

Using Transcription and Conversation Analysis for a Learner of Japanese

Jeffrey Martin

Reference Data:

Martin, J. (2022). Using transcription and analysis of conversation for a learner of Japanese as a second language. In P. Ferguson, & R. Derrah (Eds.), *Reflections and new perspectives*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2021-33>

Conversation analysis (CA) is used by a growing number of SLA researchers for tracing L2 interaction. But an opportune benefit to L2 learners would be to present CA-inspired notation of L2 interaction back to them for their own learning. This paper details learning opportunities that occurred within a process centered on interactions between one speaker of Japanese as a second language (JSL) and two native Japanese interlocutors; these interactions were transcribed, analyzed, and then later discussed to check interpretation. Emergent findings included marked divergences of mutual understanding that continued in parallel between the interactants. The characteristic of dropping reference markers in Japanese became salient, and the JSL speaker reported using this awareness to refine his sensitivity for anticipating them during conversation. The outcomes of the study provide support for CA-inspired pedagogic strategies, such as having L2 learners analyze their own L2 interaction and discuss what emerges with peers.

会話分析 (CA) は、L2の相互作用を見極めるためにますます多くのSLA研究者によって使用されている。一方で、L2学習者にCAからの調査結果を提示することでL2上達を促すという利点もある。本研究では、第二言語としての日本語 (JSL) 話者一名と日本語母語話者二名との対話の相互作用についてのCAを詳述した。相互作用の抜粋は、その後のディスカッションで使用するためにCAの書き起こしを介して提示した。分析された会話から浮かび上がった点は、当該話者間で並行して続いた相互理解の著しい相違である。その主な原因として、日本語は主語を省略できるという特徴が考えられる。JSLの話者は、日本語の会話の中で省略されている主語を予測するための感度を向上させるのに、CAの書き起こしが役立ったと報告した。本研究はより広い意味で、L2学習者にとって書き起こしを使用する学習方法が有効であることを裏付けた。

Conversation Analysis (CA) is a sociological approach to the systematic study of everyday talk (Sacks et al., 1974). SLA researchers, such as Firth (1996) and Markee (2007), have adapted CA from the study of native speakers (NS) to that of lingua franca talk among nonnative speakers (NNS). In principle, conversations between nonnative and

native speaking individuals build their conversations moment by moment like anyone else. Although proficiency level in a second language can affect the social actions achievable in NNS–NS interaction, it is important to emphasize two remarks made by Schegloff (2007) about how conversations are maintained. First, speakers in any interaction can encounter troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding. Second, not all sources of trouble or misunderstandings may be correctly noticed and addressed in the moment, and seemingly problem-free utterances can be treated as in need of repair. CA focuses on this *talk-in-interaction* case by case. Academics in many fields, including SLA, find utility in CA to build understanding of human interaction (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013).

However, EFL teachers can also use aspects of CA to assist students in understanding their own L2 interactions. Features of turn sequence, overlap, pause, and voice pass with each moment of a conversation, but they can be made tangible for later review by L2 learners through the detailed transcription of CA. In this way, L2 learners can revisit “the relevancies to which the participants themselves show themselves to be oriented” (Schegloff, 1988, p. 21). The primary aim of this paper is to demonstrate a CA-influenced approach for using transcripts of learner interaction directly with the learners themselves in order to allow for emergent and personalized L2 development. Seeing how their L2 interactions are maintained can afford learners unique opportunities to consciously register input for language learning (Schmidt, 1990).

In this study, emergent CA findings from NNS–NS interactions in Japanese were presented back to participants for them to recall and draw insights about their interactions. The protocol used in this study was similar to Jefferson’s (2004) CA transcription but adopted for interaction in Japanese. What emerged in this study were instances of marked divergences of shared understanding between the interactants, which appeared to be due to the dropping of reference markers in Japanese (O’Grady et al., 2008; Zushi, 2003). Using CA transcripts in discussion sessions with each participant allowed for a member-checking procedure. In the end, the JSL speaker in this study reported that the process brought meaningful opportunities for honing sensitivity to

the dropping of reference markers in Japanese interactions. This study can serve as a reference for L2 instruction, where L2 learners record their conversation and transcribe its interactional features to a feasible level of detail and then analyze them with classmates to check and learn from each other's experiences.

