



Narrative Inquiry Into Two Worlds of Curriculum Making

M. Shaun Murphy, University of Saskatchewan

Janice Huber, University of Regina

& D. Jean Clandinin, University of Alberta

ABSTRACT

This paper draws on a long-term multi-site narrative inquiry into the curriculum-making experiences of children, families, and teachers. We draw upon our earlier understandings of two worlds of curriculum making, the familial and the school, to inquire into tensions shaped for one family, in a place of school, as they experienced the meeting of their familial curriculum-making world with the school curriculum-making world. Familial curriculum making is curriculum making in which children are engaged as they interact with family and community members. We wonder how we might move forward as we create situations with children in both curriculum-making worlds, situations in which they can find ways of making sense of the two constructions of themselves in these two worlds.

We first met Loyla and her mother, Orie, in the late summer of 2008 as Loyla was about to begin Kindergarten. As we were beginning a narrative inquiry¹ with children, families, and teachers to understand their curriculum-making experiences at a time of increased achievement testing, we invited Loyla and Orie to participate. Our narrative inquiry was multiperspectival in that we wanted to inquire into the storied experiences of teachers working in classrooms, of families with their children at home, and of children as they lived in both homes and schools. While we have written about the broader study in other places (Clandinin, Murphy, & Huber, 2011; Huber, Murphy, & Clandinin, 2011), in this paper we focus in particular on Loyla's and Orie's experiences. Because the starting point for our

work with Loyla and Orié was in their home, we heard stories of Loyla's experiences in school as she told them to Orié and Janice, as well as Orié's experiences at home and when she interacted at school as she wrote about them in her journals and shared these experiences with Janice.

First, we introduce Loyla by drawing on field texts² that show our coming to know her as a child who began Kindergarten in fall 2008. Following are some of the ways Loyla described herself to Orié and her grandmother, Ruth, in November of her Kindergarten year.

I know my name
Lots of numbers
And my address and phone number
I am a friend
And a music-maker
Together, and alone
This is my long-time friend, Golden Pony
I know a bit about Japan
I love my new puppy, Bella
I am a birthday cake maker
And a cookie maker
I carved four Jack-O-Lanterns
This is number 2
I love Halloween
My daddy and I decorated our tree with ghosts
I am a chicken lover
I know how to gather eggs
I am a picture maker
I am a pattern maker—smooth, smooth, swirly
I am a ballet dancer
And a bike rider
I know about height
I am a letter writer
I am a card maker
For my friend Laken and her mommy, Jill,
Who live where I used to live
I love books
And I have been reading with my mommy for a long time
I am a song singer

And a Mandarin speaker since birth
 I know it's very sad when your dog dies
 And that my Grandma teaches me a lot.
 (Orie's journal entry, November 21, 2008)

This journal entry was one of a number of field texts that began to awaken us to new understandings of curriculum making.³ In earlier narrative inquiries we worked from a view of curriculum making as occurring in schools and classrooms where teachers' and children's lives met around subject matter (Huber & Clandinin, 2005). We understood curriculum making as a life-making process (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992) in which identity making, that is, stories to live by,⁴ was central. We imagined "how curriculum could be seen as a curriculum of lives" (Huber & Clandinin, 2005, p. 318). Our understanding of the negotiation of a curriculum of lives as children's and teachers' lives met in classrooms was grounded in the idea that "the composition of life identities, 'stories to live by' . . . [is] central in the process of curriculum making" (p. 318). We understood that the "complex negotiations at work in the composition of a curriculum of lives" (p. 318) drew attention to *family stories* and *stories of families* (Clandinin et al., 2006). However, in all of this, we understood the making of a curriculum of lives as firmly situated in school curriculum making; that is, schools were the only place of curriculum making. Attending closely to Orie's and Loyla's interactions as they made them visible to us in the field texts of the study enabled us to see another place of curriculum making, a place we termed "familial curriculum making" as distinct from the place of school curriculum making (Clandinin et al., 2011; Huber et al., 2011).

