Reflecting on Interaction:
Using Conversational Analysis to Improve Teaching Practices

Theodore BONNAH*, Ryan W. SMITHERS*

Introduction

'There is nothing like first-hand evidence.'
Sherlock Holmes -*A Study in Scarlet*

A central tenet of modern pedagogy since the days of John Dewey (1933) is that the educator should be reflective, always revising his or her own practices. This is easier said than done, for as Grant and Zeichner (1997) note, "teachers do not have the time to reflect given the necessity of quick action and the press of institutional demands" (p. 108). For example, peer-observation requires great coordination and communication of all participants, but may not always result in useful feedback. In other words, the evidence provided through traditional classroom observations does not always constitute a reliable resource for critical reflection.

Another issue is that, even if the conditions for observation can be agreed on and met, teachers may lack the conceptual knowledge of how to structure and articulate reflection in a valuable way. Reflective education assumes that educators can automatically perform observation and rewarding reflection, but without a conceptual basis, this remains unconnected to devising best practices and is hard to translate into research that could be shared with others for the benefit of the field. This tendency is evident in Grant and Zeichner (1997), who give much thought to the 'why' of reflective teaching, but omit a conceptual basis or research foundation in their account of 'how' to do so. This is especially problematic in terms of ESL, where both analysis and reflection should have a strong basis in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research and teaching practice, while seeing interaction as a social practice.

_____

* Instructor of English as a Foreign Language, Language Center, Kwansei Gakuin University

In contrast to reflection by observation, the approach known as Conversational Analysis (CA)[1], through its use of recorded conversations, allows the educator to cast an eye back on her or his own practice with certitude and precision, while providing an underlying schema of analysis that guides reflection. Conversational Analysis lets educators enjoy perfect recall of interactions, allowing them to become like Sherlock Holmes, take up their magnifying glasses and comb through their own in-class conversation for insights into how they manage their conversational interactions, what strategies and relations are evident or absent, and what changes in teaching style or practice these results suggest. The various methodologies of CA also contain the conceptual tools for analyzing transcripts, classifying the discourse of interactions in such a way as to suggest places for improving pedagogy in the L2 classroom in both linguistic and sociological terms. Through their CA magnifying glasses, practitioners find clues that help them to understand how their classroom interaction is organized, how social relationships between student and teacher are developed through the creation of spoken discourse, and thus discover places for improvement in teaching to support this interaction. In this light, CA offers an invaluable method for critical reflection for educations, especially in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) contexts where interaction is both the method and goal of instruction. As Richards (2003) asserts, "most teachers who take the time to study recordings of themselves at work find it a richly rewarding experience" (p. 180).

The problem comes when integrating the CA approach into reflexive teaching in a way that results in data driven insights and improvement in pedagogy. The sociological tradition of CA constitutes an intimidating specialist history, whose transcription and coding requirements may pose a barrier to entry for busy educators. The authors propose a discourse-based model of CA that alleviates some of this barrier by linking CA reflection to discourse studies, while allowing educators to begin analyzing right away.

In this article, the authors first trace the history of CA, while looking at the benefits and drawbacks of its use. Next, they review the varied application of CA methods in second language education. They follow this with an introduction to their discursive method of CA, then apply this framework to two sample conversations. They present findings for reflection, applications of this approach to teacher training, then conclude with directions for future research.

---

1) By CA the authors refer to the approach of recording and analyzing conversation, not exclusively the sociolinguistic discipline often referred to by these initials.

I. Introducing Conversation Analysis

The term CA means different things to different people. Generally in ESL circles, CA refers to the sociological tradition of analyzing conversation, and the practices this tradition has developed. Heritage (2008) traces the origins of sociological CA to the investigations of Erving Goffman and Harvey Garfinkel in the 1960 and 1970s, with the refinement of technique by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Shegloff and Gail Jefferson (pp. 301-302). Yet, over the course of its 50-plus-year development, the merits of conducting detailed examinations on the social organization of conversations has allowed this methodology to expand from one discipline, sociology, to many disciplines, such as psychology and education, to become what Rawls (2012) calls an "international interdisciplinary enterprise" (p. 145). CA is equally applicable and useful for professionals in the field of second language education where interactional competence is the main goal. As we shall see, second and foreign language pedagogy has developed its own forms of CA to suit its particular needs.

Sociological CA posits conversational interaction as the bedrock of social action. As Heritage (2008) explains, it rests on the twin assumptions that conversation is governed by shared rules, and that ordinary conversation is an empirical object of study (pp. 303-304). Initially, conversation analysts were concerned with the analysis of casual conversation to see how participants exchange information and maintain social relations within the turn structure of interaction. In later developments of CA, studies extended into the analysis of interactions in institutional settings, such as doctor-patient consultations, court hearings, news and psychiatric interviews, and classroom interactions, to name a few (Paltridge, 2006, p. 107). Considering the conversational nature of ESL interactions, as well as the power differential between the native speaker teacher and the L2 learner, both these usages of CA are applicable to TESOL interactions, and add depth to the reflective practice they allow.

