Philosophy of Education Through Narrative Pedagogy: Educationally Meaningful Storied Changes in the SARS Context

Roger H. M. Cheng
Department of Educational Administration and Policy
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

This paper begins with an initial meaning of philosophy of education through narrative pedagogy, illustrated by the author's own story for narrative quest. It points to the triadic interplay in narratives among authors, narrators and readers in determining the meanings of stories. Three further sections explore a second meaning, i.e., explicating the nature, the significance and the practice of narrative pedagogy for educationally meaningful storied changes. Built upon seven stories of how teaching colleagues at the CUHK coped with the SARS outbreak and other responding papers, it provides layers of narrative analysis drawing on "narrative philosophy". It also illustrates narrative in terms of significantly unified moments, necessarily involving three moments of a story: the past, the present and the future; or in other words, the beginning, the middle

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Roger Cheng, Department of Educational Administration and Policy, Faculty of Education, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong. E-mail: rogercheng@alumni.cuhk.net

(as the plot under "emplotment") and the ending. Further, it exemplifies as-
pects of narrative pedagogy as a narrative art putting narrative inquiry into
teaching practice. The last section ends with some critical comments on the
limits of these series of narrative papers.

Key words: philosophy of education; narrative pedagogy; storied changes;
            educational meaning; SARS

Two Meanings of Philosophy of Education Through Narrative Pedagogy

Among all manuscripts in this special issue, although mine was the last
written, it would not and could not be the final words as David expected (in
"The Hero's Journey"). It is a truth in narrative thinking that the last in
terms of temporality could not be final in terms of narrative understanding;
otherwise, the last one of the human species to die could determine the
meaning of human destiny. Narrative thinking is as ancient as human be-
ings' lives on earth, before Aristotle and before Confucius. What marks the
present is its non-finality, as well as other complexities. Indeed, narrative
thinking in a post-modern age would not allow final words, like a grand
narrative telling us all about everything (though the pre-modern and mod-
ern thinkers would have their respective types of grand narratives). Instead,
every narrative tells us something while multiple interactions among narra-
tives tell us, through continuous disclosure, more meanings beyond the
summation of their contents. Perhaps this special issue aptly and strongly
illustrates this disclosing feature of narrative thinking.

What might be expected of philosophical perspectives on a narrative
approach to teaching and learning in the context of higher education? In
terms of disciplines, there are many sources of narrative thinking: philosophy,
psychology, language studies, literary theory, historical studies,
anthropology, and others. Even within philosophy, narrative thinking has
its roots in diverse contemporary figures such as Alastair MacIntyre (1985),

Charles Taylor (1989), Paul Ricoeur (1991), to name just a few; and their antecedents dating back to Aristotle (1976). In philosophy of religion, one can read the Bible of Christianity as a narrative of divinity in humanity. Therefore, this is not a purely philosophical paper devoted to discussing a variety of narrative ways of thinking by these philosophers, but instead is an attempt to draw on some important philosophical lines of narrative thinking for educational concerns related to the storied changes in higher education during the SARS outbreak. Thus, the title of this paper is ambiguous as it can allow two interpretations. Firstly, it is a self-narrative paper about how to teach philosophy of education through narrative pedagogy. Secondly, it is a philosophical paper about education through narrative pedagogy, with respect to seven stories and related responding papers in this special issue.

What brings people into narrative interests? What happens in the change from a past moment of having no interests in narrative thinking whatsoever to a present moment of growing interests in narrative matters, while expecting a future moment of deeper narrative understanding and better narrative art? David and Carmel have their own stories shared in their papers. So do I on one's "storied changes". Pursuing along the line as Klagge (2001) argued in his edited essays that a philosopher's autobiography may provide a telling version of his philosophical thinking, the author would like to share the following story of Dr. Cheng (Cheng 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2001):

> Since January 1995, Dr. Cheng has been teaching philosophy of education at the Faculty of Education, CUHK. 2004 is his tenth year of a teaching career in higher education. Throughout the decade of his teaching career, a pedagogical question has been posing on him: "How should I teach philosophy of education to undergraduates, student-teachers and research students?" For undergraduates, philosophy of education should contribute to their liberal education (as part of general education). For teachers, philosophy of education should contribute to their professional education (as part of teacher education). For postgraduate students, philosophy of education should contribute to their research (as part of scholarly education). All of these three lines converge on the dimension of personal

education, making significance to student's personal development, for example, through the narrative form of self-understanding. An accidental interview conducted in December 1999 with a retired teacher educator in the Chinese Mainland, who shared her life of forty years in the autobiographical narrative form, has marked a watershed leading to his narrative turn—his narrative way of doing philosophy of education. After that event, Dr. Cheng became convinced that narrative inquiry could be employed to help answering many puzzles and decided to spend a month at the Centre for Teacher Development of the OISE of the University of Toronto as Visiting Professor learning the narrative inquiry from Prof. Connelly and his colleagues in the summer of 2000. When returned, he embarked on his narrative way of doing philosophy of education in both research and teaching. He submitted a research project on "narrative inquiry into the storied lives of teacher educators" to the Research Grants Council in September 2000 and got funded in summer 2001. Since then, he fully adapted the narrative approach to his educational practice, thereby developing the idea of narrative pedagogy. Accordingly, during the process of teaching and learning, students are helped to integrate theory and practice through their experiences in the form of telling and reading stories about themselves and others. A teacher can play an important role in employing the narrative art in connecting past, present and future through the story form in making sense of student's learning experiences, which include the way teacher taught as an integral part. During the SARS outbreak in 2003, Dr. Cheng employed the narrative pedagogy in teacher education—to equip teachers to teach values concerning life and death in schools in making sense of the SARS lived experience. Later in the autumn of 2003 when the editor of a journal decided to devote one special issue to the narrative approach to teaching and learning in higher education, Dr. Cheng is delighted to share his philosophy of education through narrative pedagogy.

