

Use Authorization

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Idaho State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further state that permission to download and/or print my dissertation for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of my academic division, or by the University Librarian. It is understood that any copying or publication of this dissertation for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

CO-CONSTRUCTING REFLECTION OF FEELING:
CONVERSATION ANALYTIC STUDY OF BASIC SKILL USE BY
COUNSELORS-IN-TRAINING

by

Kristen E. Lister

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Counseling

Idaho State University

May 2016

Copyright (2016) Kristen E. Lister

To the Graduate Faculty:

The members of the committee appointed to examine the dissertation of
KRISTEN E. LISTER find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Steven J. Moody, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

David M. Kleist, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Elizabeth Doughty Horn, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Tracy J. Farnsworth, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Alexander R. Bolinger, Ph.D.
Graduate Faculty Representative

Idaho State UNIVERSITY

Office for Research Integrity
921 South 8th Avenue, Stop 8046 • Pocatello, Idaho 83209-8046

September 28, 2015

Kristen Lister
Kasiska School of Health Prof
MS 8120

RE: regarding study number IRB-FY2016-18 : Conversation Analysis of Student Interactions in Practice Counseling Sessions in Basic Skills Course

Dear Ms. Lister:

I have reviewed your request for expedited approval of the new study listed above. This is to confirm that I have approved your application.

Notify the HSC of any adverse events. Serious, unexpected adverse events must be reported in writing within 10 business days.

Submit progress reports on your project in six months. You should report how many subjects have participated in the project and verify that you are following the methods and procedures outlined in your approved protocol. Then, report to the Human Subjects Committee when your project has been completed. Reporting forms are available on-line.

You may conduct your study as described in your application effective immediately. The study is subject to renewal on or before Sep 27, 2016, unless closed before that date.

Please note that any changes to the study as approved must be promptly reported and approved. Some changes may be approved by expedited review; others require full board review. Contact Tom Bailey (208-282-2179; email humsbj@isu.edu) if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Ralph Baergen, PhD, MPH, CIP)
Human Subjects Chair

Phone: (208) 282-2179 • Fax: (208) 282-4723 • www.isu.edu/research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is difficult to find the words to fully describe the depth of my gratitude for all the individuals who had a hand in my educational achievements. First and foremost, I would like to express my appreciation for my beloved husband, partner, friend, and life companion, Tedd who has been a constant stabilizing force in my life as I have experienced the peaks and valleys of this educational endeavor.

I have tremendous respect and gratitude to the participants in this study who were willing to share their learning moments for this research. I have been honored to be a witness to their experience. They have made an indelible impact on me and I am forever grateful to them for their participation.

I would also like to thank my advisor, Dr. Steve Moody for his patience, flexibility, understanding, and dedication to my success throughout this dissertation process. He put a lot of hard work and many hours into guiding me through this project. I am also indebted to my committee for supporting and challenging me to do my best work. Dr. David Kleist not only made valuable contributions as a member of my committee but also was responsible for introducing me to conversation analysis, a methodology I love. Dr. Liz Horn provided me with kind words and emotional support when I needed it most. Dr. Tracy Farnsworth and Dr. Alex Bolinger were active and engaged members of my committee providing their own insightful comments and questions which I appreciated so much because they challenged me to explore new perspectives in my research.

I am grateful for my connections to ISU faculty, doctoral students, and graduates who have all been there for me at various times available to share their wisdom, humor,

and words of encouragement when needed. I would like to thank my cohort for being supportive and showing me my growth edges. A special thanks to JL with whom I have been through so much. I will always cherish the friendship we have built from our experiences in this program and the laughs we have shared. I also am grateful to my good friend PW for being an example of the type of mentor and educator I would like to be.

I would like to thank the pioneers and scholars in the CA community who helped show me the way through the analytic work they have done. Scott Wickman was so giving when I was starting out on this journey. He was incredibly open to sharing resources and talking with me about my ideas. I appreciate Olga Sutherland and the work she did with her dissertation and the wonderful community of conversation analysts who provided me with resources for my own research through the books and articles they have written.

Finally I am thankful for my mother and father gifting me with a tenacious and unrelenting drive to succeed, my brother and sister for showing me what resilience looks like, and my Grandmother and Farmor for showing me in their own unique ways what a strong woman can be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY	xiv
ABSTRACT	xvii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	1
Conceptual Framework.....	2
Ethical and Educational Considerations	3
Counselor Development.....	5
Basic Skills Training.....	8
Overview of the Reflection of Feeling Microskill.....	14
Relevant Research.....	20
Comprehensive Reviews of Microskills Training and Research	21
Recent Studies on Competency, Self Efficacy, and Student Experience	23
Research on Reflection of Feeling	26
Literature on Use of CA in Microskills Training	28
Personal Experiences	30
Research Implications.....	33
Current Research.....	33
Background and Statement of Problem	34
Purpose of Research.....	35
Statement of Research Question	35
Scope of Study	35
Summary	37
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	38

Research Design.....	39
Overview of Conversation Analysis	39
Philosophy and Role of Researcher	42
Data Collection	45
Context.....	45
Participant Selection and Recruitment.....	46
Data Gathering	47
Transcription Process.....	48
Data Analysis	49
General Analytic Considerations	50
Analysis Procedures.....	51
Building Collections of Instances	56
Parameters of Collection and Analysis	59
Validity	59
Transparency of Analytic Claims	60
Validation Through Next Turn	60
Deviant Case Analysis	60
Institutional Character of Interaction Questions	61
Generalizability.....	62
Other Considerations	62
Summary	63
CHAPTER THREE: ANALYTIC FINDINGS	65
Formulation.....	66

Exemplar 1	67
Exemplar 2	68
Exemplar 3	68
Exemplar 4	69
Adjacency Pairs	69
Exemplar 5	71
Exemplar 6	72
Exemplar 7	73
Exemplar 8	75
Repair.....	76
Self-repair	77
Exemplar 9	78
Exemplar 10	78
Exemplar 11	78
Other-repair.....	79
Exemplar 12	79
Exemplar 13	80
Epistemic Rights	81
Exemplar 14	84
Exemplar 15	85
Exemplar 16	86
Exemplar 17	87
Preference Organization.....	88

Exemplar 18	90
Exemplar 19	90
Exemplar 20	91
Exemplar 21	92
Exemplar 22	92
Exemplar 23	93
Affiliation and Alignment.....	94
Exemplar 24	96
Exemplar 25	97
Exemplar 26	98
Exemplar 27a	98
Exemplar 27b	99
Exemplar 27c	100
Exemplar 27d	101
Exemplar 27e	103
Exemplar 27f.....	104
Exemplar 27g.....	105
Exemplar 27h.....	106
Exemplar 27i.....	107
Exemplar 27j.....	108
Exemplar 27k.....	109
Exemplar 27l.....	110
Emotion Talk	111

Exemplar 28	113
Exemplar 29	113
Laughter	116
Exemplar 30	116
Exemplar 31	116
Exemplar 32	117
Crying	117
Exemplar 33	118
Exemplar 34	119
Institutional Talk	122
Exemplar 37	123
Exemplar 38	123
Exemplar 39	124
Exemplar 40	124
Summary	126
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	128
Summary of Findings.....	128
Implications.....	133
Contributions to the Practice of Counselor Education.....	133
Contributions to the Profession of Counseling	142
Contributions to Counselor Education and Counseling Literature	143
Contribution to Conversation Analysis Literature	146
Limitations	147

Future Research	149
Conclusion	151
References.....	153
Appendix.....	165

GLOSSARY

ADJACENCY PAIR: A pair of turns where with one turn comes the expectation that a second turn will follow. Adjacency pairs have a first pair part and second pair part.

Common greetings are one example of an adjacency pair.

AFFILIATION: “Affiliation” (Stivers, 2008, p. 35) has a broad application and generally pertains to the practice of voicing support and endorsement of a storyteller’s particular “stance” (p. 37). “Stance” (Stivers, 2008, p. 32) refers to the teller’s affective position with regard to the story they are telling.

ALIGNMENT: Alignment is a conversational device used to yield the conversational floor to the person telling a story. In this study, utterances such as ‘mm hms’ were an example of alignment (Stivers, 2008).

BASIC SKILLS: *Basic skills, foundational counseling skills, introductory counseling skills, microskills, and skills*, have all been used interchangeably to mean the therapeutic skills CITs typically learn at the start of their programs. Examples of these skills are attending, FR, and immediacy.

CIT: Acronym for counselor-in-training.

CLIENT CENTERED THERAPY: *Client-centered therapy* and *non-directive therapy* are terms used to describe Carl Rogers’ therapeutic approach before he changed the name to person-centered therapy. These terms are used interchangeably in this chapter according to what terminology used in the reviewed literature.

CONVERSATION ANALYSIS (CA): A systematic approach to analysis of recordings of in-the-moment conversational interactions through the use of a detailed transcription system developed by one of its founders, Gail Jefferson.

EMOTION TALK: For the purposes of this study, emotion talk was considered to be any verbal and nonverbal communication between participants. Feeling reflections or FRs are one example of emotion talk.

EPISTEMICS: Knowledge claims that “interactants assert, contest, and defend in and through turns at talk and sequences in interaction” (Heritage, 2013, p. 370).

FORMULATION: A statement capturing the essence of what another speaker has said.