Because of CA's view of conversation as both a 'gestalt' or unified ruleset as well as an empirical resource, the common point of all CA is the use of recording data of naturally occurring interactions. CA is thus available to anybody with recording equipment and an idea of what to look for, although this 'open door' nature has lead to the criticism noted by Heritage (2008) of CA as "do it yourself linguistics" (p. 300). Yet in terms of language teaching, CA is true action research in the purest sense of the word, carried out in the course of a teacher's own work, making it a valuable resource for reflective teaching. The only prerequisites are a passion for understanding and improving one's own teaching, the determination to learn CA basics and apply them unselfconsciously, and the patience to transcribe and analyze classroom interaction.

In terms of reflective teaching, CA helps teachers to identify what kinds of

teaching practices best contribute to or impede L2 learning, and to help them evaluate and/or train teachers. Language teachers should be familiar enough with language conventions to be able to acquire CA through study and practice. Additionally, Rawls (2012) notes, CA requires "familiarity with and mastery of, the scene being studied" (p. 148), and thus teachers are suitable judges of teaching interactions. According to ten Have (1986), CA's nature leaves "the researcher ample room to develop his own best fitting heuristic and argumentative procedures" (para. 5), and so teachers performing CA will find both their own research questions and solutions as they do so. In the case study by Gebhard and Ueda-Motonaga (1992), as we will see below, the results of the teacher's exploration helped her learn "the power of small changes in teaching behavior" (p. 185) to get students more involved in classroom interaction, and she discovered the benefit of "looking outside the classroom" (p. 185) to learn what kinds of personalized content needed to be introduced into the classroom to make the learning environment more authentic. This promise of incremental improvement in practice through CA, as well as its use to identify and include external discourses that affect the classroom, is one that the authors believe should be explored, and so have constructed the discourse CA framework below to aid educators in doing so.

Conversation Analysis is not without its issues, especially when used in the language classroom. Educators approaching CA for the first time may feel intimidated by the weight of history evident in the different frameworks of CA, especially the sociological and ethnographic examples, with their myriad coding conventions and demand of technical terminology. These factors, along with the insistence of CA practitioners on linguistic disciplinary background, serve a gatekeeping function of the linguistic fraternity that may put beginner educators off trying CA, and go against CA's founding DIY ethic. However, the authors believe that CA filtered through discourse analysis should be accessible to more than linguists, and that language teachers have enough language knowledge to put it into practice for reflective pedagogy. For this reason, we hope that our discourse version of CA presented in this article helps lessen the anxiety in this way, opening the doors to more educators and other prospective CA analysts. Another problem is that even though recordings and their transcriptions are arguably objective and immutable evidence of what goes on in the classroom, not all interpretations will be the same, and thus this lack of fidelity in interpretation may be cited as evidence of CA lacking validity. The authors see this variation in interpretation as a feature of discourse CA instead of a 'bug', and we encourage CA practitioners to share their transcripts with analysts of different backgrounds, thereby improving both the range of insights they get and their understanding of what CA can do.

Ultimately, we seek to reaffirm the social nature of CA by positioning the ap-

proach in discourse. This may seem counter-intuitive, for as Heritage (2009) notes,

> Moreover, the practices of everyday conversation appear to have a 'bedrock' or default status. When they are subject to processes of historical change these tend to be slow and unrecognized, nor [sic] are they generally subject to discursive justification (by reference, for example, to logic, equity, or efficiency) in ways that practices of interaction in legal, medical, pedagogical, and other institutions manifestly are. (p. 305)

Although we agree that the interactional practices themselves are the bedrock of communication, the individuals using them are doing so from their own discursive standpoints, to further their interests. Social interaction is not one of hypothetical neutrality, it is a place where discourses of power, identity, and interaction are operationalized. In the language classroom, especially, where the power of the teacher is paradoxically reduced by interaction that improves students' language skills, and where doing so involves infusing new culture, a discourse approach to CA would seem to promise new insights on this front.

II. CA Methods and Language Teaching

'You see, but you do not observe. The distinction is clear.'
Sherlock Holmes -*A Scandal in Bohemia*

Although attention has already focused on the usefulness of CA in ESL teacher training, the various methodologies proposed have not completely welcomed teachers into the fold. Just as the iterations of CA have had a varied development and theoretical base, CA's application to SLA and Foreign Language Learning (FLL) pedagogy has taken many forms.

Wong and Waring's (2010) *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy* is a comprehensive guide to CA for conversation teachers that introduces sociological CA as "a new kind of tool kit for teaching conversation" (p. 3), one that "offers a wealth of knowledge that can make our understanding of interactional competence more specific, more systematic, and more pedagogically sound. Conversation analysis delivers the stuff that interactional competence is made of, i.e., interactional practices" (p. 8). Although the book is an excellent guide to sociological CA terminology and interactive practices, Wong and Waring's insistence that recorded data "must be finely transcribed, using CA's transcription system . . ." (p. 5) does not reflect the reality of such an endeavour. As D'hondt (2009) states, "there is general agreement as to *what* is to be transcribed, but little agreement as to *how* to

do so. It would appear that there is to date no single widely accepted system for any or all of the scientific disciplines that require transcription of spoken discourse" (p. 245). Wong and Waring's suggestion that teachers acquire the fundamentals of a hypothetical sociological CA transcription framework (p. 5) needlessly requires specialist knowledge of teachers, and thus constitutes an elite barrier to putting CA quickly and practically at the disposal of the reflective educator.