Why would I use a third-person voice of speech to story my first-person narrative quest? Its strangeness, or detachment of narrator's voice from the author's character, is intended to illuminate the first feature on narrative, namely triadic interplay among author(s), narrator(s) and reader(s) in determining the meanings of a story. Even in a single-person self-narration,

when I tell myself a story about my own life, we can conceptually distinguish three parties involved in a narrative activity: author (the one who lives the story), narrator (the one who tells the story) and reader (the one who reads or listens to the story). Narratives involve the triadic interplay among authors (A), narrators (N) and readers (R) together dealing with determinacy (D) of meanings of storied experiences. I called such triadic interplay: "rDNA Model—reforming DNA". It tries to recall, or ridicule, the tendency of believing that DNA totally determines most of our lives. If DNA largely determines our being or becoming, what differences can education make to human lives? Peters (1963) says education involves reform in making human beings better by bringing about desirable changes. However, narrativists have a counter-belief that it is narrative which opens up determinacy (to indeterminacy) and it is the narrative act which determines meanings of our lives (including experiences). Just reflect on this moment of your reading of this journal: "How many authors, narrators and readers are there in this special issue determining the meanings of a period of higher education experiences during SARS outbreak as storied in these papers?" The next section will provide further analysis along this path. Meanwhile, let us turn to the second meaning of the title of this paper: why would philosophical perspectives be expected in a narrative approach in education?

As David Chan in his editorial explained, this special issue marks a special beginning against a publication history with a bias towards quantitative research over qualitative research; in some ways it is a re-opening of the case of the history of the publishable versus the unpublishable. In their papers, David Chan and Carmel McNaught have shared a great deal about the divide and imbalance between the quantitative and the qualitative. In such a cold war, what position should philosophy of education take? As Giarelli and Chambliss (1988) argued, philosophy of education constitutes one form of qualitative inquiry. It is by no means that philosophy has no say in quantitative inquiry—just think about formal logic. If research methodology is bound to be divided into two camps, namely the quantitative and the qualitative, then philosophy of education would definitely find its greater

affinity in the qualitative family. What makes a study qualitative? In a chapter answering the same question, Eisner (1998, Ch. 2) listed six characteristics of qualitative research as follows:

1. First, qualitative studies tend to be field focused;
2. A second characteristic of qualitative studies relates to the self as an instrument;
3. A third feature that makes a study qualitative is its interpretive character;
4. A fourth feature that qualitative studies display, particularly educational criticism, is the use of expressive language and the presence of the voice in text;
5. A fifth feature of qualitative studies is their attention to particulars; and
6. A sixth feature of qualitative studies pertains to the criteria for success — qualitative research becomes believable because of its coherence, insight and instrumental utility.

David Chan's own story leading to narrative psychotherapy, seven educational stories of the CUHK colleagues coping with SARS outbreak, Carmel McNaught's attempt to capture the experience and Roger Cheng's own quest for narrative pedagogy all share some, if not all, of these six features. For instance, higher education, when SARS broke out, became a field so focused that experiences must be very special (just like experiences of the dirty team in the hospitals dealing with the SARS patients being so special, demanding field-focused studies). CUHK should do something about the SARS interruption to teaching. As Chair of the Task Force, a unique position, Jack Cheng needs to put forward himself as an instrument to reveal the process of building a network to support health, education and community needs. In doing so, he needs to employ the expressive use of language in his story, as the work of the CUHK SARS Task Force has a unique particular focus, although allowing many interpretations from others. Then Carmel and David have "used" his story (cohered with other stories) in bringing

insight to readers. Thus, in this case, usefulness constitutes one justification for the narrative approach. Are there other reasons?

What Is the Meaning of Narrative in Education?

Philosophically, we can distinguish three positions for the narrative approach (in general), i.e., minimalist (the weakest), moderatist (the moderate), and maximalist (the strongest) as follows:

1. Minimalists think that, in structuring human experiences temporally (qualitative as revealed through time), narrative inquiry is an effective (and affective) way of capturing the meaning of all or some sorts of human experience, while other inquiries (e.g., quantitative) could be equally effective. Thus, narrative inquiry is desirable (for some or all situations) but not necessary. The underlying value is convenience or usefulness.

2. Moderatists think that some sorts of human experiences are necessarily temporal (qualitative as revealed through time) and hence only narrative inquiry can capture the full meaning of these sorts of human experience, leaving other inquiries (e.g., quantitative) totally ineffective specifically for these situations. Thus, narrative inquiry is not just desirable, but necessary for some situations. The underlying value is necessity and refinement, though confined.

