



ELSEVIER

Linguistics and Education 15 (2004) 3–32

**Linguistics
and
Education**

www.elsevier.com/locate/linged

Close- and open-ended narratives of personal experience: weekly meetings among a supervisor and teaching assistants of a “Japanese language education practicum”

Matthew Burdelski

*Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, University of California, Los Angeles,
290 Royce Hall, Box 951540, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1540, USA*

Keywords: Narrative; Teacher-training; Discourse; Japanese language education

1. Introduction

The notion of reflection has been familiar to teacher education since Dewey (1933) suggested that the combined practices of action and thinking form the basis of teacher learning. Over the past two decades, teacher educators (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986; Clark, 1995, 2001; Witherall & Noddings, 1991) and second language teacher educators (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000: chap. 12; Edge, 1992; Gebhard, Hashimoto, Joe, & Lee, 1999; Olshtain & Kupferberg, 1998; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Wallace, 1991) have shed light on narrative as a powerful tool of reflection.

A number of researchers have examined narratives of personal experience as a means through which reflection is organized and articulated (Bruner, 1991), as a tool for fostering professional development (Clark, 1995; Connelly & Clandinin, 1995), and as a way of displaying personal identities (Stahl, 1989). Summarizing research on narrative in both oral and written modalities, Witherall and Noddings (1991, p. 8) write:

“The power of narrative and dialogue as contributors to reflective awareness in teachers and students is that they provide opportunities for *deepened relations with others*”

E-mail address: mburdel@ucla.edu.

0898-5898/\$ – see front matter © 2004 Published by Elsevier Inc.

doi:10.1016/j.linged.2004.10.002

... Understanding the narrative and contextual dimensions of human actors can lead to new insights, compassionate judgment, and the creation of *shared knowledge* and meanings that can inform professional practice.” (emphasis mine)

This view suggests that narrative contributes to two broad goals of teacher education, including creating shared knowledge of teaching practices and learning strategies (Shulman, 1987), and building a community that provides opportunity for self-expression and reflection (Westheimer, 1992).

In comparison to other forms of talk in interaction, narrative is a temporal and logical ordering of events, driven by a need to establish coherence across past, present, and future experience (Ochs & Capps, 2001). Relevant to any narrative are the components ‘setting’, ‘unexpected event’, ‘psychological response’, ‘attempt’, and ‘consequence’ (ibid., p. 173), which in this study will be crucial to understanding the role of narrative among expert and novice teacher educators in terms of knowledge building and professional development.

Despite research on narrative in everyday conversation (Goodwin, 1984, 1989; Jefferson, 1978; Lerner, 1992; Mandelbaum, 1993; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Schegloff, 1996), teacher education has not necessarily taken multi-party interaction as a primary locus of analysis. An assumption has been that narrative primarily resides within an individual author, as illustrated through written questionnaires and interviews with a researcher or facilitator who provides a relatively passive audience. As a result, teacher education lacks a clear understanding of narrative as an interactive process, embedded within situated talk and activity, and its relationship to professional development. Towards these ends, we need to investigate the relationship between professional roles and the structure of narrative; how professional roles and experiences make possible (and constrain) narrative; and the role of narrative within the practices and goals that constitute a group.

The present paper addresses these issues by examining narratives of personal experience as they emerged within supervisor-teaching assistant (TA) talk during weekly meetings. The findings reveal that the supervisor played a crucial role in narrative discourse, using her own CLOSE-ENDED narratives to justify a position or make suggestions for future courses of action by the group, and giving meaning to TAs’ OPEN-ENDED narratives in written journals and group discussion by suggesting future courses of action and conveying personal understandings of teaching. The implications will suggest that structured, iterative reflection with a supervisor (and peer group) focusing on specific issues and goals contributes to professional development.

2. “Japanese language education practicum”

The course that the supervisor and four graduate teaching assistants (TAs) co-taught was a “seminar” (*zemi*) on teaching Japanese as a second language, titled “Japanese language education practicum” (*nihongo kyooiku jisshuu*) at a large public university in Japan (“National University”¹). The course was a combined graduate and undergraduate course

¹ All proper names, except in reference to the author, are pseudonyms.

held for 18 weeks,² meeting once a week for approximately 2 h each.³ Seminars were in a large room furnished with movable desk chairs, an arrangement that enabled whole-class activities and small-group work. In order to meet the needs of various student teacher backgrounds including novice and experienced student teachers, at the beginning of the course the supervisor divided the class into three small groups of five students each,⁴ appointing one to two TA “coordinators” (*koodineetaa*) per group.⁵ During small-group work, the supervisor circulated among the three groups, primarily listening and occasionally providing feedback on the groups’ discussions and activities. In addition to small-group work, there were whole-class activities, generally led by the TAs. Thus, while the TAs had a primary role in leading seminar activities, the supervisor mainly played a supporting role. This structure of the course provided TAs with a great deal of autonomy to lead the course. As will be seen in the analysis, the supervisor’s expressed need to guide students towards her ways of doing sometimes conflicted with her need to provide them with autonomy.

The stated goals of the course were to introduce students to general topics in teaching Japanese as a second language, and to provide students with reflective training through in-seminar “microteaching” (*maikurotiichingu*) (see Gebhard et al., 1999) and out-of-seminar “actual practice” (*jisshuu*).⁶ In Weeks 1–15, the in-seminar activities included the following five topics: (I) learner needs analysis (Weeks 2–3), (II) classroom materials (Weeks 2–4), (III) syllabus design (Weeks 5–6 and 10–11), (IV) error correction (Week 7), and (V) microteaching (Weeks 7–9 and Weeks 11–15). In Weeks 16–18, 10 of the 15 students⁷ were to teach an out-of-seminar three-week course of elementary Japanese to a group of novice learners.⁸ These topics will become relevant later in the analysis of narratives of personal experience.

The supervisor was an assistant professor with over 10 years of experience training students in teaching Japanese as a second language at the university level, including 3 years at the present university, and thus was an expert teacher educator. While the TAs (3 male, 1

² The 18-week course began in April (start of Japanese academic year) and lasted until October, less 2 months for summer vacation.

³ The typical seminar in the department at this university is held once a week for 1.5–2 h. The supervisor announced on the first day of the course, in response to the large number of students who appeared, in order to “weed out” students who were not fully committed, that this course would demand many more hours of their time outside the usual seminar hours compared with a typical course in this department.

⁴ Three groups were formed based on the following criteria and were given the following titles: students currently teaching or tutoring one or more learners (“Group A”), students with teaching experience but who were not currently teaching (“Group B”), and students with no prior teaching experience (“Group C”).

⁵ Group coordinators and brief profiles were as follows: Group A: (Miyuki: female, post-graduate “assistant” (*joshu*), several years experience in university classroom teaching); Group B: (Yuuji: male; graduate student, age: upper 20s, 5 years experience teaching subject courses to Japanese primary school children, and Matt (author): male, graduate research student, age: 32, 5 years experience teaching English and Japanese at university level); Group C: (Manabu: male, graduate student, age: mid 20s, several months experience leading conversational tables, one-on-one tutoring).

⁶ Goals of the course are from the course “report” (*hookokusho*) (see footnote 11 below).

⁷ The 10 students chosen to teach the mini-course came from Group B to Group C, as they were not currently teaching or tutoring (see footnote 4 above).

⁸ The learners attending the mini-course were to have come from a variety of East and Southeast Asian countries attending the university as part of a training program in the biosciences.

female) had had various levels of teaching experience (1 month to several years) in various educational contexts (e.g., primary school classroom, university classroom, conversational tables), none had had prior experience training other teachers. In this respect, the TAs were novice teacher educators. In their relationships with student teachers, however, the TAs were more or less expert teachers.

Having been a student teacher in this course the previous year, I participated in the course in the present year as a TA at the invitation of the supervisor. Although the only non-native speaker of Japanese, my proficiency in oral and written Japanese was sufficient to carry out the duties of the course. Thus, my main role in the course was as a TA, rather than a researcher, and the present topic emerged after the completion of the course. As a TA, I attended both weekly meetings and seminars in which I took notes during whole-class activities and discussions within my small groups. Given this context of participation, these notes did not have the present research topic in mind, although they later became useful to tie the talk during meetings to what occurred during seminar activities. Where notes were not sufficient or where I was neither an observer nor a participant in the interaction, I asked other TAs and the supervisor for assistance with clarification.