As we lived in this multiperspectival midst, we began to see, and to tentatively name, familial curriculum making as the process negotiated between Loyla and her extended family members as they interacted in their home and community places. In this way we began to reconceptualize curriculum making in order to give an account of both the in-school curriculum making and the curriculum making outside of school, that is, what we named familial curriculum making. We understand familial curriculum making

as an account of parents'/families' and children's lives together in homes and communities where the parents and families are an integral part of the curricular process in which families, children/learners, subject matter, and home and community milieux are in dynamic interaction. (Huber et al., 2011, pp. 7–8)

Based on the overall study, we now understand that familial curriculum making is as important to the negotiation of a curriculum of lives as in-classroom, in-school curriculum making.

There is much we came to know about the different aspects of Loyla's familial curriculum making over the 2008–2009 school year including “that it is intergenerational; that many curriculum makers come alongside; that it is a kind of responsive curriculum making which begins with the child's, Loyla's, knowing, with her negotiation of her stories to live by” (Huber et al., 2011, p. 40). We drew on field texts such as the extract from Orié's journal entry, included above, as we explored Loyla's familial curriculum making. While we explored each of these three aspects of Loyla's familial curriculum making in more detail (Clandinin et al., 2011; Huber et al., 2011), our intention in this paper is to move with Orié and Loyla to a place of school to see what happens in the meeting of familial curriculum making and school curriculum making; that is, as Orié attends a school performance in which Loyla and all of the children in the school are performers. In what follows we share an interim research text we composed that drew on field notes of a conversation between Orié and Janice.

Crisis in the Gym

It was mid December 2008, when Orié called Janice to talk about a recent experience at a school concert in which Loyla was a participant. She noted that it was not named a Christmas concert, which was a typical practice for this school, but rather it was billed as a school program.

“It was awful, highly disturbing. You won't believe this,” exclaimed Orié.

She recounted her building tensions as she sat in the gym alongside her neighbours, other parents, and her friend, Tina, the mother of one of the children in Loyla's Kindergarten classroom. Tina had leaned over and whispered to Orié, “I know you are going to hate this.” Orié reported how Tina had been to the afternoon production and had returned to this evening's performance to confirm her disbelief about the production.

Orié recounted how as the production started some of the older children in the school described the school focus on peace. She couldn't recall all of the scenes in the production because she was overwhelmed by the entire experience. The production began with a scene set on the playground, a scene of children bullying another child and then, as the scene unfolded, other children with guns arrived and stopped the violent bullying.

"It was just too stupid for words," she commented. Orié said she really stopped watching the scene on the stage as she directed her gaze to Loyla who was sitting on the edge of the risers as one of the supporting singers for the production.

The production continued and another scene appeared situated in a home as a family watched Lady Gaga on television. As this scene ended Loyla and her classmates, as well as the children in Grades 1 and 2, were marshalled onto the stage where they sang a song, which included the refrain, "Junk in, Junk out." The message was that when you put junk in, such as watching the TV program from the scene in the production, you get junk out. Older children stood up to explain this explicitly to the audience, that when children are watching those kinds of videos or listening to that kind of music and if children are not monitored, then junk will indeed come out. Orié began to be aware of parents whispering in the corner of the gym in which she sat.

"I was so outraged, I spoke loudly saying, 'We should focus on the junk in, junk out that goes on in schools.' The parents around me agreed," she told Janice. This was happening as the children were herded off the stage as a new scene was organized.

A new scene began to unfold, Orié recounted. In this one a child was seated at the dining room table and her frenzied, flaky mother character entered and exclaimed, "Look honey, it's your birthday, you get to have chocolate" and the mother dumped out a bag of candy all over the table and it spilled onto the floor. The child screamed, "In school we've been learning about healthy eating and I do not want this." The mother character acted angrily and hollered at her daughter to go to her bedroom. The scene shifted to the child sitting on her bed and suddenly a fairy god-mother appeared granting the child a wish. The child wished for a "nicer family," words which Orié clearly recalled. No sooner was the wish spoken aloud than the door bell rang and into the house burst a group of people who identified themselves as social services, "We're here to take your daughter away." In the next scene, in a different house, this child was seated at a table with a different mother, father, and another child. It was calm and they were eating a bowl of healthy stew and vegetables.

