Engaging Reflection: A Training Exercise Using Conversation and Discourse Analysis

Tom Strong

The author describes an exercise for counselor trainees that promotes counselor reflection on the counseling process. The exercise, which also supports a social constructionist view of counseling, was introduced before, or concurrent with, skill development and required students to combine conversation and discourse analysis of their interactions with "clients." Methods of analysis are presented, along with specific instructions for the exercise, trainees' comments, and the author's reflections regarding the exercise.

We are seeking to complete and be completed . . . not to understand and be understood cognitively, not to get it right.
—Fred Newman & Lois Holzman, 1997, p. 113

In the last few years, I have been drawn to the collaborative potentials of counseling from a social constructionist perspective, according to which individuals construct and retain their understanding of the many forms of conversation that exist. Without bogging readers down in the complexities of the considerable body of knowledge regarding the theory (see Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Gergen, 1999; Shotter, 1993; or, as applied to counseling, Anderson, 1997; McNamee & Gergen, 1993; Parker, 1999), I will discuss the value I believe the constructionist perspective has for training and supervising counselors. In particular, I will offer a new twist on a standard counselor training tool: the transcribed interview.

Performing Counseling Skills for Whom? Some Self-Reflections

Perhaps like some readers, my initial exposure to counseling skills training was frustrating. In attempting to respond to the role-played clients of my training days—using sentence stems from Carkhuff (1969), Egan (1998), or Rogers (1961)—I came to doubt my abilities to communicate in general. My efforts were bound up in attempts to attain a 4 on Carkhuff's empathy or genuineness scales; this effort
made me focus more on obtaining that 4 and less on clients' responses to what I was saying. Like family therapist Bowen's (1978) concerns about triangulation, I had divided loyalties such that neither clients nor my focus on Carkhuff's scales received my full attention. However, as I came closer to obtaining 4-ish responses, clients were, in fact, responsive, although my journey was awkward and deeply unsettling. The audiotape transcription exercises of my training were the zenith of my "going for 4s" efforts, helping me (a) disrupt unaware and unhelpful conversational habits while (b) adding conversational tools that improved my counseling. As I watch counselor trainees fumble, early in their training, for a "right" way to converse, I have the same concerns for them that I had for myself during my own counselor training.

Trainees bring everyday, conversational improvisation skills and competence to their roles as counselors. I want them to be more reflective about those skills and competencies, recognizing how they contribute to counseling's hermeneutic circle, that is, how their comments shape and are shaped by their talk with others. To promote conscious use of these conversation-shaping skills, I now see different purposes for the transcription exercise: It can help trainees better understand how they contribute to the processes and outcomes of counseling, turn-by-conversational-turn.

Resourcefulness and Reflection Within Counseling's Constructive Conversations

Regarding counseling as socially constructed therapeutic conversation (Friedman, 1993; Gilligan & Price, 1994; McNamee & Gergen, 1993) marks a radical (some call it postmodern) departure from earlier views. This view is well established, however, in conversation and discourse analyses (e.g., Edwards, 1997; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Potter, 1996). Such ideas inform discursive approaches to counseling (e.g., Anderson, 1997; Kogan & Gale, 1997; McNamee & Gergen, 1993), and a particular ethical stance is implied when these approaches are used in practice (Swim, St. George, & Wulff, 2001): Meaning-making is undertaken or customized in mutually satisfying ways (Anderson, 1997; McNamee & Gergen, 1999; Weingarten, 1991). The customizing occurs through the conversational work of counseling—how individuals use words and nonverbal behaviors to influence each other. Because words are more than pictures of reality, individuals improvise in how they use words to understand and influence each other or how they go forward together (Wittgenstein, 1958). Anything less would mean "pre-scripted" conversation, although conversational routines can develop a fossilized feel (Newman & Holzman, 1997). From this perspective, counseling is valuable if it engages clients (and counselors) to speak in generative ways that build on what is already familiar to them (Shotter & Katz, 1999).
Early in their training, trainees should become reflective (Schon, 1983) about the effects of their ways of talking with clients, thus extending their conversational competence before they are introduced to particular counseling skills. My earliest skill development exercise with trainees, therefore, uses conversation analysis (Gale, 1995) and Friedlander's (1984) classification system for counseling discourse to heighten the trainees' awareness of how their ways of talking affect helping conversations.

**Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA)**

CA was developed from the ethno-methodological approach of Garfinkel (1967) as a research method for studying "talk-in-interaction." By analyzing the microdetails of what people say and do in conversation, CA accounts for how people "talk into being" their understandings, shared actions, and ways of relating. A significant focus of its analysis relates to how speakers manage conversational turns, referred to in CA as *adjacency pairs*. What people say and how they talk to each other at these turns have a great bearing on how their conversation develops. At the conversational turns, it is possible to see how individuals use conversational resources (e.g., words, nonverbal behavior, metaphors), and the listener's very next response shows how the conversation develops. CA is highly empirical; its micro details re-present each tenth of a second of conversation, making evident the effects of almost imperceptible communicative behaviors on individuals during conversations.

For family therapy researcher Gale (1991, 1995, 2000; Kogan & Gale, 1997), CA offered sensitizing tools to counselors who were curious about what their talk in counseling elicited. It can help practitioners determine whether their communications are congruent with their models of practice, and, better, it can permit reflection on aspects of their counseling that might be taken for granted. For Gale (1995), CA could be a self-supervision tool, helping counselors see how issues, relationships, understandings, and social identities are shaped, influenced, accepted, and rejected by each participant. The CA-derived exercise I present in this article helps trainees recognize how their often taken-for-granted microcommunications interact with those of the communications of their clients, thus contributing to the processes and outcomes of counseling. Trainees are asked to read one of Gale's (1995) chapters in order to familiarize themselves with CA's purpose and notational system.

DA is an umbrella term for methods that identify and analyze particular forms of talk and interaction. Some research has used DA to highlight cultural and institutional agendas that are evident in how counselors and clients speak with each other (Kogan & Gale, 1997; Parker, 1999). Such studies show that counselors draw clients...
into their ways of speaking and into their professional/cultural agendas by how they counsel. The much-abused term *deconstruction* fits here: The meanings and intentions behind what an individual says and does can be located (as social constructions) in particular forms of discourse or versions of reality. In addition, in discourse, meaning is seen as systematized (or rule bound) in particular ways of conceptualizing, talking, and relating, as when the street term *bad* (meaning *good*) is contrasted with its use in everyday parlance. Each discourse affords possible ways of understanding and communicating, while constraining other ways (Martin & Sugarman, 1999), but counselors' primary task is to be aware of the *positions* (Harre & Langenhove, 1999) they assume in different possible discourses. For example, misusing the word *love* on the tennis court could result in someone wearing a tennis racket!