2.1. *Weekly meetings and data corpus*

During the course, the supervisor and TAs held weekly meetings in the supervisor's office, which lasted approximately one and a half hours each. The office furnishings included a large rectangular table around which the meetings took place. These meetings were audio-recorded in order to keep a record of the talk and for later analysis. An external mike provided good sound quality.

The talk during these meetings had characteristics of both formal and informal talk in interaction. It was formal in a sense that each week the supervisor and TAs rotated roles of meeting "facilitator" (*shikai*). The emergent roles of the facilitator included nominating topics of discussion, writing them down as the meeting agenda, and monitoring their progress. The facilitator also had a role in allocating turns at talk, particularly within the practices of discussing journals and TAs' reporting on small-group work. In contrast, the talk was informal in a sense that turns at talk were often not allocated, as could be seen in spontaneous requests for clarification, continuers, assessments, comments, suggestions, as well as pauses, overlaps, restarts, and laughter.

In these ways, the talk was dialogic (as in the discussion groups investigated by others (Bailey et al., 1997; Clark, 2001)) rather than transmission-oriented. In particular, instead of directing the TAs on what to do, the supervisor engaged them, in her words, in "reflection" (*hansee*), as well as negotiated with them teaching plans for subsequent seminars. The supervisor's self-described approach to working with TAs and student teachers combined 'cooperative development' (Edge, 1992)⁹ and reflective teaching (Schön, 1987). During

⁹ A model of teacher professional development that describes activities for developing the ability to interact cooperatively. These are based on nine abilities, divided into three categories: Exploration (attending, reflecting, focusing), Discovery (thematising, challenging, disclosing), and Action (goal-setting, trialling, and planning) (Edge, 1992, p. 13).

meetings, the supervisor provided opportunities for self-expression and negotiation, rather than dictating the nature of talk with subordinates (Lacey, 1977). In this way, the supervisor promoted equality within the group by giving individuals an opportunity to reflect and contribute to planning.

Crucial to understanding the role of narratives of personal experience in the talk during these meetings were the practices in which they emerged. Specifically there were three: (a) “sharing and discussing written journals” (*jaanaru kookan*), (b) “reporting on small-group work” (*katsudoo hookoku*) by the TAs from the previous seminar, and (c) “planning for the next week” (*raishuu yotee*). In particular, as part of a reflective approach, the supervisor suggested at the first meeting that everyone write in a journal each week and then share these at the following meeting, to which all the TAs agreed. The journals were personal and individual written narratives that on occasion served as a point of departure for oral narratives.

While the analysis will examine narrative in terms of these three practices in more detail, suffice it to say here that narratives by the TAs principally emerged within practices (a) and (b), while narratives by the supervisor principally emerged within (c). The three practices were not necessarily linear or mutually exclusive. In particular, while planning was an item on the agenda each week and dealt with as a topic in its own right, talk about planning pervaded the other two practices of journals and reporting, in the forms of TAs expressing concerns about “what to do” and the supervisor making suggestions in terms of future courses of action. In sum, the talk was agenda driven, but flowed across the past, present, and future, driven in part by narratives of personal experience.

The main data for the present paper are transcripts of the audio-recorded meetings from Weeks 3 to 11 of the course.¹⁰ In addition, supplemental data shed light on in-class activities, goals, as well as underlying tensions that help shed light on the role of narrative during these meetings. These data include notes from seminars, supervisor and TA follow-up interviews and written journal entries, and a “written report” (*hookokusho*) summarizing the goals and activities of the course.¹¹ Since the author did not ask participants to directly interpret their utterances, the reader should view the following analysis in this light.

3. Data: narratives of personal experience

Narrative was not the only discourse genre in these supervisor-TA meetings. The talk included reporting and summary. Since narrative can include the aforementioned structures, it was crucial to define narrative for the purposes of the present analysis. As mentioned earlier, a basic property of narrative is temporality (past, present, and unrealized; continuous and discontinuous), constructed through grammar and other linguistic means that situate an event in time. Other discourse genres such as reporting and summary, however, share this

¹⁰ The TAs (including the author) and the supervisor transcribed the audio-recorded meetings.

¹¹ This is a collaboratively produced 247-page “report” by the supervisor, teaching assistants, and students, which states the goals of the course, summarizes each seminar meeting, and outlines the mini-course. The document is published at the end of every academic year by the university department.

organizing feature. Thus, temporality alone was not sufficient as a definition of narrative for the purposes of this analysis. A candidate narrative had to be primarily located in the past and have two or more of the following components: ‘setting’, ‘unexpected event’, ‘psychological response’, ‘attempt’, and ‘consequence’ (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p. 173). These conditions excluded from the analysis simple reporting and summary. Given these criteria, there were 33 narratives of personal experience (6 by the supervisor and 27 by the TAs) in the data corpus. We now examine features of these narratives in terms of supervisor-TA interaction and professional development.

3.1. *Practices, surrounding discourse, and development of narrative*

Two features of oral narratives by the supervisor and TAs during these meetings included the practices in which they occurred and the surrounding discourse, which included talk leading up to and immediately following narrative. The initial analysis will be in relation to narratives by the supervisor. We will examine in particular how the supervisor played a crucial role in response turns to TA narratives, providing meaning in terms of consequences for future action as well as personal understandings of teaching.

3.1.1. *Supervisor: planning and TAs’ concerns*

In terms of the relationship between narrative and activity, 5 out of 6 of the supervisor’s narratives occurred within talk concerning planning for a subsequent seminar. Furthermore, all of the supervisor’s narratives concerning planning (5 out of 5) were in response to a prior turn by a TA that displayed some immediate concern vis-à-vis a course of action. An illustration of these two features in relation to narratives by the supervisor is excerpt (1). In the talk leading up to this excerpt, the group had been discussing a plan for a seminar in 2 weeks (Week 7) that would include doing a whole-class activity of microteaching. During microteaching, one of the students was to play the role of *teacher*, who would teach a 20-minute lesson in Japanese. The other students were to be divided into two groups: *learners*, who would directly participate in interaction with the *teacher*, and *observers*, who would sit off to the side and write their observations of either the *students* or *teacher*. Following this activity, all seminar participants, but particularly the *observers*, were to be invited to give verbal feedback to the *teacher*. In anticipation of this feedback, the supervisor proposed giving a “lecture” (*rekuchaa*) to the students on how to give feedback to peers before having them share their observations. In particular, the supervisor stated through self-quotation that she would tell the students, “don’t say things like that is bad or this is bad” (*are wa dame kore wa dame to iu na to ka*). These instructions would provide the students with rules for giving feedback, in which students were to describe what they could objectively “see” (such as the use of error correction and classroom space), with the intention of creating ‘feedback with face’ (Edge, 1984). After summarizing the plans for the microteaching and ensuing peer feedback, the supervisor finished her turn with a question addressed to the group, “How about that (plan)?” (*to iu no wa doo desu ka*). Following this question, we observe Manabu’s (one of the TAs) response (see the appendix for the list of conventions and interlinear symbols used in the transcripts):

sion with a colleague who had suggested she write a book chapter titled “A Teacher’s Day” (*kyooshi no ichinichi*). As stated by the supervisor, the chapter could provide a “map” (*chizu*) to student teachers about their future. After relating that she had interviewed several teachers about their daily work and wanted to share these with student teachers, the supervisor provided the TA with the following suggestion in response to his concern:

(2) Supervisor’s suggestion following her “A Teacher’s Day” narrative (Week 4)

- 1...44 Superv: ((“A Teacher’s Day” narrative))
- 45 dakara, hitotsu no shudan toshite wa: (.)
so one-CLS LK means as TOP
‘So, as one means,’ (.)
- 46 tatoeba Hanedasan toka Morisan toka tsuretekite, (.)
for.example name-TL etc. name-TL etc. bring-CNJ
‘bring over (to your group) someone like Miss Haneda or Miss Morita (from one of the other groups) for example,’ (.)
- 47 de atashi wa koo naru madeni kooiu
and I TOP like.this become up.to this.kind
‘And (have them say to your novice student teachers) something like’
- 48 keeken o shita toka ne.
experience ACC do:PST etc. PP
‘to get up to this point I’ve had these kinds of experiences’.
- 49 soo yuu [hanashi o.
that say talk ACC
‘That kind of talk.’
- 50 Manabu: [a:
ah
‘Ah:’
- 51 n: a: ii kamoshirenai.
mm ah good might
‘Mm: ah: that might be good.’