3. Maximalists think that all sorts of human experiences are necessarily temporal (qualitative as revealed through time) and hence only narrative inquiry can capture the full meaning of all sorts of human experience, leaving other inquiries (e.g., quantitative) partially ineffective generally for all situations. Thus, narrative inquiry is not just desirable, but necessary for all situations. The underlying value is necessity and fullness, however non-final (or open).

Since educational experience is one sort (as a sub-category) among other sorts of human experience, narrative inquiry in education could also as-

sume the three positions mentioned above. Thus, educational meaning of experience, or meaning of educational experience, may or must be revealed through stories.

Readers may share the following feelings of mine—a quick labeling exercise. Obviously, authors of these seven stories may or may not be committing themselves to a positive stance towards the narrative approach; if they joined, they were at most minimalists. David, as he confesses in his editorial, is experiencing his change from the skeptical or neutral stance (shared among his colleagues and readers) to positive inclination towards the narrative minimalist in particular and the qualitative approaches in general. Carmel is definitely revealing herself a moderatist in her editorial solicitation of these stories and in her using narrative to explore relationships between crisis, innovation and pedagogy—all related to contingencies and changes. Will Roger Cheng be a moderatist marching towards a maximalist?

To answer the last question, we need to have a quick march over 20th century philosophy of sciences (natural sciences and human sciences). We can easily divide philosophy of sciences into two basic camps, the positivist and the anti-positivist (or the post-positivist, including the hermeneutic and the post-modern stances), just as it would be too simple (Pring, 2001) to divide philosophical perspectives into two main types, namely scientific philosophy and narrative philosophy. However, these two pairs of dichotomies are sufficiently enlightening for philosophy of educational studies (as human sciences). There is a large literature on these fields (details can be read from Bruner, 1996; Carr, 1995; Dunne & Hogan, 2003; Eisner, 1998; Polkinghorn, 1988; Pring, 2001). Over-extended discussion in this paper would be too long and over-indulgent in the author's "own family quarrels". In brief terms, scientific philosophy only allows deductive and inductive methods, both quantitative. In opposition, narrative philosophy (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; MacInytre, 1985; Ricoeur, 1991; Taylor, 1989) argues by mostly moderatists or maximalists for the qualitative extreme that experiences are by nature qualitative and temporal, and some signifi-

cant aspects of experiences can only be made sense of by narrative forms, i.e., storied experiences. Here I offer three distinguishing criteria for such pair of divides: (1) understanding; (2) voice; and (3) practice, as explored in this and the following two sections respectively.

Firstly, as Jerome Bruner (1996, p. 39) argued, there have been two basic forms of thinking, namely logico-scientific thinking and narrative thinking and he recognized "narrative as a mode of thought and as a vehicle of meaning making". Embedded in these forms of thinking are two respective forms of understanding: nomological understanding and narrative understanding. Sciences are aimed at generalizing particular cases into law-governed understanding. Thus, induction and deduction are main methods of thinking. However, based on analogy, metaphors and other modes of thinking, narrative inquiry is aimed at unifying the three moments of experiences, namely the past, the present and the future, into a meaningful whole. Many narrativists, including MacInytre (1985) and Ricoeur (1991), will call this narrative unity. Ricoeur (1991) called such act "emplotment" —providing the missing middle in between the beginning and the ending. I called it: "SUM Model"—significantly unified moments constitute narrative unity, a totality being more than mere sum. This echoes what Carmel articulates about the aim of this issue: gaining some understanding about how teachers in higher education in Hong Kong coped during the SARS crisis of March to June 2003. Thus, the form of understanding here is narrative in nature. Quantitative research leads to logico-scientific understanding while narrative understanding forms qualitative research, attentive to particulars.

Secondly, sciences prefer the third-person mode of speech, allowing the researchers to report experiences of others like a third party. Thus, both the first-person voice of the researchers and the first-person voice of the experiences-owners are not allowed, not welcome in their research for it to be scientific. What would be the best language, if defying first-person voices, for scientific research? It is the language of quantities. Therefore, for research to be scholarly and publisable, first and last would be based on

quantitative thinking. Here I congratulate the editors, David in particular, on breaking the history in this special issue, marking the beginning for allowing the first-person voices to be expressed, including those of the authors, narrators and readers as well (though spoken through other voices). The next section will illustrate the significance of voice in the story of the missing middle.

Thirdly, is teaching a science or an art? Scientific philosophy of education strives for the scientific pedagogy while narrative philosophy of education appreciates the qualitative features within narrative pedagogy, as one form of the narrative art. The fourth section will illustrate how the narrative pedagogy could be and should be an artistic practice, a narrative art of making educationally meaningful storied changes.

Why Are Educational Stories Meaningful?