Gebhard and Ueda-Motonaga's (1992) case study of language teacher supervision uses the less complex FOCUS framework (p. 180), demonstrating what analyzing conversations with students can offer teachers in terms of reflective teaching practice. In the study, a teacher assigns FOCUS conversation analysis "to provide opportunities to explore teaching. The aim of this approach is not to direct teachers as to how they should be teaching, but to work with them as they go through a process of discovery about teaching possibilities" (p. 179). Similarly, although the article makes no reference to reflective teacher pedagogy, the end result is that teachers become skilled at making "informed decisions about how to teach" (p. 179). In a process familiar to sociological CA practitioners, the teacher and supervisor in Gebhard and Ueda-Motonaga's case study decided that the exploration of teaching would involve having the teacher (1) audio or videotape classroom interaction, (2) transcribe a part of the interaction, (3) code it, (4) study it, (5) interpret it, and finally (6) allow practice to be guided by the knowledge derived from an understanding of concepts outlined in the framework listed above (p. 180). Despite the positive benefits of this approach, although not a concern for general teacher training, the fact that the FOCUS framework is so context-sensitive and unaligned with linguistic theory limits the practitioner in learning from or contributing to CA-derived linguistic research in second language teaching.

Finally, Johnson (1995) agrees that it is of critical importance that teachers understand the dynamics of the interaction in their classrooms because they have profound implications for teaching (p. 7). To this end, Johnson posits a framework for understanding communication in second language classrooms evidenced in recorded conversation and transcription that is designed to equip teachers with knowledge of "the moment-to-moment actions and interactions that constitute what actually occurs in second language classrooms . . . [and] what teachers and students bring to the second language classroom" (p. 7). Johnson's framework is divided into four interrelated components that lead to reflective teaching uncovered by CA. These include 1) how teachers control classroom interactions, 2) student knowledge and use of language, 3) student perception of interaction, and 4) student use of language for learning (p. 8). Johnson's method is based on the premise that success in the classroom is the result of analyses of students' responses to teacher-initiated acts. Thus, when teachers engage in CA, it provides teachers with an opportunity to "monitor and ad-

just the patterns of communication so as to maximize students' competencies" (p. 14).

These studies demonstrate that CA is a useful approach for critical reflection, regardless of which exact methodology is used. As we explain below, our discourse approach further simplifies what to look for and how to frame it, allowing teachers to concentrate on the task of reflecting on their teaching.

III. Discourse CA Methodology for Second Language Educators

'You know my method. It is founded upon the observation of trifles.'
Sherlock Holmes -*The Bascombe Valley Mystery*

To make CA more accessible to and rewarding for reflective teachers, we first reposition it in the field of discourse studies, and thus suggest that CA is not only a method for analyzing conversations, but also the discourses evident in them. However, Mills (2004) notes that the term 'discourse' has "perhaps the widest range of possible significations of any term in literary and cultural theory, and yet it is often the term within theoretical texts which is least defined" (p. 1). Our understanding of discourse comes from Bonnah's (2015) assertion that "Whereas ideology is the theory and belief about how the world works, discourse is the grouping of statements made to communicate these beliefs to others, convince them of their value, and thereby accumulate power through consensus" (p. 38). This definition is based in Bonnah's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Neoliberal Discourse, and may at first glance have little to do with second language teaching. Yet second language teaching, and indeed any form of pedagogy, is an inherently political act. Teachers operate at a power differential from students (and especially so in ESL contexts in which the value of English compared to the student's native language is implicit) which has repercussions on student identity and their power in society.

Our proposed framework is thus based on identifying the three central functions of discourse evident in speech acts as stated by Wetherall (2005)—namely for expressing identity, aiding interaction, or maintaining power relations (p. 5). Although CA has birthed various analytical frameworks, from specialist sociological CA to pedagogy-specific FOCUS, we believe that teachers need not have read every major CA study done, keep up with the latest studies, memorize every transcription symbol, nor master the entire CA framework to benefit from analyzing their own in-class conversations. Instead, the understanding of classroom interaction derived from this simplified discourse CA framework we propose can be enough to lead to critical reflection of discourses evident in student-teacher interaction thanks to the following four affordances.

First, our approach reduces the barrier to entry for teachers wanting to begin CA by simplifying the criteria of analysis. Regarding the transcription and analysis of conversation, Richards (2003) says "On a fairly basic level, this is something that anybody can do with relatively little effort, and it can be surprisingly rewarding" (p. 172). The authors of this article agree, and believe that expecting teachers and students to master the amount of complex material required in Wong and Waring's (2010) sociological CA for educators is unrealistic and counter-productive, both in terms of using CA to improve pedagogy, as well as in terms of allowing more academics to access CA-driven reflection. As Bonnah (2011b) notes, ESL teachers at universities in Japan have diverse backgrounds (p. 37), thus not all may have the linguistic background to quickly and efficiently implement CA. The authors insist that the point of introducing CA into ESL and EFL is not necessarily to create CA researchers, but rather to improve their teaching in practical ways through reflection. For this reason, the discourse framework of CA that the authors propose reduces the myriad details that analysts look for to the basic discursive functions of interaction, identity, and power. This allows educators trying CA to jump into the pool quickly. In *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy,* Wong (2010) states that she encountered CA in a discourse analysis (p. 3), and so our framework is not mere simplification of methodology, but is instead a recentering of CA from the sociolinguistic terminology that has accrued around its various forms to a discourse standpoint to allow greater flexibility of interpretation.