As seen in lines 45–49, in providing a narrative, the supervisor related the ‘consequences’ of the narrative to the TA’s concern of creating a “link” between expert and novice student teachers. In particular, the supervisor suggested having one or more experienced student teachers talk to the novice student teachers about their previous experiences. Although she primarily addressed this narrative to an individual TA, the supervisor implicated other co-present TAs in the suggestion of future action, which was to involve collaboration among the other small groups. Though not implemented in the way the supervisor had suggested here despite an aligning response (line 50), the notion of creating a link between novice and experienced student teachers became a central issue in the talk in meetings, as seen in transcripts of further meetings and notes from seminars. In particular, the whole-class activity of microteaching (Weeks 7–9 and 11–15) came to involve novice student teachers observing and getting feedback from experienced student teachers. In sum, the above excerpt suggests hearing TAs’ concerns triggered narratives by the su-

In this excerpt, the supervisor coaxes a TA into elaborating an event he had referred to in his journal. The supervisor's initial utterance (line 1), while giving the TA a reason to decline a multi-turn response for not being "very necessary to ask," makes relevant an extended telling in part through the affectively loaded word "trauma", which characterizes a particular kind of event to which the TA himself had referred. This narrative will be analyzed fully in excerpt (6); here we can point out that the supervisor used the structured activity of discussing journal entries and the rules of engagement as meeting facilitator to initiate a telling from a TA that, though not related to a particular teaching task, she deemed relevant for group consumption.

In addition to the supervisor, TAs initiated extended talk from each other when they had the role of meeting facilitator, although in different ways from the supervisor. In particular, the TA facilitator would prompt each TA to relate the activities done in their small groups in the previous seminar. In excerpt (4), Manabu (TA), who was the meeting facilitator that day, prompts Miyuki (TA) to report on the previous seminar.

(4) Initiation of "Writing lesson plans" narrative (Week 3)

- 1 Manabu: ja, toriaezu hookoku to iu koto desu kara,
 well first.of.all report QT say thing COP:POL since
 'Well, since we'll have reports first of all.'
- 2 'A' guruupu no hoo, kyoo no koto o onegaishimasu.
 A group LK side today LK thing ACC please:POL
 'Group A please tell about today's things (=small group work).'
- 3...94 Miyuki: ((report that expands to narrative))

In contrast to the supervisor's initiation in excerpt (3) above, Manabu's turn in lines 1 and 2 does nothing special to initiate more than a report, and similar initiation turns on other occasions led only to reports.

With respect to the development of narrative in these meetings, it is crucial to consider the role of hearers. Immediately following this prompt, Miyuki (coordinator of "Group A") began with an individually authored report. In her report, she said that following a whole-class activity, in which one of the TAs gave a presentation on materials for classroom learning, during small-group work her group had discussed the kinds of activities they did as teachers in the past and plan to do in the future. She then summarized saying, "many things became clear" (*ironna koto ga akira ni nattekite . . .*). Following this turn, a TA (Matt) requested clarification saying, "for example what kinds of (things became clear)?" (*tatoeba donna?*). Miyuki then expanded her report by relating the talk within her small group, which revealed underlying tensions based on the students different approaches to teaching. In particular, she conveyed a 'psychological response' regarding her change in thinking in relation to two of the students saying, "I felt that the two of them are quite different (in their approaches to teaching compared with the rest of the group)" (*chotto futari to wa chigau kana to iu kanji desu*). In concluding, she confirmed it was her students' various "backgrounds" (*bakkugurando*) or approaches to teaching that she came to understand more clearly. In addition to requests for clarification, other responses from hearers contributed to shaping the talk including other requests for clarification (by the supervisor), continuers

(‘Mm-hm’ by a TA), affirmation (‘Yes’ by the supervisor), and assessment (laughter by the supervisor). The role of hearers in co-constructing narrative was similar in relation to other narratives in the data corpus.

In sum, in contrast to narratives by the supervisor, which emerged within talk about planning in response to an immediate TA concern, narratives by the TAs emerged within discussions of journals and reporting, which were structured in terms of the rules of engagement. Furthermore, the role of hearers was crucial in shaping narrative outcomes.

3.2. *Structural and linguistic features of the narratives*

In the previous section, we discussed two features of narrative by the supervisor and TAs in relation to reflection, future courses of action, and supervisor-TA talk, including the practices in which narratives emerged, and how hearers responded. In this section, we examine narratives in terms of structural and linguistic features, shedding light on social and professional roles, speaker stances, and knowledge building.

A relevant linguistic feature of supervisor-TA talk during these meetings was speech style, which contributed to organizing the reflective practices of this group as well as constituting social roles. In general, the use of speech style displays the speaker’s understanding of social relationships as well as the event. In Japanese, one means in which speech style is encoded is predicates, including verbal, adjectival, and nominal (Iwasaki, 2002; Martin, 1975). In the data corpus, the two speech styles utilized were ‘addressee honorifics’ (*masu/desu* endings, indicated in the interlinear gloss with POL [politeness marker]) and ‘abrupt forms’ (without *masu/desu* endings). In terms of narrative, the supervisor employed abrupt forms (96%, 47 out of 49 main clauses) much more often than addressee honorifics (4%, 2 out of 49 main clauses). In contrast, the TAs employed addressee honorifics (91%, 240 out of 264 main clauses) much more often than abrupt forms (9%, 24 out of 264 main clauses). An explanation for this finding is the hierarchical nature of supervisor-TA talk. From this perspective, despite the supervisor’s attempt to create equality within the group, speech styles reflected and constructed a social and professional hierarchy.

In addition to social and professional roles, the differing use of speech styles relates to event, in particular activity and action. Recall that narratives by the supervisor emerged in response to an immediate TA concern. Thus, the supervisor generally addressed her narratives to an individual as justification of a position already taken or to provide a context for a suggestion, though often implicating more than the addressed TA in a course of action due to the overlapping goals of the small groups. In this way, the supervisor’s use of abrupt forms concerns the nature of the immediate talk (informal) and action (e.g., suggestion, justification). In contrast, recall that narratives by the TAs emerged within the more structured practices of discussing journals and reporting on activities in the prior seminar, which were practices designed to initiate reflection. Thus, the TAs generally addressed their narratives to the group, rather than to an individual. In this way, the TAs’ use of addressee honorifics was related to the formality of the activity and the action of reflection for public consumption.

On occasion both the supervisor and TAs switched from addressee honorifics to abrupt forms and from abrupt forms to addressee honorifics respectively in their narratives, as indicated in the above figures, as well as in surrounding talk. The switching of speech style relates particularly to action (e.g., disagreement, clarification), which sheds lights on tensions of egalitarianism and hierarchy, raised again below.

3.2.1. Supervisor: CLOSE-ENDED narratives

In this section, we examine narratives by the supervisor in terms of narrative components, displays of authority, and construction of shared knowledge. Recall that in addition to temporality, narratives considered here had two or more of the following components: ‘setting’, ‘unexpected event’, ‘psychological response’, ‘attempt’, and ‘consequence’ (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p. 173). We will see how the component ‘setting’ was particularly crucial in the supervisor’s display of authority. We will also examine the role of Japanese pragmatic particles, and draw upon a follow-up interview with the supervisor to shed light on underlying tensions relevant to this supervisor-TA talk.