Why are educational stories meaningful? A full answer demands firstly an answer to the basic question in philosophy of education: "What is the meaning of education?" However, this basic question is ambiguous in two senses. Firstly, it asks for a clarification of what the concept of education means, what its nature is. Secondly, it requests spelling out the significance, or desirability, or values of education. It is not difficult to find in the literature of educational studies (e.g., Cheng, 1999; Frankena, 1965; Peters, 1963) writing on the nature or aims of education. Education is learning (through experience) leading to desirable changes, including attitudes (A), skills (S) and knowledge (K) in learners. When teaching this proposition to my students in philosophy of education, the author puts this into an easily memorized model, called: "ASK Learners Model". Learning is definitive of teaching. One needs to ask learners how good the teacher taught. According to Hirst (1971, p. 171), "A teaching activity is the activity of a person, A (the teacher), the intention of which is to bring about an activity (learning), by a person, B (the pupil), the intention of which is to achieve some end state (e.g., knowing, appreciating) whose object is X (e.g., a belief, attitude,

skill)." Thus, teaching is an intentional way of bringing about learning of some specifiable content in some specific learners.

From the seven SARS stories, the conventional ways of the intentional ways of teaching needed to be changed; otherwise, the intended content would not have been learned by the intended learners. What these stories told us is the teachers' willingness to find alternative manners of teaching, other measures to convey the same message, more means to meet the ends. This illustrates the very idea of narrative pedagogy that pedagogical processes need to be attentive to particular context in which teachers and learners are bound to make suitable change for educational meanings to emerge, just like speakers in a conversation need to change their listening attitudes and skills for adapting the flow of exchange. (We may see more of this in the next section on Nancy Diekelmann (2002) on narrative pedagogy.) Narrative pedagogy is employment of the narrative art in making education meaningful to learners. As we have clarified that narrative is constituted by significantly unified moments, which could be divided into the past, the

Narrative unity ("SUM")	Past moment	Present moment	Future moment
Three moments of a story	*In the beginning*	*During the middle (the plot under emplotment)*	*In the end(ing)*
Example 1: The story of Pinocchio	Once upon a time, there was a wooden puppet, Pinocchio, who wished to be a real boy.	Having experienced vicious acts of his and others, Pinocchio learned to live out a life of virtues, including truthfulness, courage and unselfishness.	Finally and happily, Pinocchio became a real boy, free from being controlled by strings (and vicious forces).
Example 2: Sharon's story of the narrative lesson	Before the lecture, Sharon knew nothing about "narrative inquiry", but she always loves to read	During the lecture, the instructor helped Sharon and other classmates to experience how	After the lecture, Sharon now knows how to read a story narratively, and to extend

	all sorts of stories — she meant fictions and biographies, to be exact.	moments of past, present and future could be "emploted" to form a narrative unity and the same story could be narrated differently.	her narrative understanding to other texts, films, political events and real lives.
Example 3: Seven stories of CUHK colleagues during SARS outbreak	Before the outbreak of SARS, teaching strategies (and institutional support) have been planned and conducted in such and such manner accordingly (A for According to).	During the outbreak of SARS, teaching strategies (and institutional support) have been brought about some changes to so and so manner (B/C for Changes Brought).	After the outbreak of SARS or during its later stage or, new teaching strategies (and institutional support) have been conceived to have resulted in some and some desirable changes (D for Desirability).

present and the future, the following tabulated form of moving from narrative thinking in general to narrative pedagogy in particular is embodied in the seven SARS stories.

The underlined (i.e. A, B/C and D), to be filled in blanks, in Example 3, are contents of the seven stories that readers could find with details in author's own papers. Here I save my job by just highlighting their narrative form in common (i.e., before was A, in between was B/C and after was D) as Carmel has already provided useful highlights in her two papers representing the narrator's and reader's roles that she has assumed. The first (editorial) paper has shown clearly that Carmel has been very self-conscious in her intent to solicit the voices of the authors of these seven papers, as she titled it: "capturing the voice of experience". In such a soliciting act, she is but necessarily involved like a narrator, helping the authors to provide suitable forms (i.e., expressive modes of using language) to their experiences (as contents) to produce stories. Questions, guidelines, contexts, tabulated comparisons and even co-actions are provided by her to these authors in order to bring their "real stories" to become "storied texts". And in her essay she declared explicitly and sincerely that "in the process described

above I tried to act as an enabler, as an aid for clarification." Her next paragraph following this sentence could be read like a confession. Then Carmel could be pardoned by readers in the second, analytical paper as she joins us as a critical reader.

Between the beginning (A) and the ending (D), what changes (B/C) have been brought about? What has been called for is the missing middle, i.e., the plot under emplotment, in between the beginning and the ending. The following schemas or examples may help:

Three moments of a story	In the beginning	During the middle (the plot under emplotment)	In the end(ing)
Story of Hungry X	Once there was a man fond of eating who was very hungry.		Finally he died.
Story of Hungry Y	Once there was a man fond of eating who was very hungry.		Finally he died.

Readers can hardly differentiate two hungry men, X and Y, merely by the beginning and the ending. Everyone sooner or later died for some reasons. Are X and Y both died because of hunger? Only the plot, the absent middle, could tell. Here are two instances of emplotment:

Three moments of a story	In the beginning	During the middle (the plot under emplotment)	In the end(ing)
Story of Hungry X	Once there was a man fond of eating who was very hungry.	He ate all available food more than he could digest.	Finally he died.
Story of Hungry Y	Once there was a man fond of eating who was very hungry.	He shared all available food to others who were hungry and ate too little.	Finally he died.