FR: Acronym for “feeling reflection” or reflection of feeling. The FR that was the focus of this study was an utterance used by student counselors that was in the form of the sentence stem “You feel...” followed by a feeling word that was either scared, angry, sad, lonely, or happy.

HELPER: According to Hill (2010), the term *helper* refers to an “...individual providing assistance” (p. 4). The term is used in a broader sense than counselor or psychotherapist to identify individuals outside the mental health profession who may also be helpers receiving the training.

INSTITUTIONAL TALK: A specific form of conversation that takes place between participants where at least one participant is a member of an institution. In this study the institution was the university counseling program where the participants were counselors-in-training.

INTERVIEW: Another term used to describe a counseling session.

MICROSKILLS: Ivey et al. (2014) define *microskills* as “...the foundation of intentional counseling and psychotherapy. They are the communication skill units of the counselor/client session that provide specific alternatives...to use with many types of clients and all theories of counseling and therapy” (p. 10).

interchangeably with the terms microskills or basic skills.

MICROCOUNSELING: The training model Ivey (1971) created for teaching microskills to CITs.

PREFERENCE ORGANIZATION: A set of guiding principles that affect participants' actions and reactions in their conversational interactions.

REPAIR: Organizational practices used by participants in an interaction to avoid trouble in talk. Repair can come in the forms of self- or other-initiated repair, and self- or other-repair.

TURN: A speaker's utterance which could in the form of a word, phrase, or sentence.

TURN SEQUENCE: A series of turns.

ABSTRACT

Co-Constructing Reflection of Feeling: Conversation Analytic Study

of Basic Skill Use by Counselors-in-Training

Dissertation Abstract--Idaho State University (2016)

Many counseling programs use microskills training as their foundational training for counselors in training (CITs) learning basic counseling skills. Support for this training comes from the ACA Code of Ethics (2014) and developmental literature (Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss, 2010; Hill, Sullivan, Knox, & Schlosser, 2007; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). However, others (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Mahoney, 1986; Martin, 1990; Rogers, 1986, 1987) have taken issue with the mechanized use of microskills including the feeling reflection (FR). Recent research on microskills training is lacking (Gockel & Burton, 2014; Hill & Lent, 2006) with attention focused in more generalized domains such as counselor competency (Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003; Lent et al., 2006; Swank et al., 2012). Even fewer studies (Strong & Zeman, 2010) have explored the use of basic skills in counselor training from an interactional perspective. This study used conversation analysis (CA) to explore the real time conversational interactions of counselors-in-training (CITs). The purpose of the study was to gain greater insight into what was occurring when a feeling reflection (FR) is being used in practice counseling sessions. A number of CA practices were found in the analysis of the data including formulation, adjacency pairs, repair, epistemic rights, preference organization, affiliation/alignment, emotional talk, and institutional talk. Several practical implications for CITs, counselor educators and professional counselors have been found from this study.

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

One of the foundational learning experiences in most counselor programs is the basic counseling skills training course. The importance of providing ethical and competent counseling services to clients has led to ethical guidelines and accreditation standards that include the need for some type of skills training in counselor education. Skills training can also be seen as integral to the framework of counselor development (Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss, 2010; Hill, Sullivan, Knox, & Schlosser, 2007; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

Skills training has evolved over the years from Rogers' client-centered model which placed less emphasis on skills and more on counselor attitude to newer models that have centered their training on discrete microskills (Ivey, 1971; Ivey, Ivey, & Zalaquett, 2014; Rogers, 1942; Rogers 1951; Truax & Carkuff, 1967). With the advent of discrete skills training in counselor education, some authors have expressed concerns about the skills being used in a mechanical way, particularly the skill labeled "reflection of feeling" heretofore referred to as a feeling reflection (FR) (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Mahoney, 1986; Martin, 1990; Rogers, 1986, 1987). Others have shown support and highlighted the importance of FRs in the therapeutic interaction (Egan, 2010; Hill, 2010; Ivey et al., 2014). Comprehensive reviews on microskills research (Baker, Daniels, and Greeley, 1990; Hill & Lent, 2006; Ridley, Kelly, & Mollen, 2011) show support for microskills training, but have also identified flaws in the methodologies used to study these skills. More recently researchers have broadened their inquiry from discrete skills training to exploring other topics related to beginning counselor training such as student

experiences, self-efficacy, and competency in counselor training (Aladağ, Yaka, & Koç, 2014; Eriksen and McAuliffe, 2003; Gockel & Burton, 2014; Lent et al., 2006; Swank, Lambie, & Witta, 2012; Urbani et al., 2002; Woodside, Oberman, Cole, and Carruth, 2007). Studies that have been more narrowly focused on microskills, particularly the skill FR, have yielded findings that support use of FR (Bergman, 1951; Duys, & Headrick, 2004; Ivey, Normington, Miller, Morrill, & Haase, 1968).

The purpose of this research study was to gain greater insight into the dynamics of an interaction where an FR skill is implemented by a counselor-in-training (CIT) in a practice counseling session with a student client. Conversation analysis (CA) was an ideal research methodology for this study as it allowed me to analyze in-the-moment, real time conversational interactions. The analysis further allowed me to understand the interactional process between the CITs and their student clients where the FR skill was used. Wickman and Campbell (2003) used CA to identify how Rogers enacted his client-centered theoretical orientation in order to inform counselor training. Strong and Zeman (2010) and Strong (2003) used CA in the context of counselor microskills training, and have shown how CA is a fit for studying counseling interactions in a training context.

Implications of my research study included providing counselor educators and CITs with a greater understanding of the dynamics of a counseling interaction and insight into how both counselor and client influence that interaction. Using CA-specific language and analysis, the findings demonstrated what was occurring when a FR skill was implemented in the practice counseling sessions studied.

Conceptual Framework

Microskills training is used widely in counseling programs to teach CITs basic

skills for use in counseling. While research findings have provided some support for microskills training (Ivey et al., 2014; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967), some authors have raised concerns about the strength of the studies supporting the microskills training model (Baker et al., 1990; Ridley, 2011). Additional issues have been raised about the relationship between the microskill FR and Carl Rogers' definition of empathy (Rogers, 1986).

This section provides the conceptual framework for this research study. A synopsis of the most influential skills training models and skills training research is provided along with a more specific discussion of critical and supportive literature on the FR skill. An overview of recent studies in skills training on the topics of student experience, self-efficacy, and competency is shared. Studies related more specifically to FRs and CA research focused on microskills is also reviewed. Adding to the conceptual framework, I discuss my personal experiences related to learning and using the FR skill and provide my perspective as an emerging educator. To begin this section, I review the ethical and educational considerations related to skills training.

Ethical and Educational Considerations

Ethical guidelines and educational standards for the counseling profession require CITs to be prepared to provide effective and competent services to their clients. The American Counseling Association's (ACA) Code of Ethics (2014) has outlined ethical guidelines regarding treatment modalities and counselor training. In order for counselors to operate in an ethical manner they are ethically bound to "...use techniques/procedures/modalities that are grounded in theory and/or have an empirical or scientific basis" (ACA, 2014, Standard C.7.a., p. 10), and they should not use techniques

that could potentially cause harm (ACA, 2014, Standard C.7.c.). Counselor educators also have ethical obligations. They must establish programs providing both academic and practical training to CITs (ACA, 2014, Standard F.7.d.). They are ethically obligated to teach techniques grounded in theory and/or empirically based (ACA, 2014, Standard F.7.h.). The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) makes it clear that effective counselor training is imperative to prepare counselors to use modalities and techniques that are grounded in research and theoretically based.

In addition to the counseling profession's ethical standards, there are also educational standards developed by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) to govern counselor education and provide a framework to guide counseling programs in developing their training curriculum. CACREP has been the main accrediting body for counseling programs since its foundation in 1981. Since that time, CACREP has promulgated educational standards to guide training in accredited programs. The 2016 Standards (CACREP, 2015) outline the most recent accreditation standards related to counselor skills training. Counselor educators in accredited programs should be teaching CITs "essential interviewing, counseling, and case conceptualization skills" (CACREP, 2015, II.F.5.g., p. 11). To fulfill this educational requirement, many counseling programs incorporate an introductory counseling skills course that often takes place at the beginning of their training program. A typical skills course consists of training beginning CITs counseling skills in a classroom setting. The course is generally comprised of didactic and experiential learning opportunities including counselor/client peer practice counseling sessions. The skills course customarily precedes CITs' internship experience. Ivey et

al.'s (2014) training model is one that is frequently used in introductory skills courses and it introduces CITs to foundational counseling skills such as attending, paraphrasing, and FR skills.

Counselor Development

Development is one of the cornerstones of the counseling profession, and a vital point of consideration in identifying how counselor skills training fits within the framework of counselor development. Research in the area of counselor development is robust (Gibson et al., 2010; Hill et al., 2007; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992), developed a stage model of development which they refined and expanded in a later publication (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003). They found the developmental process can be unpredictable and punctuated by periods of intense change along with periods of slower change. In the training phase, they found beginning CITs were more rigid, less authentic, and externally focused in their orientation to training. Typically, students sought approval from their supervisors and professors, and could become perfectionistic, obsessive, and preoccupied with their graduate training (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). In other studies, researchers found that beginning CITs possessed a narrow view of the world and readily adopted basic skills to help with their anxiety management (Hill et al., 2007).

Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992) noted in the developmental process students moved from *received knowledge* to *constructed knowledge* as described by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986). Received knowledge is knowledge gained from outside expertise while constructed knowledge is an integrated knowledge combining

intuition with externally acquired knowledge. This movement from received to constructed knowledge can produce profound change in a learner (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). In a similar vein, Etringer, Hillerbrand and Claiborn (1995) described a developmental process where individuals go from “...declarative (factual) knowledge to procedural knowledge” (p. 483). According to O’Byrne, Clark, and Malakuti (1997), practice is the catalyst for changing declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge. Students make this shift in their basic skills training as they engage in a recursive learning process of the counseling skills (O’Byrne et al., 1997).

Gibson et al. (2010) developed a grounded theory to identify a process where counselor trainees move from a need for external validation to self-validation and from an individualistic to a systemic view of professional identity. In line with findings from Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992), Gibson et al (2010) found students initially need to rely on their professors, whom students viewed as authority figures and experts, for their learning. As students moved to later stages in their development, they gained a sense of autonomy in their developmental process.

The Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) is a comprehensive model of counselor trainee development for supervisors. Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010) conceptualized counselor development as signified by three overarching structures for professional growth that interact with four levels of development which are labeled 1, 2, 3, and 3*i*. The four levels are descriptive of the various stages of counselor development from novice to experienced. The three overarching structures are *cognitive and affective self- and other-awareness*, *motivation*, and *autonomy* (Stoltenberg &

McNeill, 2010).

Level 1 and 2 will be summarized here as they are most applicable to beginning CITs taking an introductory skills course. In Level 1, trainees have limited experience and education in the helping profession, but may possess pertinent life experiences (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Skills training can be anxiety producing and confusing to trainees at this level. They may find difficulty attending to clients with empathy or recognizing their own reactions to the client. Additionally, negative self-evaluation and self-preoccupation are common states for trainees in Level 1. This particular issue was similarly identified in a study by Hill et al. (2007), where participants reported experiencing moments of self-criticism and preoccupation with their performance in the role of counselor. Active focus on trainees' here-and-now behavior is considered helpful for them at this level. Supervision can also facilitate a shift from trainees' self-focus to attending to the impact of the therapeutic process on the client. In level 1, motivation can be high and there can be a desire to learn the "right" way to be a clinician. According to Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010), trainees at this level are also externally-focused and dependent on their supervisors due to lack of requisite knowledge or experience. At this level they are looking for structure to be provided by an authority figure.

Moving to Level 2, the counselor can distinguish emotional reactions in clients through verbal and nonverbal cues that provide information about the inner emotional experience of the client. Trainees shift their focus from self to client and are more able to carefully attend to the client's emotional experience and reflect feelings based on observation of client's non-verbal behavior or through client's words. At this level, it is important to provide breadth and depth to the trainees' understanding of the therapeutic

process and their role in the process (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

Based on a review of the counselor development literature (Gibson et al., 2010; Hill et al., 2007; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010), there is support for a basic skills course in counselor training. Basic skills training functions as a way of lowering CITs' anxiety by allowing them to grasp more fundamental concepts of counseling through use of microskills. The training can facilitate learning during a time when CITs are most rigid in their thinking, and help CITs move from the rigidity of technique to learning how to incorporate basic skills into their counseling work in a more fluid manner. Skills training can also assist CITs in moving from a position of receiving knowledge to constructed knowledge to foster greater mental flexibility and skills integration. The IDM (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) highlights effective training strategies including promoting trainees' insight of the counseling process and encouraging trainees' to pay attention to their own behaviors. In light of the utility of skills training from a developmental perspective, the next section highlights other research findings related to basic skills training (Furr & Carroll, 2003; Hill et al., 2007; O'Byrne et al., 1997).

Basic Skills Training

Basic skills training is an integral part of counselor training (Furr & Carroll, 2003; Hill et al., 2007; O'Byrne et al., 1997). According to O'Byrne et al. (1997), microskills training serves as preparation for CITs to move on to advanced courses teaching more complex issues in counseling. Furr and Carroll (2003) found students thought their experience in skills training was a "critical incident" (p. 487). Critical incidents are defined as positive or negative experiences students recognize as having an

impact on their development (Furr & Carroll, 2003). Participants viewed their skills training as growth-enhancing due to the emotional impact of acting in the roles of counselor and client. In addition, Hill et al. (2007) proposed skills training can provide a focus for students and build their confidence.

While teaching basic skills is a major focus of counselor education, it is still unclear which training approach is most effective (Lyons & Hazler, 2002). An array of training models and texts (Egan, 2010; Hill, 2010; Ivey et al., 2014; Paladino, Barrio Minton, & Kern, 2011) currently exist as guidelines for training. Each method has unique features and all attempt to develop a systematic training method for counselors and other helpers. It can be difficult to determine which training method is most effective or whether the training of discrete microskills is even the best approach for CITs.

The historical development of skills training and research has been shaped to some extent by research in the counseling and psychotherapy field. When Eysenck (1952) reported psychotherapy was not effective in facilitating recovery for neurotic patients, his findings were impactful to the counseling profession. Eysenck (1952) concluded there was a need for more substantive research in the field of psychotherapy. A number of researchers responded to this declaration by engaging in the rigorous study of the effectiveness of counseling and psychotherapy. In a control group study, Rogers (1961) found positive personality and behavioral changes attributable to therapy in contrast to the previous finding reported by Eysenck. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) were also critical of Eysenck's findings and cited a number of studies evidencing effectiveness of psychotherapy. They identified specific elements of psychotherapy that can be related to effective client outcomes and applied those elements to a model of counselor training

and practice. Training models created by Rogers (1951), Truax and Carkhuff (1967), and Ivey (1971) are three historically influential models of counselor training.

Rogers' Client-Centered Therapy Training Approach. Carl Rogers has been noted as one of the key figures in shaping the profession of counseling and counselor training (Nassar-McMillan & Niles, 2011). The history of counselor training began when Rogers developed the first systematic approach to counselor training which he based on the tenets of client-centered therapy (Rogers, 1951). His client-centered therapy, which was later renamed person-centered therapy, was the basis for many of the skills, such as FR, that CITs learn in their basic skills courses currently. As Rogers' therapeutic approach developed over the years, his influence on counseling and psychotherapy represented a major shift from psychodynamic theories and behavioral modalities to the humanistic and existential philosophies (Nassar-McMillan & Niles, 2011). At the same time, Rogers had been influenced in the creation of his approach by prominent figures in the psychoanalytic tradition, namely Otto Rank whom espoused views which laid the foundation for Rogers' core conditions (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). Rogers' (1961) three core conditions were *congruence*, *unconditional positive regard* and *empathy*. He believed the therapeutic relationship was grounded in the counselor's demonstration of these core conditions toward their clients, and he saw the path to change in clients' lives involved directly exploring emotions and feelings rather than using an intellectual approach to address a client's emotional issues in a session (Rogers, 1942; Rogers 1951). His theoretical approach was the precursor for development of discrete counseling skills that came later with Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and Ivey (1971).

Rogers (1951) described the problems he faced as a new instructor teaching his

first beginning counselor training course which he based on his client-centered therapeutic approach. One of the issues he noted was that instead of focusing on the attitude of students as counselors, the focus was on “right” and “wrong” which left the students feeling incongruent in their training practice. Rogers also reported overemphasis on use of technique was a problematic aspect with his previous training experiences before he shifted to an attitudinal focus in his training. Using CA, Wickman and Campbell (2003) highlighted the complexity and subtlety of how Rogers himself conveyed his theoretical approach when they analyzed a transcript of his counseling from a demonstration film.

On the other hand, Rogers (1951) recognized the need to find a way to avoid client harm by slowly initiating students into the practice of counseling. He felt he could accomplish this task by teaching students various counseling skills in the beginning stages of their training. Rogers (1951) hoped students would eventually be able to incorporate these skills in a way that was genuine for them. Even though Rogers appeared to be wary of technique as indicated in his writings, he seems to have grasped the developmental benefit of starting his training by teaching his students discrete skills.

In the ensuing years, Rogers reflected on the trends in counselor training since his first training experience. Rogers (1951) shifted away from technique and diagnosis putting more focus on *attitudinal orientation* (p. 432). There was a desire to teach students to operate from a theoretical orientation most congruent with who they were as individuals. There was also a shift toward determining students’ attitude first followed by an exploration of skills that fit their particular attitude. Newer training models expanded Rogers’ training approach and placed a renewed emphasis on individual

counseling skills (Ivey, 1971; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

Despite the difficulties Rogers experienced with his first training course, he reported some benefits to the training he had conducted. He noted the use of recording devices as a beneficial tool in the learning process. Students were able to become aware of what they were actually doing in a session rather than what they perceived themselves to be doing (Rogers, 1951). It seems this novel approach to training was the first hint that paying particular attention to what one is doing in a counseling session may be a helpful tool for learning counseling skills. Subsequent to this finding, other training models also incorporated some form of audio and video recording in their training (Ivey, 1971; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

Truax and Carkhuff's Training Model. Despite Rogers' efforts to formalize training, questions remained about how to translate theory into practice (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). In particular, Rogers training model lacked specifics on how to convey the attitude of warmth, empathy, and positive regard. Truax and Carkhuff, former associates of Rogers, expanded on Rogers' ideas and initiated a training program with skills they operationalized from the concepts of warmth, empathy, and genuineness (Ivey, 1971). They incorporated role play, immediate feedback, and recordings into their training method and started the trend toward teaching discrete skills to CITs (Ridley et al., 2011). Truax and Carkhuff (1967) also developed scales to measure the therapeutic conditions of *accurate empathy*, *nonpossessive warmth*, and *genuineness*. Carkhuff continued to develop a training model based on Rogers' core conditions and later versions of this model were called the Human Relations Training/Human Resource Development model (Crews et al., 2005).