Excerpt (5), introduced earlier as excerpt (1), shows how narrative components, in particular ‘setting’, ‘unexpected event’, and ‘consequence’ constructed narratives by the supervisor. To review the earlier excerpt, the prior talk concerned planning for a whole-class activity (beginning in Week 7), which was to involve microteaching, peer observation, and feedback. In terms of anticipating peer feedback, the supervisor had stated in summarizing a plan that she would give a lecture to students on how to give feedback to their peers. In particular, she said the lecture would include telling the students “don’t say things like that is bad or this is bad” (*are wa dame kore wa dame to iu na to ka*). In other words, the supervisor would direct the students to not give “critical” (*kuritkaruna*) or negative feedback to their peers. Upon finishing the summary, she invited confirmation with a question addressed to the group, “How about that (plan)?” (*to iu no wa doo desu ka*). We again observe a TA’s (Manabu) response, and then the supervisor’s ensuing narrative, which attempts to guard her position from destabilization:

(5) "Not giving instructions" narrative and TA response (Week 5)

- | | | | |
|---|---------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Manabu: | ikkai nanimo nashide yatte miru tte iu no [mo (.)
one-CLS nothing exist:NEG do:CNJ try QT say NML too | |
| 2 | | °ii keeken kamoshirenai.°
good experience might
‘Trying to do it (microteaching) once (.) without anything (giving
instructions on how to give feedback) also °might be a good experience.°’ | |
| 3 | Superv: | | [°n n: :°
mm-hm
°Mm-hm: :° |
| 4 | | (2.1) | |
| 5 | | hito ni yu- sore o yucchau to,
person DAT say that ACCsay:ASP COND
‘If you say to a person- end up saying that (=“that is bad or this is bad”), | |

- 6 ningen kankee ga kowaretari toka shikanenai kara,
human relationship NOM break.etc. etc. can so
'human relationships can break down and the like so;'
- 7 (2.0)
- 8 °n: mae taihen datta no.°
um before tough COP:PST PP
'°Um; Before it was tough°,'
- 9 °Seidai no toki ni.°
name LK time LOC
'°when I was at Sei University.°'
- 10 sono (.) yonensee ga jisshuu yattete,
that 4th.yr.student NOM practicum do:ASP:CNJ
'Those (.) 4th-yr students were doing practicum teaching and,'
- 11 sannensee no kotachi ga mitai tte itte,
3rd.yr.student LK child:PL NOM see:DES QT say:CNJ
'the 3rd-yr students said they wanted to watch (the 4th-yr students) and'
- 12 mi ni itte,
see DAT go:CNJ
'they (=3rd-yr students) went to watch and,'
- 13 .h ichioo kansoo kaite moratte,
anyway impression write:CNJ receive:CNJ
'h anyway I had them (=3rd-yr students) write their impressions and,'
- 14 sore ga nanka (.) .h nanimo yuttenai kara,
that NOM like nothing say:ASP:NEG since
'that's like (.) .h since I hadn't said anything to them (=3rd-yr students) (about how to give feedback),'
- 15 totemo totemo hi- nanka (.)
very very cri- like
- 16 sugoku kuritkaruna kan[soo o kaiteshimatte,
really critical impression ACC end.up.writing:CNJ
'they (=3rd-yr students) ended up writing very very cri- like (.) really critical impressions,'
- 17 Miyuki: [hhhhh
- 18 Superv: yonensee ga moo: .h minnade kankanni [okoru no yo.
4th.year.student NOM EMP everyone SSW angry SE PP
'and the 4th-yr students .h were furious (at the time I saw them).'
- 19 Miyuki: [hhh
- 20 Superv: .hhh
- 21 [h nadameru no ni hitokuroosuru to iu (.)
calm.down NML to tough.to.do QT say
'h It was tough to calm them (=4th-yr students) down.'

- 22 Manabu: [n:
mm-hm
'Mm-hm.'
- 23 Superv: soo iu keeken o shita node. .hh
that say experience ACC do:PST because
'Because I've had that experience. .hh'
- 24 Manabu: he:.
really
'Really.'
- 25 demo sore nitsuite wa watashi warito shinraishiteru kedo.=
but that about TOP I relatively trust:ASP but
'Although in terms of that I relatively trust (my students not to give "critical"
feedback) but.'
- 26 Superv: =un:. dakara, maa (.) sor[ya nai to omo:u kedo:.,
yeah so well that-TOP NEG QT think but
'Yeah: So, well I thi:nk that kind of thing won't happen bu:t.'
- 27 Manabu: [ee.
yes
'Yes.'
- 28 (0.3)
- 29 Superv: anoo (1.5) wakarimasen yo. [dokkara nani ga deru ka wa.
um know:NEG:POL PP from.where what NOM appear Q TOP
'Um, (1.5) You don't know, what will come out from where (= who will make
what kind of comment).'
- 30 Manabu: [n.
mm-hm
'Mm-hm.'
- 31 (2.5)
- 32 Miyuki: ((as meeting facilitator, changes topic to the longer plans for the month))

In this excerpt, the narrative begins with the consequence of the event for the future. In particular, the supervisor articulates a condition-result relationship ('if X then Y'), first saying, "If you say to a person—end up saying that" (line 5). In this utterance, the deictic "that" (*sore*) refers to the supervisor's previous statement about instructing the students, "don't say things like that is bad or this is bad." In other words, the utterance is hearable as "If you say 'that is bad or this is bad,'" followed by the result, "human relationships are apt to break down." This initial utterance broadly establishes a causal relationship between past and unrealized experience that organizes the narrative.

Examining narrative components in more detail, following a psychological response of the event as "tough" (line 8), which casts a negative stance towards the upcoming talk, the supervisor explicates the setting (lines 9–13), first locating it in place and time ("when I was at Sei University"). Through setting, the supervisor positions herself in an authoritative role, as it was common understanding that the supervisor was also a teacher educator at another university several years ago.

Setting was a crucial component in a number of ways for displaying authority. Here the supervisor further articulates the setting as a series of actions, which involved third-year students observing fourth-year students teach, and then the supervisor having the third-year students write their impressions of the fourth-year students (lines 9–13). A crucial setting in the next turn, which is temporally discontinuous to the students' writing their observations, is the utterance "since I hadn't said anything to them" (line 14). In this utterance, the conjunctive marker "since" (*kara*) creates a causal link between the supervisor not saying anything to the third-year students before their observations, resulting in an unexpected event in which the third-year students wrote "critical" (negative) reports of the fourth-year students' teaching, which further leads to another unexpected event in which the fourth-year students became "furious." Through this casual link, the supervisor indirectly conveys that she views her own action (or lack of action) as bringing about the unexpected event. This link also positions the supervisor in a role of authority in terms of suggesting her responsibility for the students' action.

In relation to planning with the current group of TAs, the supervisor anticipates a potential problem in having the students share their observations of their peers following microteaching. She justifies how she will attempt to deal with this problem in the assertion, "Because I've had that kind of experience." In this turn, the use of another conjunctive marker "because" (*node*) is also a marker of causality. Thus, the turn is hearable as, "Because I've had that kind of experience, we/I need to give instructions to the students in how to give feedback to their peers." In these ways, the narrative is CLOSE-ENDED through causal organization, in particular the articulation of the consequences of the event for the future, and through the display of strong stances of authority.

Similar to the above excerpt, the supervisor's other narratives showed framed the consequences of experience in terms of goal-oriented activity. For instance, excerpt (2) ("A Teacher's Day" narrative) discussed earlier provided a context for a suggestion in response to a TA's (Manabu's) concern about wanting to create a link in the seminar between his group of novice student teachers and a group of experienced student teachers. In that excerpt, following a narrative in which she and a colleague had discussed a similar concern under the theme of expert-novice learning, the supervisor relayed an initial consequence that led to her interviewing teachers about their daily work and attempting to share those interviews with novice student teachers. A second consequence, which directly responded to the TA's concern was the suggestion to have one or more experienced student teachers tell the novice student teachers about their experiences related to teaching. The supervisor prefaced this suggestion with the conjunctive marker "so" (*dakara*) (excerpt (2), line 45), creating a causal link between the narrated events and consequence.

Returning to excerpt (5) above, in addition to the narrative component 'setting', the supervisor also displayed stances of authority through use of Japanese pragmatic particles. In Japanese, pragmatic particles, which are optional, are a crucial means of displaying speaker stance. In particular, pragmatic particles *yo* and *sa* index strong stances of authority (Morita, 2001, 2002), when they come at the end of intonation units (see Iwasaki, 1993). In particular, in the above narrative, in relation to the second unexpected event, the supervisor used the particle *yo* in the utterance, "and the 4th-yr students .h were furious yo" (line 18). Strong stances of authority displayed through pragmatic particles extended beyond the narrative proper, into turns following its completion. For instance, in relation to the TA's

non-aligning response above (line 25), the supervisor again used the pragmatic particle *yo* in the utterance, “You don’t know *yo*, what will come out from where (=who will make what kind of comment)” (line 29).

Analysis of uses of the pragmatic particles *yo* and *sa* in the supervisor’s six narratives reveals that the most frequently used of the particles was *sa* (10 tokens), followed by the particle *yo* (5 tokens), within a total of 134 intonation units. Thus, pragmatic particles were a crucial index of authoritative stance, which helped constitute the organization of the supervisor’s narratives and the building of knowledge among the group.