The same group of K-Grade 2 children returned to the stage and began to sing a song. In her outrage Orié could not remember the entire song, but the refrain, "something's got to give, something's got to change, we think it might be you" stuck in her head as the children sang, pointing and shaking their fingers at the audience. As Orié looked around the gym at the faces of the audience she was struck by the

thought that there were people who had lived stories of social services and the apprehension of children. Orié recounted how the watching parents became angrier and more vocal. Stories began to surface of things that had happened to their children at the school.

When the performance was over, Orié quickly left the gymnasium, not wanting to be drawn into the conversations taking place around her. She quickly retrieved Loyla from her classroom, despite Loyla's desires to stay and play. When they arrived home Orié recounted the performance to Ruth, expressing her disbelief and anger. Loyla, sitting at the table with Orié and Ruth, asked, "Is that how it happens?" when Orié was describing the scene when the child was taken by social services. In that moment Orié realized that Loyla was asking if this could happen to any child, maybe even herself. It was evident to Orié that Loyla was uncomfortable and uncertain.

Over the next few days the fall-out around the performance continued as Orié heard from her friend Tina about her continued disbelief and outrage, as well as similar reactions from other parents. In one such story Orié was told of a grandmother who was so overcome by the performance that she cried inconsolably, distraught over what she understood as what her young granddaughter was learning in school. (Interim research text⁵ based on field notes, December 2008)

As we inquired into field notes in order to compose the above interim research text, what struck us about the performance at the school was that this provided an opportunity for Orié to see Loyla within a school curriculum-making place. Early on Orié noted that her attention was drawn to Loyla who was seated on a riser at the edge of the stage. There were not many opportunities for Orié to observe Loyla engaged in school curriculum making. As Orié spoke with Janice, she noted that it was made clear early on in the evening program that this was a school curriculum-making event focused on teaching children to be peacemakers, both at school and at home. In the first scene, bullying on the school playground was stopped by children with guns who stood up to the bullies. In the second scene, Lady Gaga was constructed as an inappropriate performer whom children were allowed to watch on television in their homes. The third scene, also set in homes, moved from one home where poor parenting was represented by a frenzied single mother and poor nutrition which resulted in the intervention of professionals who took the child away to another home. In this second home, the two-parent family and the food were portrayed as desirable and healthy. In this two-scene skit it was clear that the familial curriculum making was judged as inadequate and the school curriculum making, with an emphasis on healthy eating, was judged as superior.

As the scenes unfolded there was an apparent growing discomfort among the audience. From where Orie was seated, she heard parents first whispering with one another and then more loudly sharing stories of what their children had experienced in the school curriculum making, as described by Orie as the “junk in, junk out experienced in school” (Personal communication, December 2008). When Orie and Loyla arrived home, Orie recounted to Ruth her dismay about the portrayal of families.

As we wrote this interim research text we saw ways familial curriculum making was portrayed as unresponsive and irresponsible to children, and profoundly miseducative. While we do not have Loyla’s words about what her experience was of this situation we do know that Orie storied Loyla as troubled. We can only imagine Loyla’s embodied tension as she stood there on the stage and shook her finger in a chastising way at her mother.