Multicultural approaches to counseling (Pedersen, 1999) highlight a key feature of what I have explained. When counseling clients of different cultures, counselors are reminded that the ways of conversing and understanding are not the same, even when both parties speak English. Both CA and DA focus on how conversation is the medium individuals have for accomplishing things relationally: they bring to conversations different conversational resources (McNamee & Gergen, 1999) for understanding and negotiating mutually satisfactory outcomes. This view is in keeping with the multicultural counseling competencies identified by Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992), especially "Culturally skilled counselors are able to engage in a variety of verbal and nonverbal helping responses. They are able to send and receive both verbal and nonverbal messages accurately and appropriately" (p. 484). Minimally, CA and DA can help counselors recognize how they and clients use different meanings and ways of talking that must be reconciled in the conversational work required to arrive at shared understandings. Furthermore, it is counselors who must develop the sensitivities, flexibility, and varieties of verbal helping responses required for that work. Long ago, a Native American workshop participant reported at a conference on sexual abuse that for years, she had told, with difficulty, counselors and legal officials that a male family member had "bothered" her. Eventually, someone asked her what bothered meant, instead of presuming it was a benign, ignorable behavior. A failure to recognize differences in cultural meanings and ways of talking can occur when unaware counselors stop being curious or miss chances to talk their way to shared understandings with clients. This is tantamount to what Hardy (e.g., Hardy & Laszloffy, 1994) would consider "colorblindness," a cultural conversational deficit for what counselors do not discuss in counseling.
Central to the ethno-methodological (Garfinkel, 1967) roots of CA and DA research is a view that common sense is a conversational accomplishment that reflects the idiosyncracies of relationships, some that are as microscopic as couples and others that are as macroscopic as cultures. Whether in conversations with clients of different cultures or with clients of familiar cultures, counselors are reminded in many ways that their common sense is not shared and that conversational work is required to arrive at shared understandings. I canvassed many practitioners and researchers (including the primary ethno-methodology/conversation analysis electronic mailing list—ETHNO: Hotline) in an effort to identify examples of such counseling talk to present in this article, but to no avail, suggesting that there is a need for research of this kind. John Lawless, one of Gale's dissertation supervisees, used CA to examine discussions between family therapy trainees and supervisors regarding the trainees' possible or actual discussions of cultural issues in therapy (Lawless, Gale, & Bacigalupe, 2001; for a transcribed example from this research, see the Appendix). It is important to note here that CA and DA can show how differences in common sense (or meaning) are worked out at each conversational turn, contributing to what is accomplished as speakers take those turns to respond to each other (Strong, 2002b). Typically, there are many nonverbal cues (e.g., pauses, arrhythmic speech, facial gestures), which are transcribed in CA and DA, that show how counselors succeed in their conversational attempts to understand and influence clients. What matters is that these conversational transactions accomplish the client's purposes in seeking counseling.

Psychotherapy researcher Myrna Friedlander (1984) proposed a modest discursive scheme for analyzing communications between clients and counselors. In her provocatively titled article, "Psychotherapy Talk as Social Control," she classified the utterances of clients and counselors. This procedure can help counselors better discern how they interact with clients so that the effects of the communication on the course of counseling can be determined. Her two primary classifications include 10 categories of talk: Group 1 (Active Turns)—topic shift initiation, topic relevant act, initiatory turn, terminating turn, other metacommunication; Group 2 (Passive Turns)—topic relevant response, off-topic act, off-topic response, repair initiation, and passing turn. (For specific definitions of each category, see Friedlander, 1984, pp. 338-339.) Friedlander built on CA's attention to the microdetails of talk in counseling to develop a structured and limited way to evaluate those details. Although DA has been used to look at counseling's approaches (Kogan, 1998) or to show counseling as a cultural activity (Pare, 1996), my emphasis is to sensitize trainees to the content and effects of their talk.
Following is a description of trainees’ responses to being asked to reflect on their early counseling experiences, using CA and Friedlander’s DA approach. Their comments about the exercise are also presented.

The Exercise

I used this exercise, combining CA and DA, with two graduate-level classes taking a primary counseling skills development course. Within the 1st month of course work, they are asked to read Gale’s (1995) and Friedlander’s (1984) articles; they are then asked to select, from their first videotaped counseling session, a 5-minute passage to transcribe and analyze. They are told that the exercise is not meant to assess their counseling skills; assessment will take place later. Instead, they are asked to demonstrate their skills in accurately transcribing, analyzing, and reflecting on their videotaped passage. One focus is on the accuracy and detail of their transcriptions, which can be verified by cross-referencing their transcriptions with their videotape of the same passage. Another focus is on their correct use of Friedlander’s classification scheme. Finally, trainees are asked to conclude their analyses with a summary of what the exercise has taught them.

Trainees often meet this exercise with initial consternation. Many dislike videotaping themselves; others question the value of transcribing their work in such intricate detail. I have found that it is essential to frame the exercise as one that introduces reflection to their use of conversational skills, especially about the things they do in everyday conversation that they have taken for granted. I explain that this kind of analysis is a recommended form of self-supervision for seasoned counselors (Gale, 1995) and that it can enhance their understanding of the role they play in constructing counseling’s processes and outcomes. Toward this goal, trainees will also have read and discussed constructionist ideas about counseling (e.g., Anderson & Levin, 1998; Tomm, 1987; Weingarten, 1991). Recognizing that conversations are more than mere exchanges of information—that they are constructive insofar as they bring forth new understandings, actions, and ways of relating—creates a theoretical context in which the assignment makes greater sense. This is a subject by itself, but the exercise reinforces this perspective: Trainees see what their counseling constructs.