Literature Review

The features of interactions between people emerge on their own, moment by moment, and there is a challenge for researchers to investigate these interactions due to the passage of time. Geertz (1973) wrote that the details of social discourse are recalled in hindsight through a lens of interpretation, if remembered at all. Therefore, to investigate social discourse, "the interpreting involved consists in trying to rescue the 'said' of such discourse from its perishing occasions and fix it in perusable terms" (p. 21). Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) took this inductive inquiry from the societal to the individual scale, investigating how individuals structure the interaction of specific, naturally occurring conversations, as built by and understood by those talking. Conversation Analysis helps to explicate conversational practices that humans rely upon for mutual intelligibility and common action by detailing the effects of each speaker's turn (Jefferson, 2004; Sacks et al., 1974; Schegloff, 2007).

To make a conversation perusable for analysis, talk-in-interaction is transcribed using the CA notation protocol devised by Jefferson (2004), which details pauses, overlap, and phonemic features of what is said. From this notation, turn-taking, the pairing of utterances, repair, and other actions can be analyzed in their own right without relying on a prescriptive lens of interpretation. In doing so, CA transcription aims to capture how conversations are systematically organized, utterance by utterance, to gain insight into human interactions in an inductive bottom-up way. CA aims to avoid deductive, a priori reasoning based on preformulated conclusions, motivations, or social theories which may be placed onto individuals in an interaction (Heritage, 1984). Schegloff (2007) wrote, "We start from an observation about how some bit of talk was done, and ask: What could someone be doing by talking in this way? What does that bit of talk appear designed to do?" (p. 8). Viewing this recurrent structure provides a window into how humans interpret each other during interaction.

Interactions between native and nonnative speakers of various languages are commonplace around the world, and analysis of their lingua franca talk is warranted (Firth, 1996). Japanese is one such language spoken by and between an increasing number of nonnative speakers. The diversity of people residing in Japan is exemplified

by the sharp increase of foreign students (JASSO, 2019). This increase of people coming to Japan to enter universities, vocational schools, Japanese language programs, and work programs, has brought a wave of JSL speakers entering Japanese communities. These JSL speakers interact within the community to achieve social aims. CA findings are to be found strictly from what unfolds between interactants, case by case (Schegloff, 2007). That is, a priori assumptions about linguistic, motivational, and sociological characteristics of these speakers are set aside. Rather, CA places attention on what persons understand from one another within their interaction.

In using tools of CA with L2 learners, the detail of transcription can be adjusted for the situation and member-checking can be done through discussion. To date, NNS-NS interactions have been of interest to conversation analysts. For example, Markee (2007) focused on the development of Chinese EFL speakers and argued that CA approaches can track L2 speakers' development as they "locally enact progressively more accurate, fluent, and complex interactional repertoires" (p. 406). Firth (1996) analyzed a corpus of interaction between L2 speakers of various first languages that occurred in relation to Danish trading companies. But neither study presented CA findings to the participants. However, CA transcription can be done for the sake of the speakers at a level of detail appropriate for the language being used. A complementary feature of the current study is member-checking where the learner and researcher aim to check understanding in subsequent discussion sessions. Member-checking helps maintain an emic grounding of understanding (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Here, there is overlap between strictly research-focused CA and CA-inspired pedagogy with L2 learners.

The Current Study

The research goals were to use a CA-inspired approach to understand interactions between a JSL speaker and two native Japanese speakers. These findings were presented back to each speaker during discussion sessions (member-checking) to check understanding and to provide learning opportunities for the JSL speaker. The framework and considerations detailed above drove the formulation of the following research questions:

- RQ1. What noteworthy phenomena from NNS-NS interactions might be revealed through this conversation analysis?
- RQ2. During the subsequent discussion sessions, to what extent will the JSL speaker see himself or his Japanese interlocutors as having noticed at the initial moment of speaking what the conversation analysis later revealed?

RQ3. In what ways, if any, might the JSL speaker's retrospective reflection on these interactions lead to opportunities for L2 development?

