Media quotations from insiders hinted at the plot lines of school stories. White shoelaces in Doc Marten shoes, symbols of white supremacy, suggested the plot lines of students’ school stories. These school stories, retold by the media, gave the plot outlines to the story of school being created.

Contextualizing the Second Set of Stories

If we examine this story more closely using our map of the landscape, several things come to light. While the only notes we have are those based on media accounts, the story is suggestive of the way in which a single event can shatter an established story of school and make apparent the existence of cover stories being lived and told by school people. Undoubtedly, as media reports implied, there were a number of ongoing, less dramatic racist incidents in and around the school. What appears on analysis is that the story of school as one that would not tolerate racism was so strongly held that it took a dramatic incident to interrupt the plot line. As we write, the event is still unfolding. Events on the school landscape are not available to us. We can only speculate on possibilities. It is entirely possible, for instance, that the teacher stories, school stories, and stories of school still confirm a plot line in which the incident is seen as mostly a random event. Whether or not the

teacher’s story of school, namely, that it was “not a school like that,” will prevail remains to be seen. From our point of view, however, the teacher’s story is an indication both of the potential power of a story of school to sustain itself and of the fact that it keeps conflicting stories hidden behind cover stories. It is also possible, of course, that the story of school is changing and that administrators, teachers, and others are more alert to similar incidences. They may be developing policies and running workshops and counseling sessions with teachers and students to cope with racism.

Third Set of Stories—Team Teaching

One final series of stories highlights the distinctions among teacher stories, stories of teachers, school stories, and stories of schools. Annie Davies, a teacher friend, is currently working on research into team teaching relationships. In recent work (1995), Davies tells a story of one of her early team teaching experiences. As Davies tells her story, she was hired onto the staff of a school and placed on a newly established five-person team as an expert in teaching physical education. In her earlier teaching experience in Britain and Canada, she had learned to live and tell a story of herself as a physical education teacher. This was both a teacher story and a story of herself as teacher. She storied herself as having no curricular knowledge in other subject matter areas and, in early tellings of her story, spoke of herself as becoming part of the team and needing to learn a great deal about other subject matter areas in which she felt she had little knowledge. She was eager to develop other subject matter knowledge. She wrote: “The principal mentioned I’d be teaching Physical Education, some Language Arts, and some Math. This sounded perfect.” (Davies, 1995, p. 4) The story of the school that the principal was telling and living was, as Davies described it, one in which:

We would come to know all 120 Grade 3 and 4 children and they would be taught by all of us. Our team had been carefully chosen to include a specialist in each core subject: Language Arts, Math, Sciences, Social Studies and Physical Education. (Davies, 1995, p. 4)

As one of the teachers said:

... the principal always said, “Whoever’s here will team teach,” and she would interview someone and my expectation would be that she would put that right in front of you—team teaching—possibly multi-aging like the university demonstration school. . . . The expectation from the principal was you would make it work. She never really verbalized that, but. . . (Davies, 1995, p. 10)

Davies also tells school stories about the five-member team. In these school stories, the team is described as a group of experts successfully working together. For example, in recent research interviews conducted with other staff members who were not part of the team, Davies learned the school story was one of great success. The school stories were ones about how the principal “had hired the best of everybody.” These school stories were woven together by the principal into the story of the school as a lighthouse school, a model of teaming in which team members each had special subject matter strength and, collectively, had strength in all subject matter areas.

Davies, in her research, also wanted to hear each teacher's stories as a member of that team. Of her own story, she wrote: "That first year was pretty disastrous. I had all kinds of questions but was too afraid to ask them." (Davies, 1995, p. 5)

Other team members told stories such as, "I got mad a lot that first year—mad about all the expectations—the sharing that didn't fit with my sense of what sharing is," and "Getting everybody to come to consensus or agreement was the toughest part of that whole notion of the team." But even as they told their teacher stories to Davies, they would make reference to the school stories about their team. The school stories were ones of success. "We put you together and away you go. . . . They just put people in and it was an expectation of 'you will be able to do this.'" (Davies, 1995, p. 4)

A connected school story of such innovations in the board was that they were stepping stones to leadership positions. As one teacher said:

Another expectation too was, "You won't stay long." You'll do it for a few years and you'll be gone, and so the people they got were what I call up and comers, the go-getters. So they're there for personal advancement and they've got to prove that they can do this. . . and can then move out into leadership roles. (Davies, 1995, p. 11)

It is clear that these particular school stories are closely tied to the story of school. The school stories thrive because of the story of school.