Wondering About *Worlds* of Curriculum Making

Inquiring into our interim research text took us back to our earlier writing about two worlds of curriculum making in which we drew on Lugones’ (1987) understanding:

In coming to think of familial and school curriculum making as comprising two worlds, we resonated with . . . understanding that a “‘world’ need not be a construction of a whole society. It may be a construction of a tiny portion of a particular society. It may be inhabited by just a few people. Some ‘worlds’ are bigger than others” (p. 10). Lugones’ exploration of differing worlds is shaped by her experience as an “outsider to the mainstream,” as a woman “of color in the U. S.” (p. 3). Similar to Lugones’ sense of herself as needing to “travel” to different worlds, worlds in which she constructs herself and worlds in which she is “stereotypically” or “arrogantly” perceived or constructed by others, we see that not only are children’s worlds of familial and school curriculum making shaped by differing physical places but also by differing ways of being and interacting and, therefore, of knowing and knowledge. (Huber et al., 2011, p. 108)

In the above interim research text, we gain a sense of the two worlds of curriculum making: the school curriculum-making world and the familial curriculum-making world. Further, we gain a sense of the school’s construction of familial curriculum making as miseducative, at least as it was portrayed in the December performance.

We also gain a sense of the dismay of the families who saw what they were living at home, that is their curriculum making, as being arrogantly constructed by the school performance. The families' dismay was, at least in part, shaped by coming to know ways in which the familial curriculum making was constructed by the school curriculum making. Even more troubling as Orié shared with Ruth her story of her experience at the school performance, was Loyla's expression of her experience of the school curriculum making. Loyla expressed her fear of being taken away if her familial curriculum-making world was judged as inadequate. She seemed to recognize, perhaps for the first time, that the school curriculum-making world may be able to overwrite what she knows in her familial curriculum-making world.

We can only speculate on Loyla's experience as she travelled from her school curriculum-making world in which Orié was positioned as an observer to her familial curriculum-making world where she heard Orié make visible the differences between the school curriculum-making world and the familial curriculum-making world. Again, Lugones is helpful when she describes *worlds* and *world-travelling*. Lugones wrote that "those of us who are 'world'-travellers have the distinct experience of being different in different 'worlds' and of having the capacity to remember other 'worlds' and ourselves in them" (1987, p. 11). Lugones described this "shift from being one person to being a different person" as "travel" (p. 11). Lugones' concept of travel means that to travel is to be constructed, and to construct oneself differently, in different worlds. As Loyla moved from the school curriculum-making world to her familial curriculum-making world we saw her engaging in this *world* travelling (Huber et al., 2011).

For Orié, too, there was *world-travelling* as she awakened to ways she was being constructed as Loyla's mother within the school curriculum-making world. Orié realized that her familial curriculum making around food, television watching, behaviours, and family composition could all be called into question. Orié also awakened to an understanding that it was Loyla who needed to travel each day between the familial curriculum-making world and the school curriculum-making world, travelling that opened up the possibility that Loyla could be constructed in arrogant ways. Orié also seemed to become awake to how she, too, could be constructed in arrogant ways from within the school curriculum-making world.

What Now?

As we described elsewhere (Huber et al., 2011) and also showed above, we argue that there are two curriculum-making worlds: the world of familial curriculum making and the world of school curriculum making. To stop with only this description

of the two curriculum-making worlds and an understanding that children travel between these two worlds each day carrying with them embodied tensions could leave us in a place where the only possibility is blaming and judging one another, those who live in the other world.

As became evident in Orié's experience of the school program, there was a sense of dis/ease for families in the meeting of the school and familial curriculum-making worlds. We imagine that, at least for some of the teachers, there was a similar sense of dis/ease as they watched the children perform the skits in front of their families. As in the interim research text above, sometimes families gain a glimpse of these two worlds. So, too, it is for teachers. It also becomes evident in our other writing, and here, that children, such as Loyla, travel each day between these two curriculum-making worlds. They carry with them the embodied tensions of negotiating their life making in these two curriculum-making worlds (Huber et al., 2011).