Ivey's Microskills Training Model. Following Truax and Carkhuff, Ivey (1971) created a now widely used model of counselor training which he initially named *microcounseling* (p. 30). Ivey's method of skills training continues to be a dominant method of instruction in counselor training (Ridley et al., 2011; Smaby & Maddux, 2011). According to Ivey et al. (2014), their microskills approach is the standard of training and is used in over 1,000 training programs and universities all over the world. Similar to Truax and Carkhuff, Ivey's (1971) atheoretical model diverged from the one espoused by Rogers in the sense that Ivey's (1971) microcounseling instructional approach separated basic clinical skills into discrete units. One of Ivey's critiques of Rogers' counselor training was that it lacked a delineation of specific counselor skills or behaviors (Ivey, 1971). Ivey recognized microskills were a starting point in counseling training and he viewed the interview as more complex than counselors simply implementing microskills in a mechanized way. A goal of his training was for students to acquire skills in a developmentally sensitive way that would eventually lead to the skills becoming internalized and implemented in a spontaneous manner (Ivey, 1971). In a 1968 study, Ivey et al. operationalized the main interview skills used in Ivey's first iteration of microcounseling training. These skills included *attending behavior*, *reflection of feeling*, and *summarization of feeling* (Ivey et al., 1968). Ivey's model has since evolved over the years, and he along with various colleagues, have broadened aspects of the model including expanding the set of microskills used in the training.

The most current set of Ivey et al.'s (2014) microskills include the following:

- Attending behavior which is exhibited through eye contact, vocal qualities, verbal tracking and body language;

- Observation skills which involves observing both verbal and non-verbal behavior;
- Open and closed questioning skills;
- Active listening skills which include encouraging, paraphrasing, and summarizing;
- Reflection of feeling;
- Focusing;
- Empathic confrontation;
- Reflection of meaning and interpretation/reframe;
- Self disclosure and feedback;
- Action skills (Ivey et al., 2014).

The authors have also created a microskills *hierarchy* in their most recent version of the model (Ivey et al., 2014, p. 11) which is illustrated in pyramid form. The purpose of the hierarchy is to demonstrate the successive steps of Ivey et al.'s (2014) microskills model, and show how each skill set builds upon another. Listening skills comprise the base of the pyramid with influencing skills the higher levels. FR is one of the core microskills in the training model of Ivey et al. (2014), and will be covered more in depth in the next section.

Overview of the Reflection of Feeling Microskill

The microskill that was the focus of analysis in this study is the FR (Rogers, 1961; Rogers, 1986; Ivey et al., 2014), a skill widely taught to beginning CITs in their basic skills course. Many of the current leading authors of books on counselor training (Egan, 2010; Hill, 2010; Ivey et al., 2014) have recognized FR is a vital skill within a

group of microcounseling skills students learn in their initial training. However, few researchers have studied this skill from an interactional standpoint, or explored *how* this microskill has been implemented in the course of a counseling session.

Reflection, which includes FR and reflection of content or meaning, is a skill that has been associated with Rogers' client-center therapy and adapted to training modalities like the microskills model of Ivey et al. (2014). Porter (1950, as cited in Kramish, 1954) defined reflection as "A response in which the attempt at understanding is implemented by a rephrasing in fresh words the gist of the client's expression without changing either the meaning or feeling tone" (p. 203). Reflection has also been defined as a way the counselor repeats back what client said adding a message or feeling that is not at the surface or directly stated by client, but is detected by the counselor (Brems, 2001). How these definitions of reflection translate into actual practice is less clear.

FR is identified as a primary discrete skill in a number of basic skills texts with varied but similar definitions. Kramish (1954) stated FR was defined by non-directive therapy staff as an "expression in fresh words, the essential attitudes (not content), expressed by the client; to mirror his attitudes for his own better understanding, and to show that he is understood by the counselor." (p. 203). Ivey et al. (2014) described a FR as a response that identifies either explicit or deeper level emotions being expressed by a client. The FR skill is used to provide the client with clarification and acknowledgment of feelings depending on the situation. The authors suggested trainees use "You feel [emotion word]" as a sentence structure for reflections of feeling. FR statements can be standalone or added to a paraphrase, and are generally phrased in present tense rather than past (Ivey et al., 2014). According to Hill (2010), an FR is a labeling statement

made by the helper to make explicit spoken words or emotional expression inferred from client's verbal or nonverbal behavior. These statements can be tentative or direct depending on the situation. Hill (2010) suggested helpers should focus on facilitating client's expression of feelings in the present moment to encourage emotional catharsis.

Egan's (2010) term for FR is "empathic understanding" (p. 167). He proposed helpers use the sentence stem "You feel...because..." as a way for beginners to formulate a response that demonstrates accurate empathy on the part of the helper. The helper incorporates key feelings, emotions, and moods in their response, ideally to advance the therapeutic process. According to Egan (2010), it is important for helpers to distinguish between the emotions clients are actually feeling and the ones they are simply discussing, and to seek out clues about emotions from non-verbal behavior.

Criticism of Reflection of Feeling. While there is wide acceptance of the use of FR as a microskill in counselor training, there have also been vocal critics of FRs (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Mahoney, 1986; Martin, 1990; Rogers, 1986, 1987). Although Rogers claimed partial responsibility for the term *reflection of feeling* (Rogers, 1986) and discussed how the concept was introduced to him during his training (Rogers, 1975), he became increasingly critical of its use as a stand-alone technique over the years. According to Rogers (1975, 1986, 1987) there was no connection between the FR skill and the underlying principle of empathy in Rogers' theoretical approach. Rogers (1951) believed empathy is a necessary condition for relationship building and change in counseling. He described empathy as someone's ability "[t]o sense the client's private world as if it were your own, but without ever losing the "as if" quality—this is empathy, and this seems essential to therapy" (Rogers, 1957, "Empathy," para. 1). Rogers (1975)

perceived individuals misconstruing the meaning of empathy as it related to his theory, and conflating the FR skill with empathy as he envisioned it. He clarified his earlier definition of empathy emphasizing that it is a way of being rather than specific technique. He also stated “[c]lients are better judges of the degree of empathy than are therapists.” (Rogers, 1975, “General Research Findings,” para. 11).

Specific concerns had been raised by Rogers and others regarding the mechanized use of microskills such as FRs. Rogers’ (1986) main critique was the FR skill was being used in what he termed a “wooden” (p. 38) fashion, and he saw how students were viewing the skill in dichotomous terms of “correct” and “incorrect.” Moreover, Rogers was critical of students learning to choose a feeling from a prescribed list of feeling words. In a quote referenced by Rogers (1986), Dr. John Shlien, a friend and former colleague of Rogers’ raised an objection to Rogers’ criticisms and argued in favor of the use of *reflection* (para. 3) as a skill. Rogers (1986) set out to explain more fully what he was doing in counseling that others had mislabeled as FRs. He stated in his therapeutic approach he was attempting to understand a client’s “inner world” (para. 4) and suggested a change in the name from FR to “Testing Understandings” (para. 6) or “Checking Perceptions” (para. 6).

Rogers (1987) expressed renewed unease about the use of the FR skill in response to a critique by Brink (1987) about Rogers’ non-directive therapy. Brink (1987) questioned how Rogers’ non-directive therapy could have been reduced to a narrow skill set. She argued Rogers’ approach was a complex collection of abilities, attitudes and skills and not just a simple set of techniques. She noted despite the distinctions the technique of reflection became equated with nondirective therapy because it was an

identifiable aspect of the therapy. As time progressed, Rogers appeared to develop a strong emotional reaction to the skill of FR. He used words like “wince” (1987, p. 39) and “cringe” (1975, “Personal Vacillations,” para. 2) to describe his reactions to the terms reflection and FR. He expressed his regrets that the simple technique had become associated with a complex therapeutic interaction (Rogers, 1987).

Noting Rogers’ negative view of microskills and in particular the FR skill, Wickman and Campbell (2003) set out to identify via CA how Rogers was enacting his core conditions with his client Gloria. They analyzed the *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy* (Shostrom, 1965, as cited in Wickman & Campbell, 2003). They discovered there was a subtlety and complexity in how Rogers conveyed core conditions in his interview with Gloria. They also found there was constant interplay between the conditions and none of the core conditions was identified on its own in the dialogue.