Those school stories, as well as the story of the school told and lived by the principal as one of "encouraging innovation" and as a school staffed with "top people doing top things," were fed back into the school and shaped Davies' and the others' teacher stories. However, Davies was surprised as she heard the teachers' stories. As she spoke with all of the teachers who were part of the team, she learned the situation had been what she termed "a disaster" for many of them. They had all lived cover stories as they worked together to make the teaching situation fit the plot lines of the school stories and story of school. As Davies listened to their teacher stories, she heard things such as:

You have to have a group of people who agree to go in with a sense of what it is they're going to go into. We didn't have that. Everyone was coming at it from different perspectives and that's where a lot of the clashing came from. What made it work for the kids was the fact that we were very professional. . . each of us had a lot of strength to bring to what we were doing. As a result good things did happen . . . we were professional enough not to tear ourselves apart but it was very tough on all of us to get through that year. (Davies, 1995, p. 16)

And stories such as:

[I] think there was a lot of good learning. . . but we were floundering at times not knowing what we were doing. . . . We floundered in movement of kids. . . loss of time and loss of kids at times. Not knowing exactly where they were at. . . . I think that's one of the drawbacks, the tracking of kids. . . . A lot of times a specialist teacher such as you were and I was—we don't think of "my kids," we think about "our kids." (Davies, 1995, p. 26)

Before the end of the year, the principal moved. At the end of the year, the five-person team broke into teams of two. As the teachers later told their stories, they revealed

very different stories from the cover stories they had lived and told at the time. Their teacher stories were in conflict with the school stories of experts successfully teaching together and the story of school as a story of top people successfully demonstrating excellent innovative practice. The story of school and the school stories kept the teachers' stories silent as they lived and told a cover story.

Contextualizing the Third Set of Stories

Let us review this third set of stories in terms of the map for studying the dynamics of the relations between teachers' personal practical and professional knowledge. Once again, we see how the overall story took place within the context of a sacred theory/practice story. Once again, we had a reform-minded principal who set out to implement the latest theories of team teaching and multi-age grouping. Once again, the sacred story was expressed in the form of a story of school—in this case, a story of team teaching and multi-age grouping. There were school stories in the out-of-classroom place on the landscape connected to the story of school. The school principal, congruent with the story of school and the school stories beginning to be told, hired a staff that told stories of themselves as teachers with expertise in a particular subject matter and who were willing to team teach. As the teachers lived out their teacher stories in this new context, they found it difficult. They kept secret the stories that would conflict with the school stories of them as successful, upwardly mobile professional teachers and that would conflict with the prevailing stories of school. They did not acknowledge the difficulties until years later when Davies approached them with her secret teacher story of disaster in that experience. The safety created by the intervening years and Davies' admission that her story of herself as a teacher at the time had been a cover story, made it possible for them to tell their secret stories. It took years for the cover stories to be interrupted and the secret stories to be told.

Summary and Possibilities

When Fenstermacher completed his review of *The Nature of Knowledge in Research on Teaching* (1994), he left readers with a research challenge. For him, "The challenge for teacher knowledge research is not simply one of showing us that teachers think, believe, or have opinions, but that they know. And, even more important, that they know that they know" (p. 51).

We do not believe that Fenstermacher's challenge is the most important challenge for teacher knowledge research. It is clear that in the three sets of stories presented above participating teachers know, and it is clear that they know that they know.

This, to us, is not surprising. What is surprising is that researchers might feel compelled to demonstrate that teachers know things. Of course they do. Almost as surprising is the thought that teachers might not know that they know. It is true, of course, that the imposition, via the sacred theory/practice story, of knowledge from research on the four questions has led teachers to devalue their professional knowledge. But this has led in turn to necessary deceptions as teachers obscure their knowledge by saying one thing and doing another. The telling and living of cover stories may give the impression that teachers do not know that they know. But they do.

We believe that one of the consequences of an analysis of the landscape of teachers' professional lives is that all four of Fenstermacher's questions need to be answered conditionally with "it depends." For instance, suppose one has a set of answers to Fenstermacher's first question: "What is known about effective teaching?" Suppose, further, that one wanted to improve Stephanie's teaching in Bay Street School through the application of this knowledge. It is immediately clear that Stephanie's story of herself, and the school stories of her, both of which are functions of the sacred story of theory and practice, make all the difference to what constitutes effective teaching for Stephanie. What was deemed effective teaching in the new reform environment of Bay Street School was not seen as effective in the pre-reform landscape. Furthermore, as Stephanie's story of herself changed during the reform process, effective teaching was defined more by values and norms established by the principal and others committed to the reform than it was by any form of outside knowledge. Teaching practices once thought to border on the ineffective became valued on the reform landscape. New "effective" teaching practices emerged at Bay Street School under pressure of values and attitudes associated with the reform. In all of this, there is at best a modest place for the research-based purveyor of generic effective teaching practices. What might have been valued on Bay Street's landscape were research-based effective teaching practices that coincided with the reform ideology. Of course, researchers touting other effective practices would be frozen out, their research knowledge judged as ineffective in terms of the landscape.