Methodology

Context and Participants

This study centered on observations and audio recordings of a JSL speaker in two free-talk conversations with two different native speakers of Japanese. The retrospective discussion sessions were conducted separately with each of the participants in their respective languages. All meetings were situated at a Japanese language school in the Kanto region of Japan. The JSL speaker was a student, and the two Japanese NS were freelance language teachers. Over the course of this study, the NSs' roles as tutors and the NNS's role as a student were set aside. The aim was to facilitate open-ended NNS-NS interactions in Japanese. Retrospective discussion sessions followed these interactions. Each participant was assigned a pseudonym.

The JSL speaker, Joseph, had been a student at the school for 10 months and had taken lessons from a variety of teachers within the school's network. A Western European in his early thirties, he had resided in Japan for about 7 years. He reported being more confident in his speaking and listening abilities and said that he aimed to pass the N2 level of the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT). The two native Japanese speakers, Shuuta and Kazami, were language teachers associated with the school for 7 and 3 years, respectively. Joseph had already taken lessons from Shuuta and Kazami in the past, so they had established familiarity from which to quickly greet each other and start an open conversation, all in Japanese.

Regarding ethical considerations for this research design, I first discussed the study with the owner of the language school, who gave approval and then helped put me in contact with Joseph, Shuuta, and Kazami. I presented each participant with information about the study and the time requirements. Each participant gave informed consent to participate. All data were kept in a secure location offline. All participants were compensated for their time in the form of lesson fees paid.

Data Collection

Data from the conversation sessions helped structure the data collection in the subsequent discussions. These discussion sessions involved member-checking to accurately represent the participants' NNS-NS interactions and their retrospective

interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The two conversation sessions were between Joseph and Shuuta and then Joseph and Kazami. Observations were made from the side of the room while taking audio recordings with Voice Record Pro 3.7.5 by Dayana Networks Ltd., and app installed on a tablet computer. Next were the discussion sessions in which I individually met with Shuuta, Joseph, Kazami, and then Joseph again. Like Seidman (2013), I aimed to not ask leading questions and I tried to listen more than speak. Member-checking was done by providing audio recorded excerpts and CA transcript data during these discussion sessions.

The two conversation sessions between Joseph and Shuuta and Joseph and Kazami were held during the first week. Analysis of the recordings and preparation of the transcripts were carried out over the next two weeks. The retrospective discussion sessions with each participant were held on the fourth week.

Positionality

I was a new acquaintance to the three participants, but our shared interest in language made for cordial cooperation. Additionally, this researcher is also a JSL speaker. Although my presence as an observer could possibly lessen the spontaneity of communication that could be found in a more naturally occurring encounter, this effect was hopefully mitigated by the participants' familiarity with each other. My aim was to gain understanding of NNS-NS talk-in-interaction from a bottom-up perspective that did not apply a priori interpretation of the data collected during the process. Likewise, the questions I asked during the discussion sessions aimed to draw responses unique to the participants and their own understanding of their interactions.

Method of Analysis

The NNS-NS interactions were reviewed, transcribed, and inductively analyzed. Patterns of interaction began to emerge, and this led to the choosing of excerpts. The transcripts were used during the discussion sessions, and this provided data for further analysis and comparison. The transcription of segments of the two conversations followed the general CA transcription conventions of Jefferson (2004) and they can be found in Appendix A. Jefferson's system of annotation was devised for talk-in-interaction in English, but the conversations in the current study were in Japanese. Given the differences in prosody of the two languages (i.e., English is a stress-timed language, Japanese is a mora-timed language), annotation of intonation and stress patterns typical of English were not included.

The transcriptions consisted of the original Japanese kana script, its Romanized letter form with Jeffersonian CA notation, and English translation. The English translation was kept at the phrase level, generally limited to the meaning explicitly articulated in the Japanese utterances. This distinction is made salient when the cross linguistic differences of reference marking between English and Japanese is discussed (i.e., dropped subjects or objects in Japanese utterances; see O’Grady et al., 2008; Zushi, 2003 for an overview).