Second, our discourse CA is not only a heuristic for solving the problem of reflective teaching, but also a mnemonic where teachers learn CA by practicing it. Educators who begin using our discourse CA model can acquire sociological CA concepts and terminology at their own pace as they analyze their recordings, adding focus on pauses, turn taking, as well as other specialist terms of reference into their interpretations. Our transcription rules are simple and based on familiar genres, but more CA specific elements, such as standards from the Text Encoding Initiative -(TEI), can easily be added. Teachers are more familiar with their classroom interactions than CA specialists, and thus any simplifications in CA technique should be offset by their experience and reflective ability. Beyond personal reflection, learning discourse CA also lets teachers research and share their findings with colleagues. They may make insights open only to beginners precisely because, as Abbot (2004) notes, their lack of familiarity with conventions allows them to recontextualize knowledge in fruitful ways (p. 141). Thus the insights and adaptations to method made by reflexive educators doing discourse CA may contribute both to language pedagogy and CA development in the long run.

Next, the above point also implies that anchoring CA method in discourse offers a wider framework that can handle more specialist frameworks such as sociolin-

guistic CA, FOCUS, and the Wong and Waring's (2010) frameworks reviewed previously. Besides allowing beginners to perform CA, our proposed discourse framework for CA should also 'fit over' conflicting frameworks of individual research traditions. Wong and Waring's (2010) emphasis on turn taking in CA (p. 9) is reflected in our discourse model by the twin concerns of interaction (i.e., who decides to take the first turn) and power (i.e., why are they allowed to), while the focus on interaction types in the Gebhard and Ueda-Montonaga (1992) study is equally reflected in our method's questioning of who initiates interactions, and how are they repaired. Understanding our discourse CA framework should help reflective educators familiarize themselves with any of the alternate formats we have introduced, while alternately reading other CA frameworks and incorporating useful concepts or terms should not invalidate the usefulness of discourse CA.

Finally, our proposed CA framework also acts as a first step into discourse studies. By orienting to the three themes of discourse (power, interaction, and identity), instead of adhering to the focus of one particular interpretation of CA so that the educator can familiarize him or herself with the growing interdisciplinary study of discourse and branch out to other forms, such as Discourse Analysis (DA), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), or Foucaultian genealogy, if so desired. As Richards (2003) notes,

> when you have chosen to look at an extract in detail, this approach will help you to train your eye and organize your thinking—a basis for all effective analysis. Sometimes though, our analysis does not need to be at all sophisticated in order to generate interesting research questions and provide the basis for professional development. (p. 188)

Although a discourse CA approach may not seem 'sophisticated' enough in its modeling of the nuts and bolts of interaction, its apparent simplicity conversely allows analysts to make more sophisticated reflection on their classroom interactions.

With these rationales for our discursive CA framework explained, we now turn to the discourse framework and transcription basics aspiring CA reflective educators should know.

IV. Using the Discourse CA Framework

With the basic concepts behind our discourse CA introduced above, we turn to what exactly the teacher performing conversational analysis looks for. Although, as discussed above, the field of CA has developed several foci in which general educators can use the lens of discourse provided to look for a certain number of discrete

structures or strategies that indicate management of (1) power, (2) interaction, and (3) identity in conversation. Admittedly, other discourse CA foci can also be rewarding for language teachers. Rex and Schiller (2007) cite 'difference' as a major discursive concern in classrooms (p. 97). This makes sense in the multiracial US classrooms where their study took place, but it is less applicable for the authors where they teach in homogeneous Japan. Ultimately, discourses of 'difference' easily fit under our concerns of power, identity, and interaction, illustrating the robustness of these three discursive foci in CA of any teaching or social situation.

These three foci also allow educators to use their intuition and expertise to reflect on teaching practices. Conversely, sociological CA and the FOCUS framework examined above give prescriptive lists of structures to look for, and although the authors believe familiarity with these lists and the terminology they use is helpful in performing CA, they also believe that these should not straightjacket reflective thought. As Rex and Schiller (2007) note, "Discourse analysis methods capture interaction in the moment, so we can look back at the discursive choices that were made and consider what other choices were available" (p. xi). Instead of prescribing what analysts will find, discourse CA more easily allows educators to make their own findings based on their professional knowledge and intuition. Although Waring and Wong (2010) see teacher intuition as "part of the problem" with beginner CA (p. 10), this critique ignores the fact that it is teachers who know their own classrooms best, and makes this critique ironic in light of the role that intuition played in the early researchers that were instrumental in shaping CA, as extolled in Lerner's (2004) praise of CA pioneer Harvey Sacks' "brilliance" and "innovative ways" (p. 1).