Despite displays of authoritative stance, talk during these meetings also suggests tensions between autonomy and guidance, and egalitarianism and hierarchy. As suggested earlier, rather than taking a top-down approach to working with TAs in which the supervisor would mainly direct TAs on what to do, the supervisor provided TAs with a great deal of autonomy to lead the course; furthermore, during weekly meetings the supervisor engaged TAs in reflection as well as negotiated with them teaching plans. This orientation created a community of relative equality in which participants were comfortable negotiating with each other, in the forms of agreement and disagreement, alignment and non-alignment, as well as making suggestions of alternatives. In terms of excerpt (5) above, we pointed out that in response to the supervisor’s proposal, one of the TAs responded with a non-aligning turn (lines 1–2). Moreover, the TA addressed this utterance to the supervisor in abrupt speech style, which further suggests supervisor-TA equality (as well as the importance of action in terms of the use of speech style). Immediately following the supervisor’s narrative, though the TA also responded by challenging its relevance to his own situation (line 25) in abrupt speech style. Finally, although the supervisor delivered her narrative in abrupt speech style, she responded to the TA’s non-alignment with “You don’t know” (line 29), which utilizes addressee honorifics. This utterance seems to indirectly convey the notion “I respect your suggestion,” while at the same time moving to close down further talk on this topic. In sum, the mixing of speech styles suggests a tension between maintaining a supervisor-TA hierarchical relationship and promoting equality among the group.

The notion of a tension between autonomy and guidance revealed in the talk was supported by a follow-up interview with the supervisor. Upon listening to the audio-taped recording of excerpt (5), the supervisor stated that in working with TAs and student teachers she often struggles between the need to give individuals freedom to act on their own, and the need to guide them towards her ways of doing. Recall that while seminar activities (both small-group and whole-class) were primarily led by TAs, the supervisor played a supporting role by providing feedback and participating in discussion. In this way, the supervisor promoted autonomy within the boundaries of collaboration among the group. However, as reiterated in the interview, the supervisor had clear positions on particular issues, such as the need to give students instructions before they would give feedback to their peers. These positions would on occasion come into conflict with the need to let TAs act on their own. The tension between the need to assert her position and the need to give TAs autonomy bubbled up to the surface in talk during weekly meetings revolving around narratives of personal experience.

3.2.2. TAs: OPEN-ENDED narratives

In the previous section, the analysis revealed how the supervisor used narrative to display authority, justify a position, and make a suggestion for future action. In this section, the analysis reveals how TAs used narrative to explore meanings of past and unrealized experience, displaying uncertain stances, which constructed these narratives as OPEN-ENDED. While OPEN-ENDED narratives provided opportunities for hearers to participate in the co-construction of narrative (e.g. through clarification requests, continuers), the supervisor played a crucial role by relating TA concerns to larger issues, offering suggestions for future courses of action, and conveying personal theories of teaching.

The majority of TA narratives pertained to experiences within small-group work (24 out of 27). (In contrast, the majority of the supervisor's narratives pertained to experiences outside the course that the group had been co-teaching (5 out of 6).) Even though most of the TAs narratives were local (based on experiences within the course), they also sometimes invoked experiences outside the course. In both cases, the supervisor's responses focused on specific issues and gave meaning to the TAs' narratives. We will first examine a narrative by a TA pertaining to an experience within the course.

During a meeting in Week 3, the TAs had reported on small-group work in which the discussion revolved around an earlier whole-class activity based on 'presentation-input-output' model of classroom learning activities (see [Kataoka & Tohsaku, 1996](#); [Lee & VanPatten, 1995](#)). When the meeting facilitator asks the supervisor to comment on her observations, the supervisor mentions how a student teacher had summarized his small group's discussion of the presentation-input-output model, but initiates the details of the telling to the TA (Miyuki) who was leading the group. In response, the TA articulates a 'setting' in which the male student teacher had assigned a "rank" (*ranku*) (between 1 and 4) to each group member, based on degree of acceptability of the model. In particular, the student teacher had characterized the TA as "1" (most accepting), and himself and another student teacher as "4" (least accepting), adding that since it was not necessary for his language learners to become able to speak in the target language, he did not need to provide 'output' activities in the target language. The TA reacts by providing a 'psychological response' (lines 45–46) that displays her change in thinking based on the discussion, and then moves to close down the narrative:

(6-1) Excerpt from TA's "Presentation-Input-Output" narrative (Week 3)

- 1..44 Miyuki: ((narrative))
- 45 dakara kyoo wa otagaini sugoku chigau to iu sokumen ga
so today TOP each.other really different QT say aspect NOM
- 46 sugoku detekita no kana (.) hanashiai no nakade wa.
really appear:PST SE PP talk LK inside TOP
'So, today it seems like it really came out to each other that we are really
different (in our approaches to teaching) (.) within what we talked about.'
- 47 de (.) ittai (.) kyootsuu no mokuhyoo tte iu no o
and ever common LK goal QT say NML ACC
- 48 mitsukeru tte koto ga dekirun daroo ka.
find QT NML NOM able:SE MOD Q
'And (.) I wonder whether it'll be ever possible to find a common goal among us.'

49	(0.3)
50	doo daroo. how MOD 'I wonder.'
51	to iu tokoro de owarikakete. QT say place LOC finish:CNJ 'At that point we ended (the discussion).'
52...128	((discussion among group related to above narrative))

While the TA (Miyuki) had assumed that a crucial goal of second language learning was for learners to become able to speak the target language, some students in her group did not share this goal. The TA relates these differences to the possibility and means of finding a common goal within the group. In particular, she uses the expressions “I wonder” (lines 48 and 50), which leave the narrative dangling. This turn opens up the floor for others to respond.

While both the supervisor and other TAs responded in a number of ways, including requests for clarification in relation to the TA's students' stated positions on the presentation-input-output model, the supervisor then mentioned that she had heard this male student teacher (same as referred to above) was presently teaching in a relatively “happy community” (*happiina komyuniti*). In the following excerpt, we observe how the supervisor cautions against having this student teacher adopt the presentation-input-output, framing the issue in terms of reflection:

(6-2) Supervisor's suggestion following TA's “Presentation-input-output” narrative (Week 3)

129	Superv.	watashitachi ga chigau koto o yare tte, we NOM different thing ACC do:IMP QT 'When we tell him to do something different (e.g., a lesson utilizing presentation-input-output model) and,'
130		puresshaa o kakechattari shita tokini, pressure ACC put.etc.:ASP do:PST when 'put pressure on him and the like,'
131		sono komyunitii jitai ga kowareteshimau tte iu that community itself NOM end.up.broken:ASP QT say
132		kanoosee mo aru wake da kara, possibility too exist reason COP so 'there's a possibility of that community itself breaking down so,'
133		sokorahen no mikiwamekata tte iu ka, that LK way.to.evaluate QT say PP
134		karejishin mo kangaenakyaikenai koto da kedo. himself too must.consider thing COP but 'He has to think about how to evaluate (the lessons) on his own but.'
135...161		((further talk by supervisor, TAs))

In this excerpt, the supervisor suggests that pressuring the student teacher to adopt the presentation-input-output model in his teaching, which she refers to broadly as “something different,” might lead to a break down in his “community” (of language learners). As an

alternative, the supervisor begins to convey a personal understanding of the importance of reflection and autonomy, as she states the student teacher has “to think about how to evaluate (the lessons/the materials) on his own.” In other words, the supervisor indirectly suggests that a unifying goal of the TA’s small group would be to become reflective practitioners, rather than in requiring them to adopt the same teaching model.

In this same sequence of talk, the supervisor elaborates by providing a particular context of reflection (“times (when the lesson) didn’t go well”), and then provides specific reasons for this:

(6-3) Supervisor’s response to TA’s “Presentation-input-output” narrative (Week 3)

- 162 Superv. dakedo umaku ikanakatta tokini (.)
 but well go:NEG:PST when
 But at times (when the lesson) didn’t go well (.)
- 163 a: yappari shaberitakunain janai? to iu ketsuron ni iku
 ah after.all talk:DES:NEG TAG QT say conclusion DAT go
- 164 kamoshirenai kedo,
 might but
 ‘the conclusion might be “Ah, after all they (=the students) don’t want to talk,
 do they?’”
- 165 moshikashitara sore wa sono tasuku ga attenakatta,
 maybe that TOP that task NOM fit:NEG:PST
 ‘But maybe that (=the lesson didn’t go well) was due to that task not fitting,’
- 166 dandori ga warukatta toka.
 plan NOM bad:PST etc.
 ‘or the plan was bad, or something.’
- 167 (.)
- 168 hoka no genin mo kangaerarerun da kara.
 another LK cause too consider:SE COP so
 ‘You can also consider other causes so’
- 169 umaku ikanakatta tokini dooiufuuni kangaeru yooni
 well go:NEG:PST when how consider as
- 170 motteitte ageru ka tte iu yoona koto o kangaetokeba
 bring:CNJ give Q QT say as NML ACC consider:ASP:CND
 ‘When (the lesson) didn’t go well, you should think about how to get
 them (=the students) to think (for themselves) about how to deal with it.’
- 171 (.)
- 171 ne.
 PP
 ‘Right.’
- 172 (.)
- 173 nanka ii no kamoshirenai.
 like good SE may
 ‘Like it might be good.’