Analysis and Discussion

Throughout the conversations between Joseph and Shuuta and Joseph and Kazami, instances of successful and unsuccessful reference marking were observed. One successful example (with Joseph and Kazami) and one ambiguous example (with Joseph and Shuuta) are discussed in this section. In the post observation discussion sessions with Joseph, the featured example of understanding breaking into two parallel lines of thought appears related to the referencing features of conversational Japanese. That is, subjects and objects do not always need to be explicitly stated in Japanese conversation. Instead, the inferencing of this crucial information by interactants is attended to through pragmatic means (Zushi, 2003).

Successful Reference Marking

The first example shows a clear and successful instance where Joseph and Kazami receive each other’s utterances according to the recipient design at each turn. They are talking about needing guidance for an online party-space app so that partygoers use it properly. A new year’s party for the language school was coming up online. The school was going to use a new online party-space app called ‘oVice’. The most recent online party (held the previous December) used an online party-space app called ‘REMO’, but there were many problems with people gaining access (see Appendix B for the featured fragment between Joseph and Kazami).

The transcript fragment between Joseph and Kazami is an example of talk that appeared to converge for each speaker into a shared understanding within the interaction. Evidence points to Joseph and Kazami’s tying of referents. Additionally, the CA transcription notation reflects the overlap in their turn taking. As Levinson and Torreira (2015) detailed, the latencies involved in language production are generally over 600 ms and short gaps between turns (of the order of 200 ms) imply that interactants often anticipate each other’s utterances. Even more so, the overlapping between Joseph and Kazami strongly suggests that at this point, they were successfully referencing each other in shared understanding.

Examples of referencing included the uses of *zembu* [all] at lines 1 and 3, the uses of *dōn* [oh, no] at lines 5 and 6 and the uses of *shai* [shy] at lines 9 and 10. These Japanese words appeared to provide enough information for Joseph and Kazami to tie each other’s utterances at each turn of the conversation. There was no indication of confusion emerging within this fragment. Later in Joseph and Kazami’s conversation, however, an instance of an ambiguous paralleling of reference markers occurred when they were hypothesizing about whether students would be made to practice the app before joining the party. However, in this paper I share a more salient instance of a marked divergence of mutual understanding that continued in parallel between Joseph and Shuuta.

Ambiguous Reference Marking

A transcribed instance between Joseph and Shuuta showed an apparent loss of shared understanding when they discussed movies and series. Shuuta was looking up shows via a website on his laptop when he found *Outlander*, an original fantasy series on Netflix set in Scotland 200 years ago. Shuuta had not seen it, but he mentions that the book it is based on is a best seller and that the series seemed interesting (see Appendix C for the featured fragment between Joseph and Shuuta).

After an extended explanation about the series by Shuuta, Joseph responded at line 10 about not wanting to watch something long. A divergence seems to start at this point. There appears to be confusion between the speakers’ utterances in lines 7-10 about who is talking about series or movies. Joseph’s response does not seem to connect to Shuuta’s discussion of the series, because the series’ episodes are shorter than a single movie. Then, Shuuta’s mention of “two hours” (line 11) suggests that he changes his focus and is now referring to movies instead, but there is unclear evidence from what has been explicitly said. Additionally at line 11, Shuuta continues with the confirmatory statement of *nagasuginowa* [too long] being not ideal. Joseph’s question at line 12 appears to be a clarification, but he continues to outline his idea. Shuuta quickly sharing a laugh indicates that he thinks that a shared understanding is being kept. The CA transcript generally shows negligible gaps of time between Joseph and Shuuta’s turns, which suggests a paralleling of ideas has not been noticed by either Joseph or Shuuta.

Noticing by the JSL Speaker

With the CA transcript as an aid, Joseph (J) mentioned to the researcher (R) that he could look back on the conversation with fresh eyes. He stated that he was now wondering if in fact a misunderstanding had been unknowingly underway between Shuuta and him.