While some readers might find the above interim research text and the situation it portrays, extreme, we saw it as offering the possibility for further inquiries. Frequently, the meeting of the two worlds of curriculum making happen in less extreme, less conflicting ways and, as a result, we do not stop and attend to the tensions. Again, Lugones (1987) is helpful to us as she writes about different constructions each of us has in the differing worlds we inhabit:

In a "world" some of the inhabitants may not understand or hold the particular construction of them that constructs them in that "world." So, there may be "worlds" that construct me in ways that I do not even understand. Or it may be that I understand the construction, but do not hold it of myself. I may not accept it as an account of myself, a construction of myself. And yet, I may be animating such a construction. (p. 10)

For children who acted in the performance, part of the school curriculum-making world, in front of their families, part of their familial curriculum-making world, they were animating one construction of themselves, perhaps knowing they were simultaneously violating the construction of themselves in their familial curriculum-making world. Loyla's question about social service apprehension allows us some small glimpse into her experience of the tensions of visibly demonstrating one animation while at the same moment remembering herself and other constructions of herself in her familial curriculum-making world. We do not want to end with merely describing the two worlds and without a sense of how we might move forward as we create situations with children in both curriculum-making worlds, situations in which they can find ways of making sense of the two constructions of themselves.

Narrative Inquiry Spaces: Shaping Forward-Looking Stories in Familial and School Curriculum-Making Worlds

We turn now to imagine how we might live differently alongside children as teachers in their school curriculum-making world and as families in their familial curriculum-making world. As we reflected on the lives of the children in the two curriculum-making worlds and their travelling between the two worlds, we sensed the importance for children to tell and retell their lived experiences in both worlds. We wonder, for example, where Loyla might have found a space in her school curriculum-making world to inquire into the construction of herself that portrayed her as chastising her mother for her inadequacies around nutrition, behaviour, and television watching. We wonder, for example, where Loyla might have found a space in her familial curriculum-making world to inquire into the construction she was required to animate and, also, the possibility of social services taking her away to another home.

We see these spaces as narrative inquiry spaces. We wonder where these spaces are and how we might begin to compose them with children. Where are the spaces in either curriculum-making world for children to narratively inquire into their life making?

In other studies, we learned that when teachers experience tensions and do not have inquiry spaces on their professional knowledge landscapes, they tell cover stories⁶ (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). Teachers frequently search for these inquiry spaces yet often find themselves engaging in the telling of their lived stories in secret spaces (Craig, 1995) or in places off the professional knowledge landscape (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). Sometimes, but not always, these secret spaces become inquiry spaces.

With our attention on children's experiences of composing life identities as part of curriculum making in both worlds, we now wonder about the spaces for children to inquire into the meeting of their two worlds. We realize that part of composing such narrative inquiry spaces requires us to understand the necessary features or dimensions of such spaces. We do know some features that need to be in place for narrative inquiry spaces for teachers and other professionals. We know, for example, that narrative inquiry spaces need to be safe, storytelling spaces (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). We understand, too, that narrative inquiry spaces need to be in sustained relationships and intentionally focused on "telling, retelling, and reliving stories" of experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998, p. 253). We also know that these narrative inquiry spaces, while they need to be within sustained relationships, can happen informally and in brief temporal moments (Cave & Clandinin, 2007).

The narrative inquiry spaces we highlighted above are inquiry spaces filled with uncertainty, the uncertainty that comes with not knowing and with the opening up of self to inquire into felt tensions (Clandinin, Murphy, Huber, & Murray-Orr, 2010).⁷ Living at the heart of these kinds of narrative inquiry spaces is the understanding that “the educational promise of storytelling” emerges “when storytelling becomes part of our inquiry into what it means to live an educated life and what conditions are educational” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998, p. 251). We wonder if these dimensions of narrative inquiry spaces are similar for children and youth in their school curriculum-making worlds and in their familial curriculum-making worlds.

In other places we have written about narrative inquiry spaces we shaped with children and youth, such as peace candle gatherings (Huber, 1999; Huber, Murphy, & Clandinin, 2003), response groups (Chung & Clandinin, 2009), report card found poetry (Murphy, 2004; Murphy, 2011), and, inquiry into memory boxes (Huber et al., 2011). As we think again about these spaces we note that while each of these narrative inquiry spaces were situated in the school curriculum-making world, there were, at times, spaces where children told and retold stories lived in their familial curriculum-making worlds. While we were not yet awake to the familial curriculum-making world as we earlier engaged in these spaces alongside children, we cite these examples as possibilities that might encourage other imaginative practices.