What characters of X and Y could readers tell from these two present middles? One may comment: X is aggressive and Y is charitable. But one may criticize: both are foolish, or equally lack of self-regulation. These two

stories leave to readers to judge as narrative art opens up a space of interpretation, inviting all sorts of judgment. The narrative art constitutive of narrative pedagogy triggers storied changes, helping students to tell stories which are telling, based on their experiences, in making sense of educational stories.

How Is Narrative Pedagogy to Be Practised?

To employ the narrative inquiry in teaching practice leading to narrative pedagogy, we need to make a distinction between method and phenomenon, or the way and the content. Are the two terms "narrative" and "story" equivocal? Is narrative inquiry just an eloquent speech for storytelling, or are there some subtle distinctions worth clarifying? Connelly and Clandinin (1991, p. 121) have made a very succinct clarification in the following paragraph worth quoting as follows:

> It is equally correct to say "inquiry into narrative" as it is "narrative inquiry". By this we mean that narrative is both phenomenon and method. Narrative names the structured quality of experience to be studied, and it names the patterns of inquiry for its study. To preserve this distinction we use the reasonably well established device of calling the phenomenon "story" and the inquiry "narrative". Thus, we say that people by nature lead storied lives and tell stories of those lives, while narrative researchers describe such lives, collect stories of them, and write narratives of experience.

When put into teaching practice, narrative inquiry is transformed into narrative pedagogy. Is there only one form of narrative pedagogy provided that it is a narrative art? If it is a narrative art, there should not be only one form. But to learn the art, one needs to begin with one or two forms. Thanks to Carmel whose paper drew my attention to works on narrative pedagogy of others in other places on the globe. For instance, Nancy Diekelmann develops her idea of narrative pedagogy in nursing education. She says (Diekelmann, 2002):

My research in Narrative Pedagogy contributes to developing the science of nursing education. Narrative Pedagogy is a research-based nursing pedagogy —that arises out of the shared experiences of students, teachers and clinicians. It emanates out of my current research utilizing interpretive phenomenology to analyze the lived experiences of students, teachers and clinicians in nursing education.

She further qualified what she meant by narrative pedagogy:

1. Narrative pedagogy is committed to practical discourse that describes the wisdom and practical knowledge gained through experience of schooling, learning and teaching.

2. Narrative pedagogy is unending converging conversations.

3. Narrative pedagogy is a recovery of the embodied experiences of schooling, learning and teaching.

Will there be fourth or fifth features? Readers need not take any of these features as individually necessarily, nor all of them jointly sufficiently for a pedagogical practice to be narrative. These serve as some aspects of Diekelmann's own narrative quest, a quest that authors of stories in this issue embark on. As Clandinin and Connelly (2000) illustrated, each narrativist has his or her own discovery on narrative inquiry, illuminating aspects of narrative pedagogy.

Thanks for Carmel's recalling (in her second paper) lessons learned from Ludwig Wittgenstein, as I had devoted my master and doctorate theses to research in Wittgensteinian philosophy. One of the best lessons that I have learned from the Wittgensteinian philosophy is the method of attention to particulars (Savickey, 1999, Ch. 7; Wittgenstein, 1953), the fifth feature of the qualitative studies (Eisner, 1998, Ch. 2). To combine the three features characterized by Diekelmann with Wittgenstenian method of attending to particulars into narrative pedagogy, we need one further technique, i.e., what Kearney (2002) called "the excluded middle" or what Ricoeur (1991) called "emplotment".

In his preface to his book, Kearney (2002, p. xi) shared how his father

influenced him on narrative art within a family upbringing surrounded by storytellers:

> The tale of his [my father] I recall the best is that of a mysterious Jacky Dory, which lasted some ten seconds and went like this—"I'll tell you a story about Jacky Dory … (pause) … and that is the end of the story." My six siblings and I were fascinated by this story of the excluded middle and spent much of our time as children trying to draw the secret from our father—without success.

Thus, from Kearney's recall, one important feature of narrative pedagogy as a narrative art could be found as follows: "What triggers the change, i.e., the plot, constitutive of narrative understanding?" It is the missing middle in between the beginning and the ending that can trigger the narrative imagination (Nussbaum, 1997, Ch. 3) of learners to make sense of the past and the future by the present. The following is just a thin way of exemplifying the practice of narrative pedagogy.

Case A on missing middles. Look at the following two stories concerning: "How was the lecture attended?" If readers know nothing in the middle but only the same beginning and the same ending, we can hardly tell the differences between them, as for stories A1 and A2. We could easily conclude that these two stories are the same.

Three moments of a story	*In the beginning*	*During the middle (the plot under emplotment)*	*In the end(ing)*
Story A1	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants.		When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants.
Story A2	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants.		When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants.