Martin: *Using Transcription and Conversation Analysis for a Learner of Japanese*

- R: I was curious about what he said on line 11, like, 2 hours, *nijikanguraino ga ii*.
 J: Yeah.
 R: So that would be about a movie?
 J: Yeah, well we were talking about a series, so... hmm... I sometimes find that, though, like, without the subject [or object], sometimes it's hard to know. Like is he introducing the subject of a movie? That is kind of my guess.
 R: I see. What is *yatsu* [thing] at line 12?
 J: Yeah, I think a series or a movie
 R: So, if it's a long movie, do you still want to know ahead of time?
 J: Hmmm... maybe just a series...

Joseph doesn't want to waste time with entertainment that does not match his tastes. At line 16, he conveys that it is good to check beforehand. However, Shuuta's rejoinder to Joseph's idea appears to be directed at movies but not series, which Shuuta had originally introduced.

Shuuta later confirmed in his retrospective interview that he was originally talking about the series *Outlander* at this moment. But upon reviewing the CA transcript, he was then not sure if Joseph was talking about series as well or if he was talking about movies. The subject (movies or series) is not explicitly mentioned during this exchange in Japanese, whereas a typical grammar construction of English calls for the explicit mention of subjects and objects. Later in the discussion sessions, Joseph (J) elaborated on how his and Shuuta's understandings of the conversation by this point were probably diverging.

- J: Cuz actually... ya know, it's funny because I... I didn't notice he said... because, ya know, the conversation goes so fast. So, he's like, "*Sokka... touchuude ...*" [ah... part-way through] (line 15)... I don't know what this meant... Ya know, I think this is where the conversation is going ya know like... two different directions.
 R: Yeah.
 J: Because I think he's talking about... quitting halfway through a series being okay, but I'm kind of talking about... I think I'm trying to clarify what I said earlier about...
 R: I see.
 J: Before you watch a series, you want to know if it is good...

Naturally, series are presented in episodes but watching a whole series only to become disappointed in it partway through would result in much time lost. A person can lose time by watching a disappointing movie of about two hours, but that time lost would still be less than watching many episodes of a series. It makes sense to want to know if a series is good before spending much time watching it. This discrepancy of understanding during the interaction illustrated how a divergence between two speakers can continue unnoticed unless a clarifying juncture arises.

Concluding from lines 17-20, no utterances by Joseph nor Shuuta brought this apparent divergence to their attention during their interaction. The dropping of the Japanese words for movies, series, and referencing pronouns is natural for Japanese conversation (O'Grady et al., 2008). Also, the meanings represented by these unsaid words are not indicated through Japanese morphology (Zushi, 2003). Instead, interactants must infer this information through the pragmatics of the interaction. In the end, Joseph and Shuuta's inferencing encountered points of ambiguity about what each person was talking about. The member-checking of information using CA transcripts revealed these noteworthy issues to the interactants.

Learning Opportunities

Joseph, Shuuta, and Kazami showed interest in learning about their interactions when they engaged with the CA-inspired transcripts printed on paper. They were observed rereading and pointing to the pauses and overlap within the interactions. They also asked and answered detailed questions. Joseph reported a raised awareness about how Japanese subject/object dropping within a flow of turn-taking can affect mutual understanding. He reported having been already acquainted with this way of conveying meaning when speaking Japanese. But as the receiver of input in conversation, he mentioned that he would try to be more conscious of potentially changing content, and at times, respond with an explicit confirmatory utterance to check understanding.

The outcomes of this CA-inspired study were specific to one JSL learner, but they support similar activities with groups of L2 learners in classroom settings. By transcribing one's spoken L2 interaction, the momentary utterances of an interaction can be made tangible for deeper review. Similar procedures have been researched in the field of SLA more generally. Mennim (2012) found a self-transcribing task prompted L2 learners to negotiate language form and engage in productive discussions with peers, all independent of their teacher. Such retrospective discussion mirrors the member-checking step of the current study. Another study by Lynch (2007) found that self-

translation was feasible under normal classroom conditions and that it helped learners improve accuracy after subsequent activities. Lastly Cooke (2013) echoed the findings of Mennim and Lynch and found that the autonomy afforded to students through using transcripts promoted a sense of responsibility for their own L2 development. These studies support the use of transcripts with L2 learners. The current study illustrated how adopting aspects of CA transcription can further benefit L2 learners by making interactional features of conversation more salient.