In moving forward, what seems significant is that in acknowledging the familial world of curriculum making and the school world of curriculum making as two distinct places where we may be constructed differently and construct ourselves differently, the possibility of “arrogant perception” as well as the possibility of “loving perception” is opened up (Lugones, 1987, p. 8).⁸ It is in *playfulness* that Lugones finds hope in shifting from arrogant perception to loving perception. In Lugones’ (1987) words, “playfulness is, in part, an openness to being a fool, which is a combination of not worrying about competence, not being self-important, not taking norms as sacred and finding ambiguity and double edges a source of wisdom and delight” (p. 17).

We realize that little, if anything, experienced in the meeting of children’s familial curriculum-making worlds and school curriculum-making worlds is playful. As we inquired into the ways in which Orie and Loyla experienced the performance enacted as part of Loyla’s school curriculum-making world we saw no openings for playfulness. The only forward-looking story that seemed possible from this interaction was the already dominant story of judging and blaming. In earlier work Keats Whelan and colleagues wrote that

when blaming starts to happen we, as story tellers and story lovers, immediately construct protective walls around ourselves and our stories. In doing so, we are kept from each other and from imagining each other's worlds. There is no conversation, no possibility for imagining new stories. (Keats Whelan, Huber, Rose, Davies, & Clandinin, 2001, p. 149)

We realize we do not yet know enough about familial curriculum-making worlds to describe the possibility of narrative inquiry spaces in those worlds. We also recognize that our narrative inquiry alongside Loyla and Orié in their home, and alongside the additional children and families with whom we engaged in inquiry in their homes (Huber et al., 2011) was initiated by us as three narrative inquirers who entered into their familial curriculum-making worlds. We wonder if in future narrative inquiries we might begin to learn more about these inquiry spaces on familial landscapes. We wonder too about the possibilities of in-between spaces where children can inquire into their embodied tensions as they world travel each day, each week, each month, each year between the two curriculum-making worlds of home and community, and school.

Notes

1. We draw on Connelly and Clandinin's (2006) understanding of narrative inquiry, that is: "People shape their daily lives by stories of who they and others are and as they interpret their past in terms of these stories. Story, in the current idiom, is a portal through which their experience of the world enters the world and by which their experience of the world is interpreted and made personally meaningful. Viewed this way, narrative is the phenomenon studied in inquiry. Narrative inquiry, the study of experience as story, then, is first and foremost a way of thinking about experience. Narrative inquiry as a methodology entails a view of the phenomenon. To use narrative inquiry methodology is to adopt a particular narrative view of experience as phenomena under study" (p. 477).

2. We engaged in our narrative inquiry over 5 years and came into relationship with multiple children, ranging in age from 4 to 10 years old, and their families and teachers. In two sites we participated in classrooms. In each site we engaged with specific children and their families in more intensive conversations. Teachers in each site also engaged in conversations with us. In the third site, which we describe in this paper, we participated in inquiry in one family's home alongside Loyla and Orié. As we negotiated the inquiry with Loyla and Orié and all participants, we were guided by the relational, multiperspectival nature of narrative inquiry. From September 2008 to August 2009 Janice engaged in a series of audio-recorded conversations with Orié, and sometimes with Orié and Loyla. These conversations, along with artifacts from home and school, field notes of conversations and events, and Orié's journal entries, were field texts.
3. The concept of curriculum making has been used in the educational literature for many years (Bobbitt, 1924, 1926; Campbell & Caswell, 1935; Hopkins, 1941). At first the concept applied mostly to teachers and others who attended to curriculum making in relation to the mandated or planned curriculum, that is, to curriculum documents or plans and to curriculum materials. We draw mostly on Clandinin and Connelly's 1992 work on curriculum making which builds on Deweyan (1938) notions of experience and education and Schwab's (1969) ideas of curriculum. Curriculum making in the ways it is usually used, seems to focus on teachers and others outside of classrooms as making curriculum. For Hopkins (1941), and for Campbell and Caswell (1935) who stated "[e]very teacher is a curriculum maker" (p. 468), the focus was on the teacher. The focus was not, for the most part, on children as curriculum makers. We, however, do see children and others as central in curriculum making (Clandinin et al., 2006).
4. In response to identity questions that teachers ask, Connelly and Clandinin (1999) developed the idea of *stories to live by* as a narrative way to understand the connections among teachers' knowledge, contexts, and identities. Stories to live by are a narrative way of thinking about identity.
5. In order to move from field texts to interim research texts and research texts we worked within the three commonplaces of narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006), which entail an exploration of temporality (past, present, and future), sociality (the dialectic between inner and outer/the personal and social), and place (the concrete physicality of the place or places in which experiences are lived out and told). To think narratively, a simultaneous exploration of all commonplaces is necessary; one commonplace cannot be emphasized without