What follows n Table 1 are examples of questions educators can ask themselves when using our simplified discourse CA framework to analyze their own in-class conversations. Teachers are encouraged to add to the repertoire of reflexive questions as they become familiar with discourse CA. Since CA researchers have many different criteria and objects of study, not all would agree with this framework or the examples given. Nonetheless they serve their purpose of organizing teacher perception while allowing the distance required to reflect objectively on one's own teaching practices and their role in supporting interaction. Richards (2003) notes that "The process of distancing . . . gives us the chance to look at our work in a new way, and this can be invaluable. The aim of analysis is to throw fresh light on aspects of our talk, illuminating features and patterns that have previously been hidden to us" (p. 185). In other words, CA should ideally let us see not only linguistic features and interactional practices, but also reveal discourses through these as well. Please note that sociological CA keywords and terminology have been *italicized* and **bolded** to help the reader recognize terms that are common to CA work and ar-

Table 1
The Three Discourses and Reflective Questions

1. POWER
Speaker Selection − Who initiates conversation? Is this person often dominating conversation? What ***Opening Gambits*** are used? Are these conversation starters indicative of anything? Who ***holds the floor*** and can continue talking? Are other students constrained from speaking?   ***Topic Selection*** − Is the teacher ***dominating*** the topics and direction of conversations, or have students picked up enough strategies and confidence to lead discussions?   ***Authority Claims*** − Whose opinion is accepted as fact on certain topics? Is there room to validate student experience? Is anyone's opinion valued more than others?
2. INTERACTION
Turn Taking − How do speakers signal their turn to speak? Do students have the ability, or are they reliant on the teacher?   ***Hedges*** − How do speakers signal caution or uncertainty about their utterances?   ***Saving Face*** − Does the teacher give students an 'out' or show them when they make an error?   ***Back Channels*** − Is the teacher giving enough feedback or encouragement? Are students responding to these and repairing their utterances?   ***Negotiation*** − When communication breaks down, how is it ***repaired*** or put back on track?
3. IDENTITY
How is student or teacher ***cultural identity*** expressed in the conversation? Are differences in values or norms evident?   Are students signaling ***turn sequences*** in an appropriate manner for L2, and are they recognizing teacher signals for turn changing?   How are students ***presenting themselves*** − as L2 learners or users?   Which ***cultural norms*** are being referenced or conformed to?

ticulate themselves in the same terms of reference, or alternately substitute the words for terms with which they are more comfortable.

One final note is that the authors believe that performing CA is a reflexive and recursive learning process, and thus educators should not be afraid of making mistakes.

V. Discourse Transcription Basics

With the above discursive framework in mind, we move on to the laborious part of CA—making a transcript of recorded conversation. We suggest that CA be limited to excerpts of three to five minutes in the beginning. Although many CA analysts also use video recording to analyze the non-verbal or extra-linguistic aspects of interaction, for this exercise audio recording was deemed sufficient to allow analysis of conversation structures and interactive strategies. Please note that when you want to collect data to improve teaching, it is important to get students' permis-

sion to record, and you will also need to assure them that their personal information will not be published. Although this arguably introduces observer bias, it is the ethical foundation of social sciences research. For a more in-depth examination of the practicalities of recording in a classroom, we heartily recommend Richards' (2003) excellent examination of CA procedure for language educators.

Although Wetherell (2005) states, "the presentation of findings should place the reader in the same position as the researcher" (p. 396), the complex and myriad conventions used in CA transcription constitute a real barrier to participation, not only by the reflective educator, but also any colleagues who may read his or her reflections. For this reason, we suggest a simplified transcription format, which will allow the educator to build up his analytic abilities while acquiring CA foundational knowledge, which are integral should he or she be interested in sharing data, publishing research or specializing in CA later on. Our suggestions are a mix of CA conventions and dramatic dialogue, which is more familiar to the CA layman and thus promotes reflection more easily than a specialized CA transcription might. As Edwards (2001) asserts, "Direct readability is also helped by using conventions already known from other written contexts . . . a number of transcription conventions derive from literary conventions found in novels and plays" (p. 326). For this reason, we propose, below, a non-intrusive, easily legible transcription format.

Table 2

Discourse CA Transcription Framework

Capitalization	Although CA specialists often drop capital letters, this can be jarring for the beginner, so we suggest ignoring this convention.
Numbering	Although some researchers number by turn, we prefer that lines be numbered for easy reference.
Unintelligible Utterances	Use brackets with 3 x inside, (xxx), i.e., S1: This is good (xxx) to do.
Pauses	Although CA specialists often focus on the meaning of 'pregnant pauses', routinely measuring their length down to the microsecond, such detail is excessive for reflective educators. Simply using a row of dots (. . .) allows the educator to acknowledge the interruption of interaction without reading too much into the significance of its length, i.e., 1: T: I think (. . .) we should (. . .) reflect more.
Simultaneous Utterances	There are different ways of transcribing when people 'talk over' one another or in concert, by either saying the same thing or something different at the same time. For these transactions, we suggest using two dashes (⸺) at the beginning and end of the first utterance and at the beginning of the second. For example: 1: T: Doing discourse CA is⸺fun⸺right? 2: S1: ⸺fun
Translation/Interpretation	When an interpretation of a foreign utterance is required or when a teacher's interpretation of an utterance is required, write the foreign word or utterance in italics and enclose the translation or interpretation in [], i.e., 1: S1: *hon* [book].