Conclusion

Findings from using CA transcripts of NNS-NS interactions in this study were not only used for academic inquiry. Rather, the findings were presented back to a JSL speaker and the other participants in the aim of providing opportunities for L2 development. The transcripts illustrated interactional features of pause and overlap to make the flow of conversation more salient for the JSL speaker. Emergent findings included how mutual understanding about what is being said among speakers can diverge due to the dropping of reference markers, which is common to the Japanese language (Zushi, 2003). The JSL learner in this study reported increased awareness about inferring unstated subjects and objects. This inductive study supports previous literature on how well learners and instructors in L2 classrooms can utilize L2 transcripts to make interactional features of conversation salient for extended inquiry. Interpretations of the transcripts were also compared between participants to confirm understanding. This CA-inspired study on interactional features in conversation can serve as a reference for L2 speaking instruction where learners transcribe their own L2 interactions and then review and study them in detail with peers.

Bio Data

Jeffrey Martin has taught EFL learners in a variety of settings within secondary and tertiary education in Japan. He has a M.S.Ed. from Temple University, Japan Campus. Some of his research interests include materials design, vocabulary development, L2 listening, and pragmatics. jeffmjp@gmail.com

References

Cooke, S. D. (2013). Examining transcription, autonomy, and reflective practice in language development. *RELC Journal*, 44(1), 75-85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473271>

- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237-259. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(96\)00014-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8)
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. Basic Books.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.
- JASSO. (2019). 令和元年度外国人留学生在籍状況調査結果 [Annual survey of international students in Japan 2019]. Japan Student Services Organization. Retrieved from <https://www.studyinjapan.go.jp/ja/statistics/zaiseki/data/2019.html>
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Pragmatics & beyond new series*, 125, pp. 13-31. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Levinson, S. C., & Torreira, F. (2015). Timing in turn-taking and its implications for processing models of language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00731>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Lynch, T. (2007). Learning from the transcripts of an oral communication task. *ELT Journal*, 61(4), 311-320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm050>
- Markee, N. (2007). Toward a learning behavior tracking methodology for CA-for-SLA. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 404-427. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm052>
- Mennim, P. (2012). Learner negotiation of L2 form in transcription exercises. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 52-61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr018>
- O'Grady, W., Yamashita, Y., & Cho, S. (2008). Object drop in Japanese and Korean. *Language Acquisition*, 15(1), 58-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489220701774278>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Description in the social sciences I: Talk-in-interaction. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics*, 2(1-2), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1075/iprapip.2.1-2.01sch>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed). Teachers College Press.
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Zushi, M. (2003). Null arguments: The case of Japanese and romance. *Lingua*, 113(4-6), 559-604. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(02\)00085-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(02)00085-2)

Appendices

Appendix A:

Transcript conventions (Jefferson, 2004)

(.)	Very short gap of silence
(0.4) (1.5)	Timed silence in seconds
↑ ↓	Higher or lower tone in following syllable(s)
>fast<	Increased speed
[Beginning of conversational overlap
=	No gap between adjacent utterances
(hhh)	Laughter within talk
wo::rd	Lengthening of the preceding sound
(word)	Added English word(s) in translation to ensure understanding
(())	Transcriber comment

Note 1: The conversations in Japanese are transcribed and translated at three levels for each utterance: Japanese in kana script, Japanese in Romanized letter script, and English translation.

Note 2: The English translations were kept to the phrase level. Generally, only meaning that was explicitly stated in the Japanese is translated.