Case B on imagined middles. Ask the students to imagine possible missing middles for two stories to make them into different stories. For instance, for B1, the lecture was badly attended but for B2, the lecture was well attended, though both had the same number of attendants in the begin-

ning and in the ending. Why are they different, one being poor attendance and another good attendance? Let them share their interpretations and alternatives plots among the class. Instructor can just solicit their imagined middles by nurturing their narrative imagination. Instructor may or may not provide his or her example(s) depending on whether instructional examples could further trigger their narrative imagination (Nussbaum, 1997, Ch. 3). Here are some examples.

Three moments of a story	*In the beginning*	*During the middle (the plot under emplotment)*	*In the end(ing)*
Story B1	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants.	They felt bored but stayed until the end because they were afraid of letting the lecturer lose face.	When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants.
Story B2	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants.	They felt excited and wanted to stay until learning everything from the lecturer.	When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants.

Case C on triggered triad. Ask the students to trigger not just the missing middles, but also the beginning and the ending for two stories to make them into different stories. Sharing within the class is essential but some sort of private writing beforehand may be useful as students would actually be engaged in autonomous learning. I usually use the threefold technique of "one, some and all"—one for autonomous learning, some for group learning and all for public debate. Let each student do some individual writing first. Then ask them to break voluntarily into groups for group sharing. Afterwards, let them share among the class publicly, facing open confrontation and challenges, sometimes with hostility. At each interface, instructor may play the role of facilitator or of a chair for a phone-in program. The aim is to make the classroom a public space enriched by varieties of voices —voices of students as authors, as narrators and as (critical) readers. Here are some examples.

Three moments of a story	In the beginning	During the middle (the plot under emplotment)	In the end(ing)
Story C1	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants, all being compulsory undergraduate course-subscribers having no choice.	Five felt excited and called their friends to come. Fifteen attendants felt bored —ten stayed until the end because they were afraid of letting the lecturer lose face and five left during the break. Five newcomers came in.	When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants. (Afterwards, five dropped the course. Five newcomers happened to be research students.)
Story C2	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants, among which five being research students coming to audit the lessons while other fifteen are compulsory undergraduate course-subscribers.	Ten undergraduates and five research students felt excited and wanted to stay until learning everything from the lecturer. Five felt bored but were curious of reasons why others in the class seemingly found something excited, therefore wanting to stay and find out.	When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants. (What will happen afterwards?)

If I were the instructor in this class, I would ask: "Do you find any connection between story C1 and story C2?" Answer: C2 could be a sequel to C1. If I found the most learned student, e.g., Sharon, in the class (see Example 2 on Sharon's story of the narrative lesson in the section "Why Are Educational Stories Meaningful?"), I would ask her to share what she has learned (about narratives as storied changes) from these examples. After such "depth sharing", each student would be requested to write a story about his or her learning in between from the beginning to the end of the lesson, i.e., storied changes.

Such way of triadic questioning could be unendingly continued: ask further what happened in the missing middle. Then the missing middle could be further differentiated into three phases with a missing middle. Then continue to ask each phase for further missing middle. This exercise could be extended to imagining the missing part(s) in the beginning or in the ending. In short, narrative pedagogy is attentive to the plot, the changes in between not just on the part of the learners but also on that of the teachers. Or, most of the time, changes are interactive between learners and teachers.

The above line of explicating narrative pedagogy has a significant implication to the evaluation issue: "How good is the teaching?" Could the quantity of attendants tell the full story? From Case A, via Case B, to Case C, we learned that quantity could at best tell part of the whole story. We need to know the changes in between the beginning and the ending. Furthermore, if we pay attention to the quantitative aspects of the cases to the qualitative aspects, i.e., desirable qualitative changes like the change from ignorance to knowledge, we need to inquire into the missing middle as follows:

Three moments of a story	In the beginning	During the middle (the plot under emplotment)	In the end(ing)
Story K1	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants who know nothing about K.	Plot as storied changes: what happened in between (accounting for desirable changes)?	When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants, some of which know something about K.
Story K2	When the lecture started, there were twenty attendants who know nothing about K.	Plot as storied changes: what happened in between (accounting for no or little changes)?	When the lecture ended, there were twenty attendants, some of which know nothing about K.

Even if we know that students changed from ignorance to knowledge in a lesson (e.g., by pre-lesson test and post-lesson test), but fuller meaning

could only be grasped by finding the missing middle, i.e., what changes teaching has brought about in some students but not others. Teachers who are employing narrative pedagogy would be very self-conscious and artful about the plot as storied changes. They are aware of the development of story K1 and story K2 and can distinguish them. In short, they know the plots and know how to emplot. It is not about quantity, but about quality. Thus, storied changes are in need. This is why narrative approach to teaching and learning is important and contributory. It is hoped that the above has sufficiently illustrated how embodied experiences of learning and teaching are voiced through practical discourse in conducting unending converging conversations as characterized by Nancy Diekelmann (2002).

Beyond the Seven and More Stories in the SARS Context

This special issue is about higher education during SARS outbreak. What narrative approach as one form of qualitative studies defies most is the inattentiveness to qualitative nature of experience expressible in the first-person voice. Just think about that if there were two reports on SARS casualties in Hong Kong from March to June 2003, one saying 299 and other 300. For quantitative inquirers, the difference is one and the percentage error is acceptable. But if you were family members of the missing one death, the difference is intolerable, as it involves all sorts of experiences, miserable and emotionally upset, which are essentially qualitative. Just think about their happiness of togetherness before the SARS, the fear and sorrow during the SARS affection, and the anger and injustice after the SARS (casualty report). To capture the experience, we need personal narratives.