In this excerpt, the supervisor relates that reflecting on a problematic lesson may lead to the student teacher locating it within the learners themselves (“they (=the students) don’t want to talk”). She then suggests locating the problem within the student teacher’s control in terms of the “task not fitting” or “bad planning.” By responding to a TA’s concern about what to do about finding a goal among her group, the supervisor has framed the problem in terms of broader issues of reflection, which indirectly suggest that reflection could become the group’s unifying goal.

Having examined a narrative and response in which the concern revolved around small-group work, the final excerpt will examine a narrative by a TA set outside the present course, which arose from a TA’s journal entry. This excerpt will again shed light on the supervisor’s professional role in giving meaning to TA narratives.

While TAs primarily wrote in journals about topics concerning small-group work, on occasion they also related concerns beyond the setting of the course that the group was currently co-teaching. As introduced earlier in excerpt (1), upon reading a reference to a past “trauma” (*torauma*) that a TA (Yuuji) had briefly mentioned in his journal, the supervisor coaxed the TA into verbally explicating his story. Although the “trauma” may not have been relevant in terms of the immediate goals of the course, by initiating a narrative from the TA, the supervisor indirectly suggested the issue was relevant to broader issues of becoming a teacher educator.

In the first half of the narrative, the TA related an initial setting in which he was a student teacher in the supervisor’s practicum course the previous year. He stated that although his classmates had high expectations of his student teaching since he had taught for 5 years at the primary school level, he was dissatisfied with his student teaching performance, which he asserted was “usual/natural” (*atarimae*) since it was his first experience in “the world of Japanese second language education” (*nihongo no sekai*). In response to this first half of the narrative, the supervisor expressed that she also expected him to have had a successful student teaching experience the previous year due to his “experience in education” (*kyoiku keiken*), which should have given him “confidence” (*jishin*) in the classroom. In response, the TA reaches deeper into his past, offering a broader setting for his trauma that extends over the last couple of years.

In (7), the second half of this narrative, we observe how the TA articulates his trauma in terms of the differences between two educational contexts: (A) teaching subject courses to native-speaking Japanese children at the primary school level (*gakkoo kyoiku*), and (B) teaching Japanese as a second language to adult learners at the university level (*nihongo kyoiku*). As the TA had quit a 5-year primary school teaching position a couple of years before to pursue graduate studies in Japanese second language education, he locates his “trauma” in the assessment that (A) to (B) are “different.” We then observe how the supervisor aligns with this assessment and gives meaning to the narrative by relating her understanding of the differences between the two contexts.

As observed in this excerpt, the supervisor responded to the TA’s characterization that the educational contexts of “school education”

(7) Excerpt of TA's "Trauma" narrative (Week 7)

- 1...61 Yuuji: ((first half of narrative))
- 62 °sugoku sore o° saikin: demo
really that ACC recently even
- 63 boku: (.) jishin ga: (.) [sono jishshuu dake janakute,
I myself NOM that practicum only NEG:CNJ
'I've been really° (thinking) even re:cently not only about that (=last year's)
practicum course,']
- 64 Superv: [n:
mm-hm
'Mm-hm:']
- 65 n:
mm-hm
'Mm-hm:']
- 66 Yuuji: zentaitekina:: (.),
overall
'overa::ll,']
- 67 n: shigoto o yamete (.),
um work ACC quit:CNJ
'um, I quit work and,']
- 68 moo ichido daigaku ni modottekita tte iu jookyoo de
more one:CLS university DAT return:PST QT say circumstance LOC
'returned to university once more and,']
- 69 .h saikin nanka moo kako o (.) kanzenni (.) tachikitte:,
recently like EMP past ACC completely cut.off:CONJ
'recently like (.) 'I completely (.) cut off my ties with the past and,']
- 70 h (.) amari kankei nain desu kedo:, (.)
very related NEG:SE COP:POL but
'h (.) It's not very related b:ut,'] (.)
- 71 .h °yappari° sai:sho no koro tte
after.all beginning LK when QT
'h °after all° at the begi:nning (of last year's practicum course)
- 72 mawari no miru me ga sugoi sooiu me: [°na n desu yone.
around LK see eye NOM really like.that eye COP SE COP:POL PP
'the people around had their eyes on me you know.']
- 73 Manabu: [a:
oh
'Oh:']
- 74 (0.2)
- 75 Yuuji: .h de onaji: kyooiku:: tte yutte mo
and same education QT say:CNJ even
'h And even though they ('school education' and 'Japanese language education')
are called the same "educa::tion"
- 76 yappari kanari chigau shi:,
after.all quite different and
they're after all quite different and,']

- 77 gakkoo kyooiku tte yappari sugoku ne:
school education QT after.all really PP
- 78 ano chig (hh) aun desu yone.
um different:SE COP:POL PP
'School education i(h)s after all um really di(hh)fferent.'
- 79 [hak (h) kiri °yutte.°=
clearly say:CNJ
'to °be frank°.'
- 80 Superv: [un
mm-hm
'Mm-hm.'
- 81 =un.
mm-hm
'Mm-hm.'
- 82 Yuuji: .h dakara oshieru toka sono ba de
so teach etc. that place LOC
- 83 nanka yaru no wa tashoo wa naretemasu kedo:,
like do NML TOP somewhat TOP used.to:POL but
'h So as for classroom teaching etc. I'm somewhat used to doing it but;'
- 84 .h n zenzen sonnan dekiru °to omottenakatta shi,° (.)
um at.all like.that able QT think:NEG:PST and
'h um °I didn't think° I could do such a thing (=teach to adults) at all to that
extent and;'
- 85 n saisho:ni: (.) Kokudai ni hairu maeni (.)
at.beginning name DAT enter before
'um at the beginning before (.) entering National University (=the present
university)'
- 86 maa ita (.) kenkyuusee de (.)
well be:PST research.student as
- 87 Kyooikudai ni °ita n desu kedo,°
name LOC be:PST SE COP:POL but
'well (.) I was at Education University as a pre-graduate student (.) but;'
- 88 sono toki mo (.) nanka (.)
that time too like
'at that time too (.) like (.)'
- 89 moo sugoi (.) sono: senseetachi mo miru me ga chigatte:,
EMP really that teacher:PL too see eye NOM different:CNJ
'those teachers also had really (.) different ways of looking at things (in
comparison with the teachers in 'school education') and;'
- 90 (0.8)
- 91 konna no dekite atarimae desho °mitaina.°
like.this LK able:CNJ usual MOD:POL like
'it °was like° (other people would say to me) °of course you
(=Yuuji) to be able to do this kind of thing (=related to teaching).''