To illustrate the requirements and results of the exercise, following is a transcribed and analyzed passage from a counselor trainee’s videotaped session of the counselor trainee–client interaction. Trainees have indicated that the combination of transcription and analysis requires up to 10 hours to complete, not including the time required to videotape the interview and to select a passage for transcription. They transcribed 5-second segments for each line of talk, using abbreviations for Friedlander’s (1984) categories (see Table 1).
TABLE 1
Friedlander's (1984) Counselor Discourse Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friedlander Category</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic shift initiation</td>
<td>tsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic relevant act</td>
<td>tra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminating turn</td>
<td>tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other metacommunication</td>
<td>om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic relevant response</td>
<td>trr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-topic act</td>
<td>ota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-topic response</td>
<td>otr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair initiation</td>
<td>ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing turn</td>
<td>pt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following transcription system of CA (for a detailed description of this system with examples, see Gale, 1995) is based on data from conversation analyst developer Gail Jefferson (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998) and has been simplified for the exercise I have described (see Table 2).

Sample Transcription

111 Trainee: So, what you’d like to do is talk to her?
112 “Client”: ((looks at trainee then down to the right))
113 Yeah:. (.6) but it won' be easy.
114 Trainee: (hhh) How did you talk to your mother?
115 “Client”: MY MOTHER? What do you mean? (.4)
116 I thought this was between my wife and I=*
117 Trainee: Yeah. ((crossing his arms)) Ok::: Well (.hhh) what do you
118 want to say to her,
119 **then**?
120 “Client”: (hhh) I dunno. We mostly just argue.
121 Trainee: So, you want to talk in a way that doesn’t start an argument.
122 “Client”: ((rolling his eyes))Yeah, (2.4) **yeah**
123 [ ]
123 Trainee: Well let’s stop here.

This example provides some indication of the details involved in making a transcription. Evaluating this part of the exercise requires cross-referencing the detail and accuracy of the trainee’s transcript to what is observable in his or her videotaped interview. The next task is examining how the conversational turns were managed, using Friedlander’s (1984) coding. First, it is important to note the differences between what occurs at the end of a line and where a turn takes place (e.g., in the example presented, the client speaks two lines in 112 & 113). Second, as line 122 demonstrates, a conversational line can mean silence, in this case a pregnant silence that is shared by the trainee and the client. I ask trainees to show their coding (which, in their estimation, best classifies what takes place) at each conversational turn, which I did in this article when presenting the exercise. To complete the exercise, using Friedlander’s
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>A pause that is noticeable but too short to measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td>A pause timed in tenths of a second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>There is no discernible pause between the end of the speaker’s utterance and the start of the next utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>One or more colons indicate an extension of the preceding vowel sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline</td>
<td>Underlining indicates words that were uttered with added emphasis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>Words in capital are uttered louder than the surrounding talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.hhh)</td>
<td>Exhalation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hhh)</td>
<td>Inhalation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Material in parentheses are inaudible or there is doubt of accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Double parentheses indicate clarifying information, e.g., ((laughter)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Indicates rising inflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talk between</strong></td>
<td>Indicates quieter than surrounding talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}{Talk between}</td>
<td>Indicates quicker than surrounding talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>The bracket between turns indicates overlapped talk and is placed by the words overlapped.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More important, trainees are asked to reflect on the effects of their communications, that is, how they influence what clients say. To conversation analysts, the meaning of what one speaker says is evident in the response of his or her listener, helping trainees learn from what they notice about their talk and its effects. Trainees can be surprised by such things as their potential irrelevance to clients or their passivity. Other trainees believe that what they saw themselves saying and the effects of their contributions do not reflect what they intended to say. Their personal reflections can become a forum for excessive, even harsh, self-deprecation if instructions...
are not provided to emphasize that both positive and critically constructive comments are sought. The goal of the exercise is to allow trainees to see how they can build on their existing conversational competence and awareness. I also encourage comments about surprises the exercise elicits and the observed behaviors that affirm trainees' sense of doing things right. Usually, the comments highlight sensitivities the trainees have developed from their analyses, and, therefore, decreasing overall the sensitivities that I need to encourage in my role as their trainer and supervisor.