Appendix B:

CA Transcription Fragment of Joseph and Kazami

01 JOSEPH:	最初から	じゃ、どうぞ	全部	自分で主体的にやってくださいと言え、
	saishokara (0.2)	jah, douzo (.)	zenbu (0.4)	jibundeshutekiniyatte kudasaitoieba
	From the beginning...	Oh, go ahead	all (of it)	if you say, "please do it yourself on your own"

02	上手く行か [ない。 umakuika [nai <i>It won't go well</i>
03 KAZAMI	[そうね。ハハハ、 たしかにいきなり 全部は [soune (hhh) >tashikaniikinari< zenbuwa= <i>Yeah certainly (if) suddenly all of it</i>
04 JOSEPH:	いきなりは =ikinariwa (.) ((sniffle)) <i>Being (so) sudden</i>
05	そうやれば ド[ーン! souyareba (0.6) ↓d[ō:::n ((Head nod and downward hand movement)) <i>If (you) do that ohh... (oh, no)</i>
06 KAZAMI	[ハハハ、 皆 多分 ドーンと 思う。 [(hhhhh) mina tabun (.) dō::nto omou= <i>Everyone probably (I) think would be shocked/like 'doh!'</i>
07 JOSEPH:	はい。 =ha[i <i>Yeah</i>
08 KAZAMI	[シャイだし。 [shaidashi= <i>because (they are) shy and...</i>

Martin: *Using Transcription and Conversation Analysis for a Learner of Japanese*

09 JOSEPH: シャ [イ
=sha[i
Shy

10 KAZAMI [うん、うん。
[uhn uhn
Right right

Appendix C:

CA Transcription Fragment of Joseph and Shuuta

01 SHUUTA アウトランダーだ。 アウトランダー。 ((Looking up from the computer))
↑autorandahda(.) ↓Autorandah::: (0.6)
It's Outlander Outlander...

02 200年まえの スコットランドに タイムスリップ しちゃう やつ。
nihyakunenmaeno sukottorannndoni taimusurippu >shichau yatsu<
200 years ago in Scotland timeslip (to the past) story

03 これ、 おすすめって 言っていた。
kore (.) osusumette yutteita.
This one (the website) said they recommend it

04 (9.0) ((Shuuta is reading about Outlander from a website))

05 見てないけど ダイアナ ガバルドンの ベストセラー。
mitenaikedo (3.0) daiana (.) gabarutonno omoubesutoserah
I haven't seen it but. It's a best seller from Diana Gabaldon

06 (14.0) ((Shuuta is reading about Outlander from a website. Joseph is waiting))

07 これ、 面白いらしい。
kore (.) omoshiroirashii (1.1)
This seems pretty good

08 でも、 こんだけ長いとね。 けっこう時間がないと 見れない。
Demo (.) kondakenagaitone (.) kekkoujikanganaito. (1.6) mirenai
But one that's that long ya know if (you) don't have a lot of time can't watch it

09 (6.0) ((Joseph is seemingly planning his speech))

10 JOSEPH: ん うん んんん 長いなら まあ、 見たくない。
Hmm ↑uhn::: (.) nagainara (6.0) ma (.) mitakunai
Hmm uhm... if long yeah don't want to watch it

11 SHUUTA あ、そう。 長すぎるのは。 2時間ぐらいのがいい。 2時間。
ah (.) sou (.) nagasuginowa (2.0) nijikanngurainogaii (.) nijikan=
Ah right as for being too long about two hours is enough two hours

12 JOSEPH: それは、 長いやつ? 見る前に いいか 悪いか 知りたい。
= sorewa (1.5) nagaiyatu? mirumaeni (.) iika (.) waruika (.) shiritai=
Yeah long ones before watching. if good or bad want to know

13 SHUUTA なる(ハハハ) ほど ね。
= naru (hhh) hodo ne=
(I) see, yeah

14 JOSEPH: 時間を無駄にした[くない。
= jikanwo mudani[shitakunai
(I) *don't want to waste time*

15 SHUUTA [ハハハハ。。 あ、 そっか。 途中でて。
[(hhhhh) (0.2) ah (.) sokka (.) tochudete
Oh, (I) see (stopping) part-way

16 JOSEPH: いいかどうか 確認してもいい。
iikadouka (0.4) kakuninnshitemoi.
If good or not it's okay to check

17 SHUUTA なるほど。 失敗したくない。
naruhodo shippaishitakunai
(I) *see don't want to 'fail' (waste time)*

18 JOSEPH: うん。
unn
yeah

19 (1.6)

20 SHUUTA それは、 あるかも ね。
sorewa ↑arukamo ↓ne
Yeah maybe that, too