- 92 demo sonna no shiru w(h)ake [nai kara,
but like.that LK know reason NEG so
'But there is no reason for me to have known it (then),'
- 93 Miyuki: [°hhh°
- 94 Yuuji: ze(h)ttai dekinai n desu [kedo, zen:zen
absolutely able:NEG SE COP:POL but at.all
'I a(h)bsolutely can't do it but, at a:ll'
- 95 Manabu: [un.
mm-hm
'Mm-hm.'
- 96 Yuuji: .h n:: nanka sono hen ga sugoku zu::tto shin:do:kute,
um like that part NOM really whole.time hard:CNJ
'h u::m like that part was really ha:rd for me the who::le time and,'
- 97 saikin yatto nanka (0.8) u::n (0.8) maamaa (.)
recently finally like um sort.of
'recently I like finally (0.8) u::m (0.8) sort of' (.)
- 98 bochibochi (.) chiisana kot(h)o k(h)ara
gradually small thing from
- 99 kotsukotsut(h)o tte iu (0.5) .h °kanji° (1.8) °arimasu kedo°.
steadily QT say feeling have:POL but
have the feeling (0.5) .h of gradually going from little things (1.8) steadily up.'
- 100 (3.1)
- 101 Superv: demo nanka (.) sore wa wakatta.
but like that TOP understand:PST
'But, like (.) I understood that.'
- 102 dakara .h kyonen: (.) itta kedo sa,
so last.year say:PST but PP
'So .h I said it to you last year but,'
- 103 hora (.) Katosan no jugyoo (.)
look name:TL LK class
'Look, as for Mr. Kato's (=your) class' (.)
- 104 kakko wa tsuiterun da [kedo: ,
appearance TOP have:ASP:SE COP but
it looks good (on the surface) but,
- 105 Yuuji: [soo?
so
'Really?'
- 106 (1.8)
- 107 Superv: demo (.) ja: (.) sorede (.) kono hitotachi (.)
but well and.then this person-PL
- 108 nani o mananda no? tte itta tokini: ,
what ACC learn:PST Q QT say:PST when
'But (.) well then (.) when you ask, "What did these people (=the students the Yuji has taught) (.) learn?,"

- 109 (.) un yappari soko ga (.) gakkoo kyooiku to
 um after.all that.place NOM school education and
- 110 nihongo kyooiku no °chigai kana: tte.°=
 Japanese.language education LK difference PP QT
 ‘Um, after all °I think that’s the difference° between school education and
 Japanese language education.’
- 111 Yuuji: =°soo desu ne.°
 so COP:POL PP
 ‘°That’s right.°’

(A) and “Japanese second language education” (B) are “different” by locating the difference between appearance (“looks good”) and content (asking “what have the students learned?”) respectively. In this way, the supervisor conveys that the TA’ trauma is related to the transition from (A), in which he was not expected to reflect on student learning to (B), in which he was expected to reflect on student learning.

In contrast to the supervisor’ narrative examined earlier (excerpt (5)), which utilized ‘consequence,’ and was casually organized, the TA primarily builds his narrative with the components ‘setting’ and ‘psychological response.’ In this respect, the narrative is similar to other TA narratives, such as examined above (excerpt (6)). However, in contrast to excerpt (6), in which the TA located the differences in approaches to teaching solely within individuals, in excerpt (7) this TA locates differences in approaches to teaching first broadly within educational contexts (or institutions) (lines 77–78) and then specifically within individuals (line 89).

Examining narrative components in detail, in this second half of the narrative the TA articulates another setting, in which he transitions from the previous year’s practicum course (lines 62–63), to the time he entered graduate school (line 68). (He briefly returns to the setting of last year’s practicum course in lines 71–72). These two settings are related, however, as they are both “Japanese second language education,” as opposed to “school education” with which he had “cut off” his ties (line 69). In relation to Japanese language education and school education, the TA expresses a ‘psychological response’ that assesses the two contexts as “different” (*chigau*) (lines 75–76), further emphasizing that “school education” is “really different” (lines 77–78). These assessments of school education represent a change in the TA’s thinking that arose after he undertook studying Japanese second language education.

In terms of pragmatic particles, in contrast to the supervisor’s narratives in which the use of particles *yo* and *sa* displayed strong stances of authority, the TA’s narrative uses pragmatic particles that attempt to built affective common ground and shared perspective. In this narrative, we observe use of pragmatic particles *ne* (line 77) and *yone* (a combination of the particles *yo* and *ne*) (lines 72 and 78). While we earlier discussed the pragmatic particle *yo* in terms of indexing strong authority, the pragmatic particle *ne* indexes weakened authority (Morita, 2002) or affective common ground (Cook, 1992). The combination *yone* simultaneously indexes poles of authority (Yoshimi, 1997). This seemingly contradictory notion can understood by examining the TA’s second use of *yone* in relation to his statement that school education is “really different *yone*” (line 78), which he indirectly compares with Japanese second language education. The pragmatic particle *yo* indexes a stance of strong authority based on the TA’s experience of both school education (as a teacher) and Japanese

language education (as a graduate student and TA). In contrast, the pragmatic particle *ne* indexes weakened authority or affective common ground, displaying the TA's recognition that the supervisor also has experienced school education in Japan as well as has (more) experience in Japanese language education, and is a relevant party to share the position that the two educational contexts are recognizably "different." From a broader perspective, the use of *yone* helps build shared perspective (Hayashi, 2000, p. 156) between the TA and supervisor in relation to understandings of school education and Japanese language teacher education. This use of pragmatic particles furthermore suggests the TA's active role in seeking aligning responses from the supervisor.

Examining uses of the pragmatic particles *ne* and *yone* in all TA narratives reveals the most frequent use of the particle *ne* (47 tokens), followed by *yone* (24 tokens), within 1671 intonation units. In sum, in addition to the absence of 'consequence,' pragmatic particles constructed TA narratives as OPEN-ENDED, through which they explored meanings of experience.

Returning to the narrative component 'setting', in this narrative the TA articulates a third setting related to the context of Japanese second language education, in which he enrolled as a "research student" (*kenkyuusei*) at another university (lines 85–87) the year after quitting his job and the year before entering graduate school at the present university. In relation to this setting, he again conveys a psychological response in relation to the teachers who "also had different ways of looking at things" (line 89). This utterance aligns the teachers in his pre-graduate course and other teachers in Japanese second language education in terms of their approaches to teaching.

While the narrative is incomplete, as the TA brings it to a relevant point of speaker transition by assessing his present situation in a positive but hesitant light (lines 97–99) and following this with no immediate talk (line 100), the supervisor responds by giving meaning to the TA's narrative in several ways. Initially the supervisor reiterates something she had said to the TA regarding his student teaching in the previous year's class. Specifically, she assesses that his teaching "looks good" (line 104) then follows this with an evaluative question, "What have these students learned?" (line 108). In other words from the supervisor's perspective, while the TA's teaching has a good appearance (e.g., it may be fun for students), she implies it is crucial to reflect on teaching. This question provides a contrast in terms of the TA's experience as a teacher within school education. In this way, the supervisor conveys an understanding of the broader approaches of teaching within the two educational contexts: reflection is marginalized in school education and prioritized in Japanese second language education.

In this excerpt, though he characterized school education as being "really different" from Japanese second language education, the TA's narrative did not articulate these differences. An explanation for this is that the TA and the primary addressee of the narrative, the supervisor, shared a great deal of information about the 'setting' of this narrative in terms of differences between the two educational contexts, which allowed the supervisor to intervene and give meaning to the narrative. In a follow-up interview, I asked the TA to elaborate on differences between school education and Japanese language education in order to shed more light on the root of his trauma. The TA conveyed that in school education (primary and secondary), the decisions about curriculum primarily come from the top down. He compared this with Japanese second language education at the university level

and other post-secondary institutions in which, in his view, teachers have more freedom to decide the syllabus, textbooks, teaching approach, and the like. In addition, during the interview, as he did in the narrative above, the TA continuously referred to the setting including people close to him when talking about his “trauma.” For example, he confirmed that his trauma was located in the transition from teaching Japanese native-speaking children and adolescents to teaching non-native speaking adults, in which these two groups of learners’ have different needs and goals. He also suggested, from a broader societal perspective, changing the trajectory of one’s career in Japan from a socially and financially stable job (as a primary school teacher) in order to return to school (as a graduate student) is considered by many to be an unacceptable move, as was conveyed to him by his own family and friends. Thus, in light of the cultural framework in which the TA finds himself, setting may continue to define his feeling of trauma and other understandings towards his role as a teacher and teacher educator. The narrative and follow-up interview suggest that setting reveals the root of novices’ concerns. Furthermore, a more experienced individual’s understanding of setting may be crucial in order to help the novice make sense out of experience.

4. Discussion

In the preceding analysis, we have seen reflection in the form of narratives of personal experience within supervisor-TA talk during weekly meetings while co-teaching a second language practicum course. Examining the practices in which narratives emerged and the structural and linguistic features of narratives, revealed heuristic categories (OPEN- and CLOSE-ENDED) for understanding the role of narrative in professional development. In general, narratives by the supervisor (i) emerged within talk of planning in response to a TA concern, (ii) displayed stances of strong authority through narrative components ‘setting’ and ‘consequence’, and linguistically through use of abrupt speech style and pragmatic particles *yo* and *sa*, and (iii) were causally organized, relating past events to suggestions for future action (CLOSE-ENDED).