Rogers’ concerns about the FR skill were not new. Critique of the use of the FR skill started to arise in the early days of Rogers’ client-centered therapy. Kramish (1954) proposed it was difficult and took skill to effectively implement the FR skill in therapy. In his view, counselors often could be indecisive and ambiguous. At times, they unintentionally provided cues through their voice and gestures when delivering an FR skill that could inadvertently influence a client’s response. Kramish (1954) believed any indication of the counselor leading the client would be disruptive to the process of a counselor understanding the client’s feelings as the client experienced them. He also saw the value in feeling reflections, stating that accurate reflections of feeling could help clients better clarify their beliefs about themselves, and could lead to clients’ exploration of their emotional experience. This exploration is a critical component of effective

therapy. He reported the literature was unclear about what effect the skill was actually having on clients or even how FR skill should be evaluated. He also advised the counselor's failure to deliver an accurate feeling could be counterproductive to the therapeutic process (Kramish, 1954).

While Kramish had discussed issues with implementation of FR, Rogers had concerns with how students were trained to use the skill. According to Rogers (1987), the problem was programs could teach the FR as a cognitive skill as opposed to teaching students genuine empathy, a personal characteristic that cannot be taught. Mahoney (1981) offered a possible explanation for the general issue of teaching counseling skills which may also address the reason for the gap between Rogers' therapeutic approach and skills such as FR. He surmised that "...we want to operationalize humanism" (p. 269). He went on to characterize these skills as "...tools subservient to a larger and more elusive endeavor" (Mahoney, 1981, p. 269). Mahoney (1981) appears to suggest there is a divide between skills and the work of psychotherapy.

Mahoney (1986) raised his own concerns over what he called the "tyranny of technique" (p. 171) noting the primacy of technique mastery in the fields of clinical and counseling psychology. Martin (1990) who was also critical of skills training defined the term *skills* to mean being able to perfect an ability through training and exercise without regard for context. He advised while psychological skills such as FR and meaning may be a part of empathy, they do not constitute empathy. According to Martin (1990), it is conceptualization grounded in knowledge, not skills that comprise therapeutic action. He further questioned the generalizability of psychological skills and pointed to the need for client to comprehend and be able to act on the skills being used on them.

Support for Reflection of Feeling. While some authors (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Rogers; 1975, 1986, 1987) have raised concerns about how clinicians were using the FR skill, it has remained in the repertoire of foundational counseling skills (Egan, 2010; Hill, 2010; Ivey et al., 2014). According to Hill (2010), the FR skill allows clients to access their inner experiences, and more deeply explore their emotions in a safe space. In a study conducted by Hill et al. (2007), they reported students had positive views of their implementation of FR and found using the technique in session to be helpful. The participants reported the FR provided them with a greater depth of understanding of their clients, and allowed the clients to focus on their feelings.

Egan (2010) identified three key reasons for recognizing emotions in session: they are pervasive; they have an effect on quality of life; and they drive behavior. Egan's model also highlights the identification of emotions as an opportunity for clients to learn more about themselves. Clients seek understanding from helpers because they tend not to receive that type of clarity in their own lives. Ridley et al. (2011) recognized empathy can be enacted when a counselor can accurately convey a client's feelings.

Relevant Research

Microskills research has been limited in recent years (Hill, 2007; Ridley et al., 2011). This section will examine some key comprehensive reviews of the research literature on microskills training over the last few decades. Newer research has made a shift to examining broader issues related to counselor training such as self-efficacy, competency and student experience. Relevant studies related to these areas will be discussed in more detail. There will also be a review of studies conducted that reference the FR skill in this section.

Comprehensive Reviews of Microskills Training and Research

Baker et al. (1990) conducted a large scale review of research findings for skills training models. Those models including Carkhuff's Human Resource Training/Human Resource Development Model, Kagan's Interpersonal Process Recall model, and Ivey's Microcounseling Training. The authors utilized a narrative and meta-analytic review process for the studies. They limited their review to studies that had experimental designs and used master's level graduate students as participants. The purpose of Baker et al.'s (1990) review was to summarize existing studies to provide future direction for training research in addition to comparing the two narrative and analytic review approaches for prospective similarities and differences. Based on their analysis, Baker et al. (1990) concluded the studies they reviewed provided some support for the microcounseling approach including basic attending skills and more advanced skills. They discovered findings that indicated there was a reduced level of defensiveness in trainees who used the microcounseling method and positive evaluations from clients. While Baker et al. (1990) were unable to find studies drawing comparisons between the reviewed training models, they found microcounseling is a more effective modality than didactic and other traditional training methods. However, the authors also noted there were internal validity issues with many of the studies they reviewed.

Hill and Lent (2006) revisited the literature on helping skills training indicating they hoped to renew interest in this area since there had been a lack of research activity in more recent years. To uncover what was known and unknown at the time of their review, Hill and Lent (2006) undertook a meta-analysis of helping skills training. They found two helping skills training models, Carkhuff's Human Relations Training and Ivey's

Microcounseling were more effective than no training, but they asserted more research is needed to determine what makes these approaches effective. In addition, they identified a number of methodological flaws in the studies they reviewed. Limitations included lack of control groups or random assignment, small sample sizes, and lack of clear operationalized definitions of the methods under study. One of their recommendations for further research was to answer the questions how, who, and what of helping skills training in order to make improvements to the training approaches they reviewed.

More recently, Ridley et al. (2011) conducted a comprehensive critique of the research base pertaining to the microskills approach in addition to reviewing major texts used for microskills training. They called for reforms in the training of entry-level CITs citing limitations in the microskills model and flaws in the research supporting the microskills approach over the last few decades. In fact, studies with weak designs far outnumbered strong research studies in the collection they reviewed. They also noted external validity is of major concern with many of the studies. Ridley et al. (2011) were critical of the fact most microskills studies under review were analogue, meaning they were studies conducted in a controlled environment as opposed to studies conducted in naturalistic settings. There was also a lack of clear definitions for the constructs under study or missing definitions for those constructs. Ridley et al. (2011) raised concerns about the use of self reports and subjective scales to measure trainee competence. While the authors praised the work of the pioneers in counselor training, they urged the field to do more to facilitate effective counselor training. According to Ridley (2011), trainees should know how therapeutic change is brought about by the skills they are being taught or they will potentially use these skills randomly or inappropriately. My study provides

some insight into this area through the analysis of interactional dynamics between counselor and client when the FR skill is used.

Recent Studies on Competency, Self Efficacy, and Student Experience

While there is a large research base targeting microskills training spanning decades, newer studies focusing on discrete microskills are lacking (Gockel & Burton, 2014; Hill & Lent, 2006). More recently, the focus of beginner counselor training has been on broader issues such as student experience, self-efficacy, and competency research (Aladağ et al., 2014; Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003; Lent et al., 2006; Swank et al., 2012; Urbani et al., 2002; Woodside et al., 2007). Studies in each of these areas will be reviewed in this section.

Student Experience Studies. Recent studies have been conducted focusing on students' experiences and opinions of basic skills training (Aladağ et al., 2014; Hill, 2007; Woodside et al., 2007). These studies offer beneficial insight into students' perspective to better determine what might be helpful for students in learning basic skills. According to Aladağ et al. (2014), trainees were uncertain about the function and effective usage of the basic skills, but they were able to improve in this area through practice and regular use of skills. In the study by Woodside et al. (2007), participants shared they wanted to learn more about the counseling process and to implement that learning in practice. Woodside et al. (2007) and Hill et al. (2007) identified the need for counselor educators to encourage students to practice self-reflection and focus on self-awareness during training so they can access themselves more fully in the process of counseling. Students also recognized the benefits of listening and understanding the client's perspective (Woodside et al., 2007). According to Aladağ et al. (2014), one of

the most effective training methods identified by students was the use of self-observation.

Students also noted an increase in self-efficacy coupled with decrease in anxiety as the semester progressed (Hill et al., 2007). Some reported mitigating their anxiety by focusing on the client and using exploratory skills like FRs. An implication from the research was students and instructors continue to attend to the basic skills and recognize the value of basic skills in instilling a sense of confidence in students. Findings from this study seem to suggest there may be a connection between the use of basic skills training in helping to reduce anxiety and increase in self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy Studies. According to Lent et al. (2006), counselor self-efficacy is counselor's beliefs about his/her performance abilities in enacting certain skills. The term *self-efficacy* (Bandura, 1977) is a concept derived from Bandura's social cognitive theory. Urbani et al. (2002) conducted a study to test their model of training called Skilled Counselor Training Model (SCTM). The researchers found students who used the SCTM had higher self-efficacy scores and improved their basic skills than those who did not.

Lent et al. (2006) reported self-efficacy is related to anxiety and that it can affect counselor performance and client gains in counseling. They found self efficacy generally increased over time although not with all participants. As an implication in their study, Lent et al. 2006 suggested trainees investigate their attributions about what the causes were for a session to "go well" or "not go well" and to explore the contributions they and their clients made to the session.

Gockel and Burton (2014) identified helping skills training as a "linchpin" (p. 101) of the training process. They asserted it helps students connect knowledge to

practice while encouraging greater self awareness. They conducted a study on social work helping skills training and found there were increases in self efficacy but no changes in levels of anxiety as a result of their helping skills training.

Competency Studies. One recent focus of basic skills/prepracticum training research has been research on instrument development to measure competency in counseling students. The Counseling Skills Scale (CSS) by Eriksen and McAuliffe (2003) and the Counseling Competencies Scale (CCS) by Swank et al. (2012) are two recently developed measures to evaluate student competency including their use of microskills. Both measures have included for evaluation the counseling skill FR. Eriksen and McAuliffe (2003) wanted to create a reliable and valid instrument to measure student competency and effectiveness of counselor training after finding most measures created previously did not meet satisfactory standards. They critiqued previous scales and found there were issues which included lack of specificity about what was being rated and the use of frequency counts for skills used rather than judging the use of specific skills within a context. Research on discrete skills has long been criticized for a lack of focus on contextual factors to help determine whether a skill is effective or not. The objective of Eriksen and McAuliffe's (2003) instrument was to capture the subtleties of the counseling process in their measure. The final scale included the FR skill under its third subscale "Deepens the Session" (p. 128).