As we turn to Fenstermacher's second question—"What do teachers know?" our answer, "It depends," is even more obvious. Here, what teachers know depends on the school stories and stories of school that constitute their landscape. As this landscape shifts, what they know shifts as, indeed, do the values attached to that knowledge. As the values shift, cover stories emerge or disappear, thereby either hiding or bringing to light previously hidden teacher knowledge. The same kind of conditional "it depends" thinking applies to the other two sets of stories told in this paper, and it applies equally to Fenstermacher's remaining two questions—"What knowledge is essential for teaching?" and "Who produces knowledge about teaching?"

As we pursue our thinking on this matter, it seems to us that rather than simply adding a fifth question, i.e., "How is teacher knowledge shaped by the professional knowledge landscape in which teachers work?" to Fenstermacher's four, we need, instead, to question the questions themselves. We believe that we have shown that the professional knowledge landscape of schools is of such contextual complexity that the implication with which we began the paper—namely, that knowledgeable responses to Fenstermacher's questions would lead to better teachers—does not hold or, perhaps, to put it more softly, only holds with slight force. Generic answers to the four questions can be expected at most to result in only modest improvements in teachers and teaching.

The history of research on teaching basically supports this contention. Fenstermacher's four questions are essentially the questions that have permeated and driven the vast research on teaching literature and, yet there is a widespread sense that this literature has not amounted to much. Practical expectations have dramatically exceeded practi-

cal reality. Though this research has a history reaching into the previous century (see Medley, 1982) and though the American Educational Research Association has published three handbooks of research on it, it simply is not possible to use this specific knowledge base to build, with confidence, programs that lead to better teachers and teaching. It always "depends." We believe that an understanding of teachers' personal practical knowledge, set in the context of teachers' professional knowledge landscapes, points in a different direction. We need new questions. Better yet, we need new ways of relating to professional life in schools out of which productive researchable questions might emerge⁶.

Notes

¹The work on which this article is based is supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

²Fenstermacher came at the review in which he posited the four set of questions from a philosophical perspective. He was interested in epistemology. He drew a distinction between practical and formal forms of knowledge, locating his review in the latter. This paper is an evaluation of the epistemic status of work conducted under the four questions. He also says that practical forms of knowledge may be more important for understanding and advancing the practice of teaching than formal forms of knowledge. Given Fenstermacher's terms, practical and formal, we are not engaged in a discussion with him over the epistemic status of knowledge claims in the field of research on teaching. If, however, Fenstermacher were to adopt a more dialectic stance in which the practical and the formal were seen, at least potentially, as connected by yet a third set of terms, we might then be said to be engaged in a common inquiry.

³In a discussion of these concepts with Gary Fenstermacher, he noted that cover stories are an important way of living teacher stories and their uses might profitably be taught in teacher education programs.

⁴At the editor's suggestion, we offer this note on narrative and narrative inquiry adapted from Clandinin and Connelly (1994). The social sciences are concerned with humans and their relations with themselves and their environments and, as such, are founded on the study of experience. For us, keeping experience in the foreground comes about by periodic return to the works of Dewey (1916, 1934, 1938). For Dewey, education, experience, and life are inextricably intertwined. In its most general sense, when one asks what it means to study education, the answer is to study experience. Following Dewey, the study of experience is the study of life. One learns about education from thinking about life, and one learns about life from thinking about education. Keeping this sense of the experiential whole is part of the study of narrative. Broadly speaking, we follow Carr's (1986) argument in which the case was made that when persons note something of their experience either to themselves or to others, they do so not by the mere recording of experience over time but do so in storied form. Story is, therefore, neither raw sensation nor cultural form but is both and neither. In effect, stories are the closest we can come to experience, as we and others tell of our experience. With this as our standpoint, we have a point of reference, a life and ground to stand on, for both imagining what experience is and for imagining how it might be studied and represented in researchers' texts. Experience, in this view, is the stories people live by.