**Afterthoughts: Mine and Those of Trainees**

My goal in conducting this exercise is to make trainees more aware of the role of talk in counseling. Although counselor training often focuses on the correct practice of standard responses, much can be gained by simultaneously incorporating exercises, such as the one I have reported in this article, to enhance trainees' reflective participation in counseling. I want trainees to be more sensitive to how their talk performs in counseling, thus enhancing their sense of how using any conversational skill is interpreted by clients from any culture. Further variations on this exercise can be used to more fully develop specific areas for which trainees seek or require greater awareness. Reviewing videotapes of cross-cultural counseling can help trainees reflect further on what they and clients bring to each conversational turn. This permits closer analysis of the resources used by both parties at precise and significant conversational turns (Rawls, 2000). For example, asking trainees, who play a crucial role in their own development as counselors, to observe the effects of their efforts on clients can facilitate other kinds of responding. Focusing on repair initiation together, as a training group, can elicit many new conversational resources for how to initiate repairs for the counseling trainee's inevitable missteps and misunderstandings. However, I do not want to lose sight of the information that the CA transcriptions make available. Transcribing, alone, asks trainees to sensitize themselves to the microdetails of their talk and that of their clients, promoting more reflection on how they practice. In traditional CA, reviewing how conversational turns are managed can produce valuable retrospective hypotheses about the contextualized intentions of speakers, highlighting what is accomplished between the speakers as they talk.

I currently have only anecdotal comments to share regarding students' assessments of the exercise; students' comments were collected approximately 6 months after they completed the assignment. Formally sharing this exercise and students' views of it came as an afterthought during discussions with colleagues. Fur-
thermore, my current teaching assignment does not include a skill
development course of this kind. Thus, the comments must be
considered as tentative glimpses from students who were exposed
to the exercise. Further research is necessary to provide firm evi-
dence of the generalizability of the exercise.

The students' postassignment comments were generally favorable,
although most of them complained about some part of the transcrip-
tion phase. They appreciated the fact that the exercise focused on
things other than a counseling skill demonstration, while offering
up-close opportunities to reflect on their existing conversation skills.
They saw their contributions more clearly, noting the effect their
contributions had on conversation, regardless of their intentions.
That is, the students saw how their talk performed for them when
they were interacting with clients. My experience with non-CATran-
scription assignments is that trainees attend to nonverbal commu-
nications; however, the process of transcribing the counseling session
seemed to heighten the students' sensitivity. Such transcribing gen-
erally focuses on the counselor and not on how clients respond to
the counselor's nonverbal communication. Overall, the exercise I
described in this article allowed for greater reflection on how stu-
dents' ways of talking influenced their clients' responses and the
course of counseling.

Following are comments obtained from students after they com-
pleted the exercise.

Clearly reality is constantly being negotiated.

It helped me appreciate the way meanings and understandings are constructed
in conversation by looking at the exchanges that took place.

One trainee had difficulty distinguishing between or using the
Friedlander (1984) codes, adding however that,

I also liked looking at my voice and deciding whether it was an active or
passive one.

"Looking at [her] voice" is an aim of the exercise; conceptualizing
talk as visual allowed her to classify her responses, reinforcing
her attentiveness to how she communicated. Finally, it was the
"pickiness" of the exercise—its attention to microdetails—that was
frustrating to transcribe but that was so valuable to reflect on, as
evident in the following comment:

Having gone through the laborious exercise (and it was quite time consuming),
I now find myself doing this automatically during conversations and afterwards;
the exercise provided me with a tool (a framework) that's become internalized.