Swank et al. (2012) sought to expand the domains of their CCS measure. They shifted the focus from being solely on skills to evaluating skills, dispositions, and behaviors. The skills domain of their measure was part of a larger comprehensive assessment of the CITs. According to Swank et al. (2012), there was a need for a more

comprehensive measure of evaluation, and one that would help address ethical and legal considerations about assessment and gatekeeping of CITs. They also discussed how such a measure could be used as a way of facilitating delivery of supervisory feedback and as a resource for educating CITs on competency constructs.

In conclusion, researchers have turned their attention in more recent years to effectiveness of counselor training and student competency. Eriksen and McAuliffe (2003) and Swank et al. (2012) have both developed instruments to measure effectiveness and competency with use of microskills. Included in both measures is the FR skill which suggests its continued relevance as a skill for counselor trainees. Though evaluative measures for counseling skills are valuable, there is still a question of how to sufficiently capture the dynamic nature of the counseling interaction including client's impact on the interaction.

Research on Reflection of Feeling

There has been little systematic research focusing on the FR skill and its usefulness in a counseling session. Dickson (2006) stated the proof of efficacy of FR has come more from its practical application and theoretical backing than from research findings. This section will provide a brief review of a few studies that have examined the effectiveness of microskills in therapeutic interactions and have referenced FRs.

Bergman (1951) conducted a study of skills, including FR, early in the development of Roger's client-centered therapy. His study examined the interactional process between client and counselor in non-directive interviews. While he had a similar focus as the present study, he took a different approach to his analysis which was to code and classify utterances in a quantifiable manner rather than using a qualitative

methodology. Specifically, he wanted to look at the interactions related to a client's request for evaluation from the counselor. His analysis of the process involved separating the therapeutic conversations into units and categorizing the client and counselor responses immediately following a client request for evaluation. Bergman (1951) analyzed what he referred to as a "response unit" (p. 216) which is a unit comprised of three utterances starting with a verbalization by the client, followed by response by counselor and completed with a response by client. He coded, classified, and determined the frequency of these instances. He also identified the degrees of agreement based on judges' categorization of the response units to establish reliability in his analysis of the data. Bergman (1951) wanted to determine whether there was a relationship between a client request for evaluation and the resulting response by counselor, and determine the relationship between counseling method and client's self-exploration and insight. He found FR was the only counselor response of significance to increase of self-exploration and insight by the client.

Ivey et al. (1968) conducted a quantitative control group study to affirm the efficacy of microskill training in counselor education. Participants in the experimental group using Ivey's training model followed a series of steps including a counseling interview, review of written and video materials, and supervisory feedback. Individual counselor trainees' skills were rated and counselor and client completed self-report measures. The control group engaged only in the mock interview steps. Findings showed over time counselor trainees' ability to reflect feelings improved, results which demonstrated support for the microcounseling training approach (Ivey et al., 1968). A more recent study by Kuntze, van der Molen, and Born (2009) found microcounseling

training is effective for individual microskills but less effective for advanced skills.

Duys and Headrick (2004) conducted another study that examined the interaction of counseling. They utilized a novel statistical analysis called Markov Chain Analysis to determine the effectiveness of counseling skills. They theorized students who were more effective would exhibit a different pattern of using counseling skills than those who were not. In their analysis they used Ivey's microskills including FR which was classified as a more difficult microskill for beginning students to master. Raters were used to evaluate the trainees and determine which students were deemed to be effective and which were ineffective. They determined effectiveness of CITs by viewing videotapes of simulated sessions and seeking evidence demonstrating each trainee's appropriate use of skills with a given client in those recorded sessions.

Duys and Headrick (2004) found differences in patterns between the two groups of students. They determined effective students were more likely to use empathic reflective skills than those who were deemed ineffective. Notably, they found consistent patterns even though counselors and clients were completely different for each simulation. They discussed the possibility of using knowledge regarding patterns of interaction to inform counselor education pedagogy. They also suggested exploring patterns of counselor responses to client statements would also yield important information about counseling effectiveness. Building off the studies of Bergman and Duys and Headrick, this study explored the dynamics and patterns of the counseling interaction in an educational context through the use of CA methodology.

Literature on Use of CA in Microskills Training

CA methodology has been used in various ways to analyze therapeutic

conversations and identify what is occurring between counselor and client in those interactions. Wickman and Campbell (2003) used CA to analyze how Rogers enacted the core conditions of his theoretical approach. The focus for Strong and Zeman (2010) in their CA study was use of the microskill *confrontation*. They analyzed a video recording created by Allen Ivey to demonstrate confrontation in a mock counseling session. The focus for Strong and Zeman (2010) in this study was on the "...*mundane* or taken-for-granted aspects of communication which if better appreciated could help one to become more deliberate in counseling" (p. 334). In their analysis, Strong and Zeman (2010) were interested in examining confrontation as a "dialogic accomplishment" (p. 334) between counselor and client rather than a discrete skill. They highlighted how reviewing videotapes and transcripts of therapeutic processes can be helpful for training purposes.

Strong (2003) outlined his efforts to incorporate CA as a part of teaching a basic skills course. As instructor of the course, he used CA in combination with discourse analysis (DA) in a training exercise to help counselor trainees reflect on the counseling process. Strong (2003) stated he found reviewing audiotape transcripts when he was a student quite helpful to his learning process. He introduced CA into his teaching practice because he wanted his own students to move away from the mindset of right and wrong, and instead recognize their place in the "hermeneutic circle" (p. 66) of counseling. He directed his students to read two CA articles and then select a 5-minute portion of their videotaped practice counseling session to transcribe and analyze. The objective of the exercise was to introduce a reflective process into students' use of conversational skills and to come to new understandings about their therapeutic interactions. According to Strong (2003) this exercise helped to sensitize students to their conversational

interactions, and clarify how their contributions to the counselor-client dialogue affected the interaction. They saw benefits in the transcription process because it shifted focus to counselor and client rather than solely focusing on the counselor. However, some students reported a limitation to this exercise was the time consuming process of transcribing and analyzing their work.

Findings from this study supplement what has been discovered by Strong and Zeman (2010), Strong (2003), and Wickman and Campbell (2003). The findings are useful for CITs and instructors in demonstrating the dynamics of counselor trainees using microskills in a practice counseling session. The findings also make more clear to counselor educators and CITs what is occurring when FR is used in a practice counseling session.

Personal Experiences

In this section I provide my personal reasons for wanting to conduct a research study that analyzes CITs' implementation of FR in their practice counseling interactions. I reflect on my experiences as a CIT, practicing counselor and doctoral student who has learned, used, and taught the FR skill. I also discuss how my thoughts and feelings about the skill have evolved, and what I hope to learn about teaching the skill when I become a counselor educator.

When I recall my counselor training, the most significant course I remember taking was our prepracticum or basic skills course. The course had a reputation for being quite challenging so I experienced a great deal of anxiety at the start of the course. As I embarked on the task of learning the basic skills of counseling, I had mixed feelings about the FR skill. In the basic skills course, we were instructed to use the sentence stem

“You feel...” exclusively when implementing an FR. At first I was embarrassed by how awkward the FR sounded when I used it. As Ivey et al. (2014) have described, I thought feeling reflections sounded a bit like “comical stereotypes” (p. 162).

As a CIT, I faced developmental challenges of moving from a right/wrong mentality related to how I was supposed to respond as a counselor to my client. At the time, I also had difficulty grasping what it even meant to be a counselor. When I acted as the client, I felt vulnerable if an FR was accurate, and disengaged if the counselor misinterpreted how I was feeling. I had to learn to balance my need to be what my peers, instructors, and I called a “good client” for the benefit of my peers in their role as counselor with being authentic and in the moment. I was able to recognize some of my peers were more accomplished in their role as counselor than others by their ability to elicit emotional reflection in me and others in my group. However, my perceptions of my progress or that of my peers was limited to an intuitive understanding of the counseling interaction since my instructors did not provide direct feedback related to our skills development.

Skills training as a whole was an ambiguous learning process, and I felt this most acutely when it came to choosing the appropriate feeling for my client. Through my own interpretations of the process along with discussions in my practice group, I found clients either accepted or rejected an FR verbally or through facial expression, tone of voice, and body language. As a part of the course, we were prompted to watch ourselves on videotape which I found to be incredibly valuable to analyzing the interaction more closely. Being able to watch my practice sessions allowed me to see and hear what I had not noticed in the moment of the practice session. I was able to take a closer look at the

posture, body language, voice inflection, and response patterns of my client and me. I could see the interactional processes that were beneficial and those that were not. In hindsight, I realize analyzing those sessions was the initial impetus for my research study.