Similarly, the organization of a transcripted text, such as splitting it into columns to reflect order of speaking, uses various different formats depending on what is being analyzed. We suggest a simple left margin order-of-occurrence format because, as Edwards (2001) notes, "having utterances and nonverbal acts in chronological order provides a more immediate sense of the flow of an interaction. This . . . approach is the more common in discourse research" (p. 331). Our transcription choices thus fulfill our criteria of allowing educators to quickly begin CA for reflection, while letting the discourses we seek stand out. According to Edwards (2001), "There are many distinctions of interest to discourse researchers which have less obvious relationships to physically measurable properties. This is not a problem, so long as they can be applied reliably by human observers, on the basis of clearly specified criteria." (p. 322). We thus make the following suggestions in Table 2 for transcription based on our discourse framework and the criteria of analysis we suggest and invite any reflective educators attempting discourse CA to adjust the method as they see fit.

If reflective educators find that our transcription framework doesn't meet their needs, we suggest they consult Edwards (2001) and Wong and Waring (2010) as comprehensive guides to transcripting and coding options, and add whatever conventions they feel suits their criteria of analysis. Next, we turn to the actual conversations to show transcription in action, and follow with an analysis of the discourses evident, ending with suggestions for pedagogy they imply.

VI. Discourse CA in Action

Text One

This first transcription comes from an EFL class (n = 11) of Japanese lifelong learners who are all over the age of 55 and are learning *eikaiwa* (English conversation) in a non-formal setting, a community center. All of these learners, except for two, have been studying EFL for more than ten years in this setting. All of these learners could be classified as learners who enjoy learning EFL as a hobby or leisure activity (Kubota 2011). Their proficiency, as the excerpt below shows, ranges from false beginner to low intermediate. With this demographic—as Smithers (2014) has highlighted previously in a similar sample—is one in which the learners are very intrinsically motivated and have strong ideal L2 self images, but they are also, ironically, extrinsically motivated to an equal degree because of fears that "their relationship with their teacher and or classmates will be adversely affected if they quit studying" or because they feel that they must meet with their community every week for their hour-and-a-half lesson so that their medium-to-long-term hobby will not become a "futile" endeavour should they decide to break the bonds that this

learning community has created (p. 29).

Note that T denotes Teacher, students are identified as S1, S2, S3, and so on, while group utterances are denoted by 'Ss' (for 'students'), such as laughter or when two or more students are saying the same thing almost simultaneously in a manner that makes it too difficult to distinguish between voices.

1: T: Have you been to the Gion festival before?

2: S1: Yes.

3: T: And what did you think about it? Eh (. . .)

4: S2: Crowded. (laughs)

5: Ss: (laughter)

6: T: Crowded?

7: S1: It's ah *eto* [Japanese for hmm] (. . .) I I I thought *janai* [no] (. . .) *kanjiru*? [feel] I feelt.

8: S3: I felt *yo*.

9: S1: It's hot very hot and = crowded.

10: S4: = Yeah! =

11: S2: unn, yes.

12: T: So how did that make you feel?

13: S1: *un*? [unsure]

14: T: So how did that make you feel?

15: S1: How?

16: T: How did you feel?

17: S4: *doudatta*? [What did you think?]

18: S1: How did you feel?

19: S1: *eigode*? [In English?]

20: T: *eigode* [In English] (laughs)

21: Ss: (laughter)

22: S1: *dou kanjiru*? [How did I feel?]

23: T: So would you go again?

24: S1: No.

25: Ss: (laughter)

26: T: Alright. I see. S4.

27: S4: *eto*, I think um (. . .) when when this *eto* (. . .) when this season (. . .) I think um um I think summer summer season in Kyoto. I think summer season. *Datte* [but] (. . .) (xxx)

28: T: What do you mean? I think = this season, summer season

29: S4: = I think =

30: S4: I think, um *watashi wa natsu omou.* [I think summer is] *kono eto gy-*

ouji de natsu omou to iu no wa. [It means summer festivals] I feel *eto* summer season um in *eto Gion matsuri.* Gion festival. And, so, uh because I sound *kon kon chiki chiki kon chikichi* [onomatopoeia synonymous with Japanese summer festivals]

31: S5: *Gion bayashi*? [Name of the festival in Gion]

32: S4: *Gion bayashi.* I ss I I I heared uh the sound and *kon kon chiki chiki kon chikichi* (laughs)

33: Ss: (laughter)

34: S4: I like uh festival uh *eto Gion matsuri* [Gion Festival].

An analysis of any text ideally begins with the opening question or statement by the teacher because it provides the pretext for the utterances that follow and allows us to see if the interactions that follow are in line with the teacher's purpose for exchanges; to allow students an opportunity to interact on a topic that is familiar to them all, which in this case is a famous Japanese festival, the Gion festival. This is done because it affords students the opportunity to use what they know to converse or interact and to learn new vocabulary through such interactions on a topic that will be meaningful to them. In our text, it does seem to prove that students are keen to engage in topics that hold meaning to them. This is especially apparent by the way Student 4 code switched to be able to share her thoughts, and upon analysis and reflection of previous interaction on other topics, the author of this class has been able to conclude that this was a better than usual exchange and suggests that festivals might be good topics to introduce to the class in the future.