To capture a communally shared experience like SARS, personal narratives are just the beginning. Not a single personal narrative could suffice to tell the social narratives shared by Hong Kong citizens, but a number of personal narratives and organizational narratives could be informative of how social narratives could be imagined. Perhaps this is one significant contribution that this special issue has made, or could have made. There are

taxonomies of narratives. In this issue, we may just divide narratives into three types, not exclusively: personal, organizational (institutional) and so-cial narratives. (But social narratives could be further differentiated into ethnic narratives, family narratives and communal narratives.) Within this special issue, four personal narratives and three organizational narratives are made sense of by a larger narrative connected by an expanding group of constituents, i.e., by the *ERJ* participants, including authors, editors and readers. At least, seven personal and organizational narratives have consti-tuted a set of social narratives of the CUHK colleagues who made desirable changes during a crisis. This line of extension is hoped to be informative of the larger narratives, from Hong Kong to the globe, like rings spreading outwards. Thus, authors of seven stories and narrators of the editorial team have just started an unending story, breaking a history of publication in the *ERJ*, just as the SARS outbreak has started a history of narrative pedagogy in the CUHK. In my paper, I do not intend to claim that all of these seven stories have been employing narrative pedagogy, not withstanding whether they were self-conscious of that. But instead, the very idea of narrative pedagogy delineated in this paper may serve as an ideal for which we could strive for, beginning with our teaching experiences during the SARS out-break—in relating crisis, innovation and pedagogy (as Carmel says) and in telling (and re-telling) our educational stories which could tell more about our future (as David says about telling alternative stories in narrative psychotherapy)

So far, this paper has explored the first meaning of philosophy of edu-cation through narrative pedagogy illustrated by the author's own story for narrative quest, and spent three sections on the second meaning in explicat-ing the nature, the significance and the practice of narrative pedagogy for educationally meaningful storied changes. To end this paper now may fail an expectation of some readers since philosophy is bound to be connected with critique of some kind, like an original sin. Thus, the following will critically reflect on some limits of the series of papers on narratives, leading to mainly three critical comments.

First of all is the absence of the voice of learners. Definitely, it is a strength in this series of paper solicited and analyzed by Carmel that readers know what teaching colleagues though during the SARS outbreak and made desirable changes. Carmel helped us a lot in suggesting three themes, namely, making connections, developing confidence and maintaining focus, summarized in Table 2 of her second paper as an interpretation of the seven narratives. All are very rich. But there has been a missing party, namely, voices of learners involved. Perhaps as a special issue already made sizable due to a series of teacher's narratives and their meta-analyses, this may be excusable. Nevertheless, as I have delineated in the "ASK Learner Model" above, education in general and teaching in particular could hardly leave the voices of learners unheard and expressed, especially their personal experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998). Perhaps all of the tables in this paper have illustrated the point that narrative pedagogy is storied changes between teachers and learners over time. Without learner's voice in the dialogue, it would be just monologue for teachers to tell their own stories, however telling.

Secondly, as David responded to these papers in the editorial and in the analytical paper, narrative psychotherapy (McLeod, 1997) is dealing with telling alternative stories in making better sense of one's experience with the effect of empowerment (gaining more power) or heartening (comforting one's heart). It is essential to know how authors of the seven stories felt after putting their (private) "lived stories" into (publicized) "storied texts", especially when embedded in a series of responses and meta-analyses. How do they feel after "composing their lives" (Bateson, 1989) or "expressing their personal experiences" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998)? In what ways did they feel empowered? Is the idea of narrative pedagogy helpful for them to make better stories, retrospectively and prospectively? Thus, their narratives have not ended at all. Teaching colleagues may reflect on their storied changes to make further changes but with a higher level of narrative consciousness or narrative art. Nevertheless, this is not a criticism at all, but just a limit to be mentioned in order for powerful commentators to feel comfortable.

Thirdly, it is my own apology. I could have done or lived better. As David mentioned in his editorial, I experienced a serious burnout, once a conceptual construct, at least from November to December 2003. Here is the part of Dr. Cheng's story missing in the first section:

> Dr. Cheng has felt increasingly excited along his narrative quest since December 1994 when he completed his PhD thesis in which he already developed roots of a ten-year research agenda with narrative self-understanding as the core. ... During the SARS outbreak in 2003, Dr. Cheng employed the narrative pedagogy in teacher education—to equip teachers to teach values concerning life and death in schools in making sense of the SARS lived experience. Later in the summer of 2003 when Prof. David Chan, the Editor of the ERJ, approached him discussing the possibility of devoting one special issue to the narrative approach to teaching and learning in higher education based on several teacher's stories of the CUHK during SARS outbreak, Dr. Cheng was delighted to share his philosophy of education through narrative pedagogy. However, since September when the first term started, he was increasingly burning out, a fact that he was not aware of. When, in auditing a counseling class in early November, he filled out a burnout questionnaire and scored the highest, he still thought of burnout as a conceptual construct. After his return of an academic trip from Nanjing and Suzhou in mid-November, he felt loss of energy and confidence in his once normal work. His doctor diagnosed serious burnout in him, demanding a rest, retreat and release for one and half months. What does such experiencing burnout mean? What about the promise to write the narrative paper for ERJ?