As my training progressed, I used feeling reflections more grudgingly and I became increasingly resentful that I even had to use them at all. As Rogers (1942) had warned about using skills in a rote fashion, my implementation of feeling reflections did not feel genuine to me, especially in the way we were instructed to phrase the skill. With my growing disenchantment, I vowed never to use an FR again once I graduated from my master's program. Much of the learning in this course was at the experiential level and there was not much time spent on didactically learning about the basic skills. As a result, I did not see the value of the FR as a counseling skill because I only knew about FRs through the experiences I had using them in practice.

I gained a new awareness and appreciation for the basic skills when I returned to my doctoral program in counselor education. For the first time I was in the role of supervisor for our basic skills course. In teaching master's-level CITs and observing them in their practice counseling sessions, I learned more about feeling reflections and became aware of the turn-by-turn interplay between counselor and client. I also learned about the research methodology of CA through my qualitative research course. I discovered CA had been used in the counseling discipline before and would be a good fit for engaging in an analysis of the implementation of an FR in session.

My perspective as an emerging counselor educator is that I want to better understand the FR skill and find effective ways to teach basic skills to CITs. With this study, I have built greater understanding about what interactional dynamics are occurring

between counselor and client when implementing the FR skill. My research findings have provided greater insight on identifying how microskills work in a practice counseling session. I have also uncovered distinctive CA-related practices present when the FR skill is used. These findings will further inform implementation of the FR and other basic skills.

Research Implications

Attending to the relational dynamics of the counseling process can be impactful for students (Furr & Carroll, 2003). Also a number of researchers have stated self-reflection is an integral part of student development. (Hill et al., 2007; Paladino et al., 2011; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). I have raised greater awareness about the conversational interactions involved in implementing an FR in a counseling session to help inform CITs and instructors about what is occurring during the process of skill implementation. The findings encourage CITs to become students of the counseling interaction. This research can also help alleviate CITs' perception that the onus is on them to successfully implement skill as they learn more about how both counselor and client contribute to the interaction.

Current Research

The focus of my research was to analyze the conversational interactions between counselor and client when the FR skill was used in a practice counseling session with beginning CITs. I used CA to analyze the interactions in order to gain a greater understanding of how FR skills were enacted in a counseling session. I built a collection of instances to identify patterns that may exist across instances of FR implementation, and developed a formal description of these instances.

Background and Statement of Problem

While researchers and educators have produced a multitude of findings and resources over the years to guide educational practices in the domain of basic skills training, a gap remains in understanding the implementation of these practices in a way most effective for student learning. Researchers have developed measures to evaluate competency, but current measures do not attend to the interactional process of counseling and what is occurring in the interaction between counselor and client. Skills training needs more than static measures as a way of assessing the process, and is more aptly suited for study with the use of CA.

Identifying how a particular basic skill is efficacious is imperative since questions remain about how CITs know a skill is effective when they are using it (O’Byrne et al., 1997). Scholars have suggested eliciting emotional responses from clients is integral to effective counseling (Egan, 2010; Hill, 2007; Ivey et al., 2014). At the same time, there is discussion in the literature of the fear of “mechanization” related to using the microskills (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Mahoney, 1986; Martin, 1990; Rogers, 1986, 1987). There are further concerns about the misinterpretation of Rogers’ client-centered therapeutic approach in terms of its link to discrete skills such as FR, used in counseling programs today (Rogers, 1957; Wickman & Campbell, 2003). Kramish (1954) recognized “[t]he FR skill attempts to provide a genuine living situation in that there are two persons who interact and communicate with one another” (p. 207). However, there is a void in studies showing how these skills are actually implemented. Before researchers can make a determination about effectiveness of these discrete skills, it is important to take a step back to analyze from an objective perspective what is happening

in the interaction when the FR skill is used.

Purpose of Research

Continued research efforts focusing on counseling microskills are essential to promote greater understanding of this vital area of counselor training. The purpose of this research is to provide insight into dynamics involved in the implementation of feeling reflections in a beginning-level microskills course. CA is the methodology that has accomplished that task. Using CA, I analyzed what is occurring in the turn-by-turn interaction between counselor and client when an FR skill is used by the counselor. This study has captured those dynamic features of implementing a basic skill.

Statement of Research Question

CA is unique from other methodologies with regard to developing a research question. CA generally discourages bringing a preconceived idea of what a researcher is seeking in their analysis of the data. According to Sacks (1984), consideration should not be given to what findings may result from analysis, rather the data should serve as the guide to discovery. That being the case, I proceeded with care in formulating a research question that fit within the constructs of CA. In this study, my research question was: What is occurring in the conversational interaction between CIT and student client when the FR skill is implemented in a practice counseling session?

Scope of Study

For this study, I collected data from a selected group of first year master's CITs in a beginning counseling skills course in a counseling department at a university in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States. The data I gathered were recordings of participants' practice counseling sessions occurring during the second half of the one

semester class along with participants' video recording and transcript submitted as a graded assignment for the class. I reviewed these recordings to identify instances of dialogue between CIT and student client where the FR skill was used and build a collection of those instances. From the collection, I developed through my analysis a generalizable description of what occurred across instances of FR sequences. There are no definitive guidelines in the literature regarding the number of instances needed for a collection. I collected enough instances in order to ensure I could develop a robust and comprehensive description from the data while also keeping a manageable scope on the project. Further details regarding the scope of the study are discussed more fully in Chapter 2.

My focus was on the particular microskill FR because it is a fundamental counseling skill that allows CITs to convey empathy and explore the affective experience of their clients which is an essential component of effective counseling. By focusing on FR, I was able to conduct a comparative analysis of instances of turn sequences involving one particular skill. I determined through my analysis of conversation what, if any, patterns of conversation occur across dyads when the FR skill was used and explored whether there are similarities in the patterns of interaction.

Due to the inductive nature of CA, I did not bring to my analysis any preconceived ideas of what I expected to find in the data. However, I was already familiar with certain contexts related to the study such as my previous knowledge of the prepracticum class, and my understanding about the basic principles of CA such as the idea that orderliness can be found in all conversational interactions. I identified in the conversational interactions a range CA practices that will be discussed more fully in

Chapter 3.

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to gain greater insight into the dynamic interactional process when CITs implement an FR skill with their student clients. CA was an ideal methodology which was used to analyze real-time data unlike other studies that rely on experiments, surveys, and interviews. Literature pertaining to microskills training and the FR skill has been reviewed to support the need for this study. I have also drawn from my personal experiences to provide some context regarding my own interest in this topic as a researcher. This study gives CITs and instructors a better understanding of both the dynamic counseling process and their role as counselor in the interaction. In the next chapter, more information is provided regarding research design, including an overview of CA methodology, data collection, data analysis and validity considerations for a CA research study.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

This study of basic skills training using conversation analysis (CA) furthers understanding of interactional processes involving implementation of counseling microskills. Researchers have suggested it would be beneficial for CITs to gain a better understanding of the dynamics of the interactional process (Furr & Carroll, 2003; Strong, 2003; Woodside et al., 2007). They also have called for students to engage in self-reflective practice during their counselor training (Hill et al., 2007; Paladino et al., 2011; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Strong, 2003).

The advantage of CA is researcher access to the details of the interaction itself as it unfolds which allows for a unique analytic process not available through other methodologies (Toerien, 2014). Much of the existing research involving microskills training has included quantitative studies using experimental designs or qualitative studies that have analyzed post hoc data from participants (Hill et al., 2007; Ridley et al., 2011; Woodside et al., 2007). Rather than relying on controlled study conditions or participants' recollections of their experience, I have analyzed the real time data of skills-based counseling interactions.

Findings from this study supplement existing literature on microskills and inform what is happening in the conversational interaction between CIT and student client when the basic skill FR is implemented. This study assists CITs and counselor educators in gaining a better understanding of the dynamics within this interactional process. It also helps CITs understand their role as counselor in this interaction. In this chapter I provide an overview of my research design, data collection, data analysis, and validity considerations for this study.

Research Design

For this study, my research question was: What is occurring in the conversational interaction between CIT and student client when the FR skill is implemented in a practice counseling session? CA is a methodology well suited for studying the dynamic conversational interaction of the counseling process and in skills training for CITs. In this section, I begin with an overview of the methodology of CA followed by a discussion of why CA is the preferred methodology for this research. This section concludes with an overview of my philosophical stance as it pertains to this methodology and my role as researcher.

Overview of Conversation Analysis

According to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), CA is an organized system of analysis with general rules for everyday conversations. Some CA researchers have found that the word “conversation” in CA inaccurately describes what CA examines (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; Psathas, 1995; Schegloff, 1968). CA researchers do not just investigate conversation, they analyze what Sacks et al. (1974) referred to as *talk-in-interaction* (Psathas, 1995). CA uses recordings of *mundane, naturally-occurring, and taken-for-granted* ways individuals interact with each other (Rapley, 2007). Analysis in CA is focused on “...uncovering the *socially organized features of talk in context*, with a major focus on action sequences” (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984, p. 5). Analysis in CA is objective, systematic, and micro-focused (ten Have, 2007).

Historically, CA developing from various educational disciplines and perspectives. CA arose from the discipline of sociology and was further influenced by phenomenology, linguistics, language philosophy, and most notably ethnomethodology

(Psathas, 1995). CA was created by sociologist Harvey Sacks along with his colleagues including Edward Schegloff, Gail Jefferson, and David Sudnow in the 1960s (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997). Since that time, many other researchers have made significant contributions to the evolving field of CA (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Moerman, 1988; ten Have, 2007).