There is not space in this note to give a full account of narrative terms. It is equally correct to say "inquiry into narrative" as it is to say "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.

⁵Throughout, we use the term "field texts" instead of data for reasons discussed in Clandinin and Connelly (1994).

⁶An anonymous reviewer for a draft of the paper commented that, "the stories seem cast with an unnecessary emphasis on the dark side of all involved. I am left with a view of imperial administrators, hapless theorists, and secretive teachers." This reader's interpretation is not our intent. We see ourselves working at the interface of teachers' and others' lives in an exceedingly complex professional world that we refer to as a professional knowledge landscape. It is not our intention to make judgments about this landscape nor to take sides on issues as they evolve but, rather, to map out this complex, narrative, historical, interwoven, and constantly changing landscape on which teachers, administrators, and children's lives are lived out. In fact, we steadfastly stay away from the apply-to-all-situations generalizations found in the reviewer's comments. Instead, we view these professional knowledge landscapes as exceedingly complex places with multiple layers of meaning that depend on individuals' stories and how individuals are positioned on that landscape, as well as the landscape's own narrative history of shifting values, beliefs, and stories. Every specific landscape situation should be worked through on its own terms. It is possible, in some circumstances, that teachers might be seen by some as "secretive," theorists as "hapless," administrators as "imperialistic." It is never this simple. People are always complex mixes of different plot lines.

References

- Carr, D. (1986). *Time, narrative and history*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
 Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practices: Teacher images in action*. London: Falmer Press.

- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Narrative and story in practice and research. In D. Schön (Ed.), *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice* (pp. 258-281). New York: Teachers' College Press.
 Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 413-427, Chap. 26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
 Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
 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) 291-311.
 Davies, A. (1995). *New beginnings: Storying my way*. Unpublished doctoral proposal, University of Alberta, Canada.
 Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
 Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Capricorn Books.
 Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.
 Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, 20 (pp. 3-56). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
 Medley, D. M. (1982). Teacher effectiveness. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (pp. 1345-1352). New York: The Free Press.

Manuscript received July 28, 1995

Revision received January 15, 1996

Accepted February 8, 1996

Call for AERA Award Nominations

The submission deadline for all three awards is November 1, 1996. Send all nominations (including self-nominations) to the AERA Awards Committee, 1230 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Please indicate the award for which you are making a nomination. All awards will be presented at the Association's 77th Annual Meeting, March 25-29, 1997.

Outstanding Book Award

The AERA Council has established this annual award for the best book-length publication in educational research and development. To be considered for the 1997 Outstanding Book Award, a book must be concerned with the improvement of the educational process through research or scholarly inquiry, must have a research base, and must have a 1995 or 1996 copyright date.

A book may be nominated by the author or by another scholar. The nominator must submit six copies of a one- to two-page letter detailing the contribution of the book. The publisher of a nominated book must be prepared to provide copies of the book to the six members of the committee, whose names and addresses will be provided after the nomination is received. The book may have been published anywhere in the world but must be available in English. A 1996 book considered for the 1997 award may be considered again next year, but must be renominated. No edited volumes will be considered.

Outstanding Contributions Relating Research to Practice

This award was established by AERA to stimulate and recognize outstanding contributions by individuals to increasing practitioner and lay group understanding of the contributions of educational research to the improvement of educational practice. The award includes an honorarium and scroll.

There are two award categories. One is **Interpretive Scholarship**, which is for an individual who has published

in a nonresearch publication, e.g., an interpretive article, essay, or testimony (not a book-length work) that relates research to practice. To be eligible for consideration, the work must have been published in 1995 or 1996. Seven copies of the publication should be sent to the AERA Awards Committee.

The other award category is **Professional Service**, which is for an individual who has related research findings to practice through direct involvement with the educational community, e.g., work with a school district or state department of education that provides reliable information based on research studies that address promising solutions (or alternatives) to locally identified problems. To be eligible for consideration, the work must have been completed in 1995 or 1996. Seven copies of a document (not to exceed 20 pages) that summarizes (a) the nature, purpose, and consequences of the work and (b) reactions from the client of the work should be sent to the AERA Awards Committee.

Raymond B. Cattell Early Career Award for Programmatic Research

This award is open to scholars in any field of educational inquiry within the first decade following receipt of the doctoral degree. Nomination should be for a distinguished program of cumulative educational research. The award includes a plaque and cash award.

To be considered, send six copies of a letter of nomination, current curriculum vitae, two representative scholarly publications, and two supporting letters to the AERA Awards Committee.