Next, in this text, we see that students are responding to teacher prompts, as is characteristic of low level learners, and turn taking can be observed. The questions and prompts are simple and help students 'home in' on an appropriate answer and make it possible for other students to follow the discussion. At this point, it is appropriate for teachers to personally assess whether or not they are dominating the conversation because this can be demotivating to students who are left out of exchanges. Ideally, interactions will be equally distributed among all student, and in this interaction we can only observe five of the eleven students interacting, which suggest that the teacher might want to look at limiting this type of exchange or break students up into smaller groups to provide greater opportunities for interaction among all of the students.

In terms of power, besides the vertical teacher-student dialectic/paradigm that is characteristic of direct transmission at lower proficiency levels, we also see other students stepping in to help each other. This is due to how the instructor has set up the student creations, and attests to how transcriptions can also uncover non-linguistic evidence of pedagogy outside the conversation. Culturally speaking, the

students' utterances are filled with references to context as well as L1 use. Even the native-English speaking teacher uses Japanese. Bonnah (2011a) notes the stigma in Japan of foreigners who teach English using Japanese, as well as the usefulness of L1 speaking (pp. 57-58), and so this analysis also touches on institutional pressures and social taboos of which the educator must be aware.

Text Two

The following conversation was recorded in a class of advanced Japanese learners of English. T denotes Teacher, students are identified as S1, S2, and S3, but only the leader (S1) talks in this extract. The original data is twenty minutes of student-chosen and led discussion, two of which are undergraduate Japanese females with overseas experience and near-native English, while the third is near-native, but with no overseas experience. In this extract, S1 is encouraged to conclude the discussion she was tasked with initiating.

The small number of students, which might be overlooked in other types of classroom-based research, makes this suitable as CA data, since CA focuses on small extracts (Nunan, 1996, p. 86). Additionally, the high levels of student English proficiency allow more complex conversational structures to be seen, but also allow the educator to see whether he is matching his own interactive strategies to high level learners, who are often overlooked in L2 classrooms.

1: T: You started it. What's your final word, final opinion on it?
2: S1: Yeah. Like S3 said like what do we cut but there's like I don't know how to say in English but there's like *doutoku*
3: T: Ah, it's ah moral moral education
4: S1: Moral education?
5: T: Or ethics yeah
6: S1: Yeah I learned English class in that time, so like yeah actually when I went to el elementary school I didn't have like English class but a teacher came (. . .) moral education =
7: T: = Un hunh un hunh
8: S1: class and I learned English from that class but
9: T: Oh so the class was in English?
10: S1: Yeah.
11: T: Ooh. OK interesting.
12: S1: In
13: T: Oh so they cut or they cut some moral (. . .)
14: S1: Yeah but we usually play at the like . . . ground like we
15: T: Playground yeah.

16: S1: Playground. But sometimes they cut like that time and we learned English

17: S3: Mmmmm

18: S1: But it didn't really work it was like one one in three weeks

19: T: Um oh once every three weeks yeah

20: S1: so it was nothing for me I just learned how to say hello or something like that

21: T: Well it probably it wasn't nothing it probably accumulated in your brain but it wasn't super big right?

22: S1: (xxx)

23: T: Interesting

24: S1: (xxx)

25: T: Yeah

To start, in terms of interaction, even though students are near-native, high level English users, we still see the type of repairs and clarifications common at lower levels. When the student at 14 tapers off without saying the word, the teacher suggests 'playground' at 15 which the student repeats at 16. Although normally this type of vocabulary suggestion is a feature of conversation at low levels and could be termed successful pedagogy, at such a high level upon reflection it might be considered off topic or breaking the flow of conversation, which is more important than accuracy. Here we see how CA leads to questioning of practices and fossilization of techniques when compared across teaching contexts. Similarly, at 3 the teacher translates S1's L1 utterance '*dotoku*' as moral education. Here again, the teacher could see this is an act to facilitate conversation and interaction, but as pedagogy it may be seen as a lost opportunity. Instead of providing the English word in 2, the teacher could have had students explain in simple English, giving them a chance to exercise their explanatory skills and cement meaning in their mind through interaction.

Next, from the whole conversation we can see that at higher levels, the prominent discourse is more of power and authority than interaction or identity. Specifically, although this conversation is meant to be a student-led discussion, the leader must be reminded of their authority and obligations by the teacher, and prompted repeatedly to fulfill them. This is at odds with the vocabulary prompt mentioned above, which undermines authority. Although the conversation is proceeding, at 21-22 the teacher interrupts to clarify the student's experiences. This is both an usurpation of the student's authority as discussion leader, as well as an exercise of the teacher's authority. Although both of these are natural in the L2 classroom and not examples of dominance per se, at the same time it could be seen as robbing the stu-

dent of agency and failing to support student-centered learning.

Finally, the student shows her identity as a Japanese person who learned English as an extension of a Christian-themed education. The mention of moral education at 4-6 shows the particularities of English in the Japanese context, even in higher education. This may suggest modifications to content taught by teachers, as students who have learned English in a religious context may be sensitive to topics or opinions that challenge their worldview. Alternately, the teacher should be aware that students may be unable or unwilling to express things in English due to their perception of anglo-christian taboos, as well as unfamiliarity with its discourses.