What is the intention of supplementing this missing part? Does the narrator want to provide an excuse for the quality of this paper, if not just the lateness? Or, there lies a personal meaning that could be made sense of by readers for themselves? Perhaps the absence is partly constitutive of the presence. This is how I see the role of Glenn Shive in this special issue. Many personal narratives, including those expressed in psychotherapeutic treatment, helps the authors themselves in their narration disclose and uncover the once-present, now-absent significant events or significant others. I could have done or lived better. This is the lesson learned from auto-

narratives.

Is this paper a postscript? In a sense, yes. It is written after all other manuscripts have been drafted and the author has taken advantages of such situation (partly due to his lateness deferred by the personal burnout problem). In another sense, no. While this paper is based on the past, i.e., their manuscripts, most authors wrote with expectations of the future, i.e., what Roger would respond from the philosophical perspective, as part of an un-certain whole. They all have their own expectations of what a philosopher should react. This paper may have failed some but fulfilled others. This is exactly the predicament of teaching (in higher education) and narrative peda-gogy courageously embraces such predicament: let experiences of teaching and learning be storied. Teachers (in the present) teach learners who all have their own experiences (from the past) and expectations (of the future) (McEwan & Egan, 1995). Teaching is, requited from David's quote, the hero's journey—a journey unto life and death (e.g., lived experience of learn-ers and death threat during the SARS outbreak that Carmel suggested we capture), a journey unto contingency and meaningfulness (e.g., making of this special issue involving a silent, late partner like Roger and once-present, later-absent partner like Glenn), a journey into controversy (between quan-titative and qualitative research specially issued by David) and openness (to readers' responses, i.e., yours).

References

Aristotle. (1976). *Nicomanchean ethics* (J. A. K. Thomson, Trans.). Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Bateson, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life.* New York: Grove Press.

Bruner, J. (1996) *The culture of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carr, W. (1995). *For education: Towards critical educational inquiry.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Cheng, H. M. R. (1999). Education requiring contextualized epistemology: Restruc-

turing knowledge-based education into quality-based education in contexts. *Education Journal, 27*(1), 137–158.

Cheng, H. M. R. (2000a). The threefold knowledge of teachers as educational practitioners: Knowledge of the goods (ends), self-knowledge and problem-solving knowledge. In R. Davies (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain* (pp. 114–122). U.K.: PESGB.

Cheng, H. M. R. (2000b, April). *My story and the narrative methodology for teacher development and educational research: Values in narrative (self-) understanding.* Paper presented during the visit to the CTD, OSIE, University of Toronto.

Cheng, H. M. R. (2000c, October). *Philosophical thinking on qualities of teachers: From an interview with professor Lu Jie on the way of teaching to the narrative inquiry in teacher education* (in Chinese). Paper presented at the International Conference on Reform on Basic Education and Teacher Education, Nanjing Normal University.

Cheng, H. M. R. (2001). Narrative pedagogy for teacher education and moral education: Action research on autobiographical narratives on "how has a teacher's heart been cultivated?" (in Chinese). In X. M. Zhu (Ed.), *Teacher education turning towards professionalization in the new century* (pp. 147–164). Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1998). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Linclon (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp.150–178). London: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1991). Narrative inquiry: Storied experience. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 121–153). New York: SUNY Press.

Diekelmann, N. (2002). *Schooling, learning and teaching: Toward a narrative pedagogy.* Retrieved January 8, 2004, from http://www.son.wisc.edu/diekelmann/research/slt/index.html

Dunne, J., & Hogan, P. (Eds.). (2003). *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 37*(2). Special Issue: Education and practice: Upholding the integrity of teaching and learning

Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Frankena, W. (1965). *Three historical philosophies of education: Aristotle, Kant & Dewey.* Glenview: Scott.

Giarelli, J. M., & Chambliss, J. J. (1988) Philosophy of education as qualitative inquiry. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods* (pp. 30–43). London: Falmer Press.

Kearney, R. (2002). *On stories.* London: Routledge.

Klagge, J. C. (2001). *Wittgenstein: Biography and philosophy.* Cambridge: CUP.

MacIntyre, A. (1985). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (2nd ed.). London: Duckworth.

McEwan, H., & Egan K. (Eds.). (1995). *Narrative in teaching, learning and research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McLeod, J. (1997). *Narrative and psychotherapy.* London: SAGE.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Peters, R. S. (1963). *Ethics and education.* London: Duckworth.

Polkinghorn, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences.* New York: SUNY Press.

Pring, R. (2001). *Philosophy of educational research.* London: Continuum.

Ricoeur, P. (1991). Life in quest of narrative. In D. Wood (Ed.), *On Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and interpretation* (pp. 20–33). London: Routldge.

Savickey, B. (1999). *Wittgenstein's art of investigation.* London: Routledge.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity.* Cambridge: CUP.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). New York: Macmillan.