Discussing the exercise's outcomes helped trainees further recog-
nize how they coconstructed the proceedings, understandings, and
ways of relating that were evident in their transcribed conversations. In later supervisory opportunities involving videotaping, students were more sensitive to how their ways of talking influenced how clients responded to them.

Conclusion

My purpose in sharing this exercise has been to highlight an effective way to allow trainees to reflect on how their communicative behaviors contribute to the understandings, actions, and ways of relating that are an integral part of counseling. Presenting the exercise to students early in their training introduced them to the kind of reflection that Schon (1983) encouraged in all professionals:

In a practitioner's reflective conversation with a situation that he treats as unique and uncertain, he functions as an agent/experient. Through his transaction with the situation, he shapes it and makes himself a part of it. Hence, the sense he makes of the situation must include his own contribution to it. (p. 163)

This kind of reflection regarding how what counselors say influences what clients say, and vice versa, attempts to enhance the conversational flexibility (Strong, 2002a) of counselors as they practice. In a multicultural, postmodern world, the norms of conversation are hardly universal or static; meanings and ways of talk differ. For Wittgenstein (1958), words often function like deeds in how they play out in individuals' conversations and relationships. In short, this view of conversation holds that language is used improvisationally. Individuals can assume that the words they use reflect accepted understandings, but this is precisely where Wittgenstein would say language can go "on a holiday," where persons can fail to coordinate their understandings and intentions.

Conversation and discourse analysts attempt to show how people use language to create their ways of relating and what they accomplish through conversation. This is particularly important to counselors because their work is primarily conversational, making the quality of a collaborative working relationship central to ethical and successful practice. By promoting this kind of reflection on counseling talk early in the training of counseling students, through the use of the CA/DA exercise, I hope that trainees can better respond to the improvisational immediacies required in counseling. Sequentially, I prefer to introduce this exercise before teaching any of the common counseling skills. The reflection it promotes helps trainees become receptive to these skills as conversational resources (McNamee & Gergen, 1999) to enhance their responsiveness in counseling. It can also help to minimize trainees' efforts to be theoretically "right" when those efforts are not perceived as right for clients.
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**APPENDIX**

In the following example, I analyzed a conversation from Lawless et al. (2001, p. 190). The transcribed conversation highlights the meaning-making efforts of a trainee (T2) and supervisor (S) and can be seen as analogous to the conversational work involved in cross-cultural counseling.

402 T2: And (2.49) again, it it (1.0) I said it in several different ways but I
403 felt as I was saying it, >this was a phone conversation<, I felt that
404 I was (.86) forcing, (1.25) to some extent, I was forcing my values
405 on her (1.68) by emphasizing the impact that this was having,
406 could be having on Jim.
407 (1.61)
408 S: Do you have the sense that, that, that is not valid a valid argument?
409 T2: I think it is a valid argument but [the
410 S: Hhm, hhm]
411 T2: the feeling I had making the argument
412 S: Hhm, hhm
413 T2: vas tres vas,
414 S: YEA
415 T2: was that I was pushing a point of view upon her that she was
416 (1.12) uh (1.55) "she didn't rea- really want to (1.24) accept as
417 valid." (4.45) So I felt aggressive. I don't think (2.15) if you had
418 overheard me, I don't think I
419 S: [Hhm, hhm]
420 T2: would] have sounded aggressive. I think I would have
421 sounded very gentle. [But internally I felt aggressive
422 S: and but that hhm, hhm] But does it
423 come from a cultural difference?
424 (3.0)

In examining the transcription above, one can see conversational work around the trainee’s self-doubts about a matter pertaining to cultural competence (sounding too pushy or aggressive in a culturally biased way) in working with a particular client. The supervisor’s contributions at lines 408, 414, and 422-423 are followed by responses by the trainee showing T2’s efforts to grapple with the topics raised and extended by the supervisor. For conversation analysts, interest focuses on how speakers make sense of, and influence, each other; this should be evident in how turns between speakers are managed and in how they respond to each other. Although the previously presented transcript does not highlight multicultural counseling specifically, it does convey what conversational work in counseling can accomplish. Transcribing the talk permits the trainee to see what occurs as speakers make sense of and build on each other's responses.
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