Conclusion

"The world is full of obvious things which nobody by any chance ever observes."
Sherlock Holmes -*The Hound of the Baskervilles*

From the analysis of conversation in Text 1, it is easy to see how a teacher of low level EFL learners can glean insights from performing discursive CA. Alternately, in Text 2, CA allowed the teacher to see where he had become complacent with high level students and missed opportunities to have them make repairs of their own mistakes. The interaction could still be classified as 'top-down', whereas at higher levels allowing students free reign would seem to be better pedagogically. Overall, one can see that even a simplified CA framework such as ours can stimulate insights on one's own teaching. At both high and low learner levels, CA practice serves to isolate places where teaching practice does not meet good pedagogy, thereby suggesting the incremental changes that are the aim of reflective teaching.

As we have shown, analysts new to CA do not need to be seasoned researchers, well-schooled in qualitative methods of inquiry, nor do they need to generate an *a priori* theoretical discussion of the literature to formulate a hypothesis. A basic understanding of our simplified discourse CA framework can allow educators to make useful insight about their own interactional practices based on identification of discourses in re-viewable recorded data, which will inspire them to make changes for the better. By using discourse-based CA for reflection, educators will be engaging in a practice that is reproducible and reliable, and one that supports evidence-based reflective teaching, while linking to sociolinguistic theoretical underpinnings and leading to shareable research.

Most importantly, the practice of identifying discourses of interaction, identification, and domination in classroom conversation allows a focus for reflection and thus pedagogical change. This change includes (1) greater clarity for teaching, (2) an awareness of non-productive, unconscious patterns in teaching, (3) an under-

standing of the importance of connecting interaction inside and outside the class-room, (4) an increased sense of responsibility and control over classroom activities, and (5) a zeal for further observation, reflection on practice, and investigation that benefits not only the reflective educator and his or her students, but also fellow educators and the field of Conversation Analysis. By sharing this with colleagues, they may increase both insights on their teaching, as well as enlarge the field of CA reflective pedagogy further.

However, the authors caution that the promise of discourse CA can only be fulfilled if practitioners try not to prescribe discursive foci, limit the number of reflective questions, or let the framework stagnate. The authors will continue to refine their method, knowing that the process of refinement for a living heuristic should never end. They also encourage educators to make discourse CA their own, creating new foci and reflective questions based on their experience, insights, and intuition. Only by applying these to classroom interaction and testing the method in more field studies or natural settings can discourse CA contribute to the practice of reflective teaching.

References

Abbott, A. (2004). *Methods of discovery: Heuristics for the social sciences.* New York: Norton.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1986). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bonnah, T. (2011 a). My dream: Towards a methodology for using Japanese in the ESL classroom. *The Language Teacher, 35*(1), 57-59.

Bonnah, T. (2011 b). Grading from the right direction. OnCUE Journal, 5(1), 37-43.

Bonnah, T. (2015). *A cautionary tale: Neoliberal discourse and the pedagogic function of the mediated Lost Japan narrative during the financial crisis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Doshisha University, Kyoto.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process.* Chicago: Henry Regnery.

D'hondt, S., Östman, J. O., & Verschueren, J. (2008). *The pragmatics of interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Edwards, J. A. (2001). The transcription of discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse* (pp.321-348). Malden: Blackwell.

Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing casual conversation.* London: Cassell.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2004). *Reflecting on classroom communication in Asia.* New York: Longman.

Gebhard, J. G., & Ueda-Montonaga, A. (1992). The power of observation: 'Make a wish, make a dream, imagine all the possibilities!' In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp.179-191). Cambridge: Cambridge.

Grant, C., & Zeichner, K. (1997). On becoming a reflective teacher. In J. Strouse (Ed.), *Exploring themes of social justice in education: Readings in social foundations* (pp.103-114).

New York: Pearson.

Heritage, J. (2008). Conversation analysis as social theory. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The new Blackwell companion to social theory* (pp.300-320). Oxford: Blackwell.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge.

Kubota, R. (2011). Learning a foreign language as leisure and consumption: Enjoyment, desire, and the business of eikaiwa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(4), 473-488.

McKay, S. L. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms.* New York: Routledge.

Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse.* London: Routledge.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing discourse analysis.* London: Penguin.

Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis.* New York: Continuum.

Rawls, A. W. (2012). Conversation analysis. In A. Harrington, B. I. Marshall, & H. P. Müller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social theory* (pp.146-150). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rex, L. A., & Schiller, L. (2009). *Using discourse analysis to improve classroom interaction.* New York: Routledge.

Rex, L. A., & Green, J. (2010). Classroom discourse and interaction: Reading across the traditions. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp.571-584). Malden: Blackwell.

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50,* 696–735.

Smithers, R. (2014). The ebb and flow of a language learner's motivational profile: A quasi-longitudinal study. In L. Yoffe & H. Obari (Eds.), *Proceedings of the JACET 2013 Summer Seminar, 12,* 26-31.

ten Have, P. (1986). *Methodological issues in conversation analysis.* Retrieved from http://www.paultenhave.nl/mica.htm#N_1_

Wetherell, M. (2005). Debates in discourse research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp.380-399). London: Sage.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy.* Hoboken: Routledge.

Woofit, R. (2001). Researching psychic practitioners: Conversation analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp.49-92). London: Sage.

Yule, G. (2011). *Pragmatics.* London: Oxford.