inclusion of the others, for all three “specify dimensions of an inquiry space” (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006, p. 479). We composed, shared, and negotiated interim research texts that allowed for the voice and signature of both researchers and participants (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Murphy, 2004; Huber & Keats Whelan, 2001).

6. Clandinin and Connelly (1995) describe *cover stories* as the stories teachers tell on out-of-classroom places on their professional knowledge landscapes as a way to appear as though their lived practice is in line with dominant school stories and stories of school.
7. As we earlier attended to the place of tensions in narrative inquiry we highlighted (Clandinin et al., 2010) that “for many teachers, and indeed for many people, tensions are thought to have a negative valence, that is, tensions are something to be avoided or smoothed over. If there are tensions evident in a school it is usually seen as a problem” (p. 82). Through years of engaging in narrative inquiries we now understand “tensions in a more relational way,” that is, that the “tensions . . . lived between people, events, or things . . . [shape] a space between (p. 83)”, a space with much potential for inquiry.
8. As Lugones (1987) wrote, “To the extent that we learn to perceive others arrogantly or come to see them only as products of arrogant perception and continue to perceive them that way, we fail to identify with them—fail to love them—in this particularly deep way” (p. 8). Lugones explained the complex ideas of *world* travelling with loving perception and noted that this requires us to see how we are constructed in an other’s world, how we are constructed in our world, how we construct an other in our world, and how we construct an other in an other’s world. It is, Lugones wrote, through travelling to each other’s “worlds” that enables “us to be through loving each other” (p. 8).

References

- Bobbitt, F. (1924, 1975). The new technique of curriculum-making. *The Elementary School Journal*, 75, 70–77.
- Bobbitt, F. (1926). The orientation of the curriculum-maker. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *The foundations and technique of curriculum construction, part II the foundations of curriculum making. The 26th yearbook of NSSE*. Bloomington, IN: Public School Publishing, 1935, 41–55.
- Campbell, D. S., & Caswell, H. L. (1935). *Curriculum development*. New York: American Book Company.