In contrast, narratives by the TAs (i) were initiated within the practices of discussing written journals and reporting on events in the previous seminar, (ii) displayed understanding of professional roles, activity, and action through use of addressee honorifics, and (iii) attempted to establish affective common ground and build shared perspective through use of pragmatic particles *ne* and *yone*. Furthermore, the TAs’ narratives (iv) explored meanings of past events through narrative components ‘setting’ and ‘psychological response’ (OPEN-ENDED).

In terms of the role of narratives of personal experience in professional development, it is necessary to reiterate the professional roles of the supervisor and TAs, as well as the structuring properties of narrative as a discourse genre. In particular, the supervisor had primary responsibility for the course, including establishing goals, choosing topics, and deciding her initial participation (e.g., observing small-group work) and the participation of TAs (e.g., coordinating small groups). Furthermore, the supervisor had brought to the co-teaching endeavor a keen interest in giving TAs autonomy, as well as promoting reflection through written journals and talk. In comparison, the TAs had come to the course with

varying degrees of teaching experience but no formal experience training other teachers; nevertheless they were willing, active participants in reflective activity, including writing and sharing journals, and recounting past activities and discussions that took place in small groups. Thus, the professional role of the supervisor was that of expert teacher educator, while the roles of TAs were those of novice teacher educators learning to become 'teachers who teach teachers' (Russell & Korthagen, 1995). These roles made possible (and constrained) the types of talk in general, and account for the distribution of the two types of narratives in particular.

While narrative is a relatively structured discourse genre, with identifiable components, this structuring property enabled the supervisor to insert her 'personal practical knowledge' (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986), both in her own narratives and in response to TAs' narratives. For instance, in response to TAs narratives the supervisor showed that she grasped the implications of narrated events in terms of circumstances and consequences, using narrative to promote goal-based activity and to initiate TA efforts to attain a goal. In these ways, the supervisor utilized her professional role and the structuring properties of narrative to build knowledge among the group.

5. Implications for professional development

The implications of this study are that iterative reflection with a supervisor (and peer group) around specific issues and goals contributes to professional development. Thus, for educators hoping to use reflection for professional development, it may be helpful consider the process of reflection and the contexts of reflection. In this respect, reflection articulated as oral narratives of personal experience is an object of public discourse, responded to and given meaning by self and others. Having a novice produce an OPEN-ENDED narrative in a written journal or an interview with a facilitator may be informative in a number of ways, but it may not contribute to professional development unless an expert (or peer) responds in ways that contribute to sense making. For novices, structured, formal activities surrounding journal writing and talking about previous classes may be particularly beneficial for initiating narratives of personal experience. As novices develop into more experienced practitioners, we may look for them to articulate CLOSE-ENDED narratives, which may signal that they have "arrived" professionally.

Acknowledgments

Prior versions of this paper were presented at the Association of Teachers of Japanese Annual Seminar in Washington, DC, April 2002, and the Second International Conference on Language Teacher Education in Minneapolis, May 2001. I am grateful to a number of individuals including Naoko Aoki, Marianne Celce-Murcia, Candy Goodwin, Shoichi Iwasaki, and Elinor Ochs, whose comments on prior versions of this paper have helped shaped its outcome, as well as Chisato Koike and Tetsuya Sato for comments on transcripts. I am especially thankful to the previous editor David Bloome and the current editors Alexandra Jaffe and Marilyn Martin-Jones for their suggestions, as well as two anonymous reviewers.

Any errors or inconsistencies are mine alone. Finally, I am indebted to Naoko Aoki, Rikako Maeda, Masanori Nagami, and Uichi Kamiyoshi for their collaboration. The research was supported by a Japan Ministry of Education (*Monbusho*) Scholarship (1999–2000); writing and revision were made possible through a UCLA Quality of Graduate Education Writing Fellowship (2003) and a Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Fellowship (JSPS) (2004).

Appendix A

Transcription conventions

(1.0)	Pause measured in seconds and tenths of a second
(.)	Micropause (two tenths of a second or less)
((comment))	Nonverbal action or transcriber's comment
°word°	Reduced volume
:	Vowel stretch
?/./,	Rising, falling, and continuing intonation, respectively
=	Latching of first speaker utterance to the next speaker utterance
wo-	Hyphen following part of a word indicates sound cutoff
.h	Inhalation
h	Laughter token
(h)	Laughter or exhalation within a word
[Overlap of first speaker utterance with next speaker utterance
<u>word</u>	Emphatic stress

Interlinear gloss abbreviations (adapted from Iwasaki, 2002)

ACC	accusative
ASP	aspect
CLS	classifier
CNJ	conjunctive (-te form)
COND	conditional form
COP	copula
DAT	dative
DES	desiderative form
EMP	emphatic marker
IMP	imperative form
LK	linker
LOC	locative
MOD	modal expression
NEG	negative
NML	nominalizer
NOM	nominative
PL	plural

Appendix A. (Continued)

POL	polite suffix (addressee honorific)
PP	pragmatic particle
PST	past
Q	question marker
QT	quotative
SE	sentence extender
SSW	sound-symbolic word
TAG	tag expression
TL	title maker (for persons)
TOP	topic marking particle

References

- Bailey, F., Hawkins, M., Irujo, S., Larsen-Freeman, Rintell, E., & Willet, J. (1997). Language teacher educators collaborative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 536–546.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18, 1–21.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teacher: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1986). Rhythms in teaching: The narrative study of teachers' personal practical knowledge of classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2(4), 377–387.
- Clark, C. M. (1995). *Thoughtful teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, C. M. (2001). *Talking shop: Authentic conversation and teachers learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1995). Narrative and education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1(1), 73–85.
- Cook, H. M. (1992). Meanings of non-referential indexes: A case study of the Japanese sentence-final particle *ne*. *Text*, 12, 507–539.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. New York: Heath and Company.
- Edge, J. (1984). Feedback with face. *ELT Journal*, 38(3 July), 204–206.
- Edge, J. (1992). *Cooperative development: Professional self-development through cooperation with colleagues*. London: Longman.
- Gebhard, J. G., Hashimoto, M., Joe, J., & Lee, H. (1999). Microteaching and self-observation: Experience in a preservice teacher education program. In J. G. Gebhard & R. Oprandy (Eds.), *Language teaching awareness: A guide to exploring beliefs and practices* (pp. 172–194). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1984). Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 225–246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1989). Tactical uses of stories: Participation frameworks within girls' and boys' disputes. *Discourse Processes*, 13, 33–71.
- Hayashi, M. (2000). *Practices in joint utterance construction in Japanese conversation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Iwasaki, S. (1993). The structure of intonation unit in Japanese. In S. Choi (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics: Vol. 3* (pp. 39–53). Stanford: CSLI.
- Iwasaki, S. (2002). *Japanese*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 219–248). New York: Academic Press.
- Kataoka, H., & Tohsaku, Y. H. (1996). *Teaching Japanese as a foreign language parts I, II*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. London: Methuen.

- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology*, 15(3), 247–271.
- Mandelbaum, J. (1993). Assigning responsibility in conversational storytelling: The interactional construction of reality. *Text*, 13(2), 247–266.
- Martin, S. (1975). *A reference grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Morita, E. (2001). Stance marking in the collaborative completion of utterances: Final particles as epistemic markers in Japanese. In N. M. Akatsuka & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics: Vol. 10* (pp. 220–233). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Morita, E. (2002, March). *The Japanese particles sa and ne*. Paper presented at the Workshop for East Asian Linguistics, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Olshtain, E., & Kupferberg, I. (1998). Reflective-narrative discourse of FL teachers exhibits professional knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 185–202.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, T., & Korthagen, F. (Eds.). (1995). *Teachers who teach teachers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). “Narrative analysis” thirty years later. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(14), 97–106.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge-base and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Stahl, S. D. (1989). *Literary folkloristics and the personal narrative*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westheimer, J. (1992). Communities and consequences: An inquiry into ideology and practice in teachers’ professional work. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(1), 71–105.
- Witherall, C., & Noddings, N. (1991). *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Yoshimi, D. R. (1997). An expanded concept of speakerhood in Japanese discourse. In H. Sohn & J. Haig (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics: Vol. 6* (pp. 583–605). Stanford: CSLI Publications.