- Cave, M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2007). Learning to live with being a physician. *Reflective Practice*, 8(1), 75–91.
- Chung, S., & Clandinin, D. J. (2009). The interwoven stories of teachers, families and children in curriculum making. In M. Miller Marsh & T. Turner-Vorbeck (Eds.), *Mis understanding families: Learning from real families in our schools* (pp. 179–195). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 363–401). New York: Macmillan.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1998). Asking questions about telling stories. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Writing educational biography: Explorations in qualitative research* (pp. 245–253). New York: Garland.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, D. J., Huber, J., Huber, M., Murphy, M. S., Murray-Orr, A., Pearce, M., & Steeves, P. (2006). *Composing diverse identities: Narrative inquiries into the interwoven lives of children and teachers*. London: Routledge.
- Clandinin, D. J., Murphy, M. S., & Huber, J. (2011). Familial curriculum making: Re-shaping the curriculum making of teacher education. *International Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 17(1), 9–31.
- Clandinin, D. J., Murphy, M. S., Huber, J., & Murray-Orr, A. (2010). Negotiating narrative inquiries: Living in a tension-filled midst. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 81–90.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice* (p. 184). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 477–487). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Craig, C. (1995). Safe places on the professional knowledge landscape: Knowledge communities. In D. J. Clandinin & F. M. Connelly, Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes. (pp 137–141). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938, 1997). *Experience and education*. New York: Touchstone.
- Hopkins, L. T. (1941). *Interaction: The democratic process*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co.
- Huber, J. (1999). Listening to children on the landscape. In F. M. Connelly & D. J. Clandinin (Eds.), *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice* (pp. 9–19). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huber, J., & Clandinin, D. J. (2005). Living in tension: Negotiating a curriculum of lives on the professional knowledge landscape. In J. Brophy & S. Pinnegar (Eds.), *Learning from research on teaching: Perspective, methodology, and representation (Advances in Research on Teaching, Volume 11)*, (pp. 313–336). Kidlington, Oxford, UK: Elsevier Ltd.
- Huber, J., & Keats Whelan, K. (2001). Beyond the still pond: Community as growing edges. *Reflective Practice*, 2(2), 221–236.
- Huber, J., Murphy, M. S., & Clandinin, D. J. (2003). Creating communities of cultural imagination: Negotiating a curriculum of diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 33(4), 343–362.
- Huber, J., Murphy, M. S., & Clandinin, D. J. (2011). *Places of curriculum making: Narrative inquiries into children's lives in motion*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Keats Whelan, K., Huber, J., Rose, C., Davies, A., & Clandinin, D. J. (2001). Telling and retelling our stories on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 7(2), 143–156.
- Lugones, M. (1987). Playfulness, "world"-traveling, and loving perception. *Hypatia*, 2(2), 3–19.
- Murphy, M. S. (2004). *Understanding children's knowledge: A narrative inquiry into school experiences*. Unpublished Dissertation/ Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Murphy, M. S. (2011). Poetry from report cards: Children's understanding of themselves in relationship to their teachers. In C. Craig & L. Deretchin (Eds.), *Cultivating curious and creative minds* (pp. 245–261). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review*, 1, 1–23.



M. Shaun Murphy, PhD, is an Associate Professor in Curriculum Studies at the University of Saskatchewan. He was a primary schoolteacher for 20 years. Shaun co-authored *Composing Diverse Identities: Narrative Inquiries into the Interwoven Lives of Children and Teachers* (Routledge, 2006) and *Places of Curriculum Making: Children's Lives in Motion* (Emerald, 2011). His current research interests are in mathematics education, curriculum, familial curriculum making, and teacher and student identity.



Janice Huber is an Associate Professor in pre-service and graduate teacher education at the University of Regina. She is a former elementary teacher and teacher researcher who, with Karen Keats Whelan, coauthored a relational, paper-formatted doctoral dissertation. Growing from doctoral and post-doctoral study, Janice's collaborative narrative inquiries and publications, including *Composing Diverse Identities: Narrative Inquiries into the Interwoven Lives of Children and Teachers* (Routledge, 2006) and *Places of Curriculum Making: Children's Lives in Motion* (Emerald, 2011), continue to explore narrative understandings of identity in relation with Aboriginal teachers and Elders in Canada and in relation with the curriculum-, identity-, and assessment-making experiences of children, families, and teachers.



D. Jean Clandinin is Professor and Director, Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development, University of Alberta. A former teacher, counselor, and psychologist, she co-authored with F. Michael Connelly four books and many chapters and articles. Their most recent book is *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. Jean also co-authored *Composing Diverse Identities: Narrative Inquiries into the Interwoven Lives of Children and Teachers* (Routledge, 2006) and *Places of Curriculum Making: Children's Lives in Motion* (Emerald, 2011). Jean is currently working on a narrative inquiry with youth and families of Aboriginal heritage as well as on a narrative inquiry with teachers who leave teaching within the first five years of teaching.