Sacks and his colleagues were most directly influenced in their development of CA by Erving Goffman, a social anthropologist and Harvey Garfinkel, a sociologist who were both involved in studying “ordinary” social interaction, an area of study that was ignored by social science researchers at the time (Sidnell, 2010). Goffman engaged in research which involved developing rich descriptions of ordinary interactions (Psathas, 1995). Around the same time, Garfinkel developed ethnomethodology which is the study of organized common activities in everyday life (Garfinkel, 1967). The idea that there was organization to social interaction was novel since social scientists had historically viewed society as random and disorderly (Sacks, 1984). In contrast to that view, Sacks (1984) raised the alternate possibility that social interaction may have what he referred to as “order at all points” (p. 22). He further proposed conversational interaction could be systematically studied as an orderly phenomena. According to Sacks (1984), the goal of CA is to take particular instances of conversational interactions and identify the *machinery* of social interaction.

A distinct advantage of using CA methodology in this research study was the ability to conduct an in-situ examination of participants’ talk-in-interaction in an introductory counseling skills course. According to Moerman (1988), “[c]onversation analysis awaited the invention of the portable sound recorder that freed the student of

speech from distortions of standardization, self-interest, and memory” (p. xi-x). Other researchers might study the phenomenon of this study by gathering data through interviews or surveys that require a reflective process or they may manipulate participants’ experiences through experimental designs. While such research methods are valuable in their own right, they have limitations including the difficulties with participants accurately remembering an event after the fact, or researchers creating simulated and unrealistic controlled conditions that do not match real world experiences.

In addition to the general benefits of CA for the study of conversational interaction, CA is specifically well suited for the study of counseling interactions. In fact, CA has a history of use in psychotherapy research, and has been used frequently in family therapy research (Friedlander, Heatherington, & Marrs, 2000; Gale, 1996; Tseliou, 2013; Wickman & Campbell, 2003). Sacks’ used CA to analyze group counseling sessions (ten Have, 2007). Wickman and Campbell (2003) used CA to analyze Carl Rogers’ session with Gloria in the well-known training film called *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy* to determine how Rogers enacted his core conditions through his therapeutic talk with Gloria. Tseliou (2013) conducted a comprehensive methodological review of several studies that used the CA methodology along with a review of discourse analysis and discursive psychology studies. Gale (1996) described CA’s fit with the constructive nature of interactive communication and the epistemology of family therapy. Peräkylä, Antaki, Vehviläinen, and Leudar (2008) noted that unlike other research methods, CA explores sequences of interaction and the way turns are interconnected with other turns. This specialized process of exploration is also the essence of what occurs in the counseling process. At the heart of counseling is the building of mutual

understanding via conversational interaction between counselor and client. CA can closely examine and analyze this process in a way no other methodology can (Peräkylä et al., 2008). The CA methodology fits well with this study considering the history of psychotherapy studies using CA, and the distinct characteristics of CA in capturing the interactional process involved in counseling.

Philosophy and Role of Researcher

As researcher, I consider the philosophical stance of CA and identify how my own philosophical views fit within the CA paradigm. I describe the more practical aspects of my role as researcher in this study. I discuss the collaborative aspect of most CA research and outline my plan for collaboration with my advisor to check the accuracy of my analysis.

First, CA has some seemingly contradictory philosophical positions at its core. A foundational premise of CA is that conversational interaction is socially constructed (Rapley, 2007). Meaning is derived and ever-evolving from co-constructed talk-in-interaction (Sacks et al., 1974). However, CA's approach to analysis is rooted in empiricism. Sacks' (1992) intent was to make sociology in general, and CA more specifically, a scientific endeavor akin to the natural sciences. Ultimately, the stance of CA is that researchers can objectively analyze conversational interactions without imposition of their own socially constructed views on the analysis.

According to Gale (1996), researchers of CA adopt an array of epistemological stances. In my own philosophical positioning, I believe that interaction is socially constructed but also ascribe to the notion that I can take an empirical approach to studying that co-constructed interaction as a CA researcher. From my perspective there

is a world that exists outside of individuals' socially constructed perceptions of that world. In terms of CA research, while I think that the participants of an interaction co-constructed that interaction, as researcher I am not a participant of that co-construction. However, both the participants and I can share a similar objective understanding of the interaction that occurred. Validity checks are vital for CA's empirical approach to data analysis as they help maintain a researcher's objectivity while holding participants' own interpretations of their interactions as paramount.

I viewed my role as CA researcher to be objective yet informed by context. The analysis of data is a purely inductive analytic process devoid of theoretical presupposition by the analyst. According to Sacks (1984), the basis of theory in CA is observation. He warned hypothesizing can lead to constraints in discovery and the potential for missing what is actually occurring. However, a guiding assumption CA researchers bring to their research is an understanding conversational interaction is orderly and there is a set of rules that govern the interaction. Psathas (1995) outlined the rules of order in CA: (a) order is production of the individuals in a conversational interaction; (b) this order is co-constructed and free of analyst-imposed theoretical conceptions and generalizations; (c) repetition and recurrence are facets of order; and (d) the task of an analyst is to discover, describe, and analyze the order.

As CA is empirically driven, the role of a CA researcher conducting an analysis is to be an objective observer of interactions taking context into consideration. While most CA researchers formulate their analytic findings by focusing primarily on what interactants have provided in their conversational interactions, a familiarity with the milieu of the participants is preferable to having no local knowledge or understanding of

participants' backgrounds or the subject of the interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Rawls, 2004). Sidnell (2013) asserted having as much access to the context of a given situation as possible is preferable for analysis which means conversational interactions cannot be treated as if they are self-contained units of talk but rather they are interactions informed by context. Similarly, Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) noted an analyst's common sense knowledge can play a part in their analytical work. In the present study, I have direct knowledge of the prepracticum course because I have taken this particular course as a master's-level CIT, and more recently have been a doctoral-level co-supervisor/co-instructor for the course. I am also familiar with the FR skill and how it is used in counseling and counselor training. I was able to draw on my own context as I carried out my analysis.

In my researcher role, I interpreted my participants' specific conversational interactions as the participants themselves understood them. I used my interpretation to create a formal description of those interactional processes in conversation analytic terms. Due to my unique experiences and knowledge, there may have been occasions where I had a slightly different interpretation than would another analyst. In such cases of analytic variation, one way to confirm my analysis is accurate is through the use of a *proof procedure* (Sacks et al., 1974; ten Have, 2007). The main idea of proof procedure is my finding can be verified through others' inspection of the next speaker's turn to see if that speaker understood the meaning of the previous turn the same way that I interpreted the turn. For this reason, working as a sole researcher in CA is uncommon (ten Have, 2007). Oftentimes, CA researchers collaborate with other researchers to analyze data and verify their analysis (Gale, 1996; ten Have, 2007). In order to

accomplish that task in the study, I regularly met with my advisor and we periodically discussed my findings as my analysis unfolded. My advisor's role was to compare my analysis to the relevant data to provide feedback on his perception of the accuracy of my analysis in order to provide a check of my interpretation of the data.

Data Collection

Data collection consisted of gathering and transcribing video recordings of practice counseling sessions between a CIT and student client. In this section, I provide an overview of my data collection considerations for the study. First, I provide context to describe the circumstances upon how I derived my data. Then I discuss my participant selection and recruitment process for the study. To close this the section, I provide a brief overview of the data gathering and transcription process for CA which is a vital preparatory step for data analysis in CA.

Context

My research study took place at a counseling department at a university in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States. My participants were seven master's-level CITs taking a semester long introductory counseling skills class. The class was divided into smaller groups with six to seven CITs in each group and my participants were all members of the same small group. Each of the groups were led by one first year and one second year doctoral student with the instructors of record observing the groups on a remote video link to the practice rooms. The smaller groups met twice weekly for most of the semester outside of a few class meetings that all CITs attend. In these group meetings, CITs learned and practiced counseling microskills in dyads as remaining group members and doctoral supervisors observed in an adjacent room behind a one-way glass.

The dyadic practice sessions were generally followed by the group reconvening to discuss feedback of the sessions. Interactions arising from the dyadic practice sessions were the focus of the present study.

In addition to the in-class practice sessions, CITs submitted a midterm and final recording of a session conducted outside of class along with a transcript for course grading. I accessed two final recordings and transcripts from two participants in my group as part of my data collection. These recordings occurred outside the regular practice sessions. The variability in conditions of these additional recordings were not a factor in my analysis.

Participant Selection and Recruitment

The participants in my study were selected based on their participation in a beginning level basic counseling skills course. The purpose of selecting participants from this course was to capture and analyze the process of CITs implementing basic skills at the beginning of their counseling training. I recruited seven participants for my study. My data collection started midway through the semester and ended with the final recordings and transcripts submitted at the end of the semester. The reason I selected participants from my program instead of CITs from another program was to establish greater trust with them in my role as researcher. Similar to a real counseling session, some of the information CITs shared in role plays was sensitive in which case trust was paramount.

After submitting and receiving IRB approval I met with one of the smaller groups of seven students that I picked randomly from the four that were available. I shared information about my study as outlined in my approved IRB with the selected group of

CITs. I answered their questions, invited them to participate, and had them each sign informed consent forms. I collected signed consent forms from all the CITs in the group. I also obtained signed release forms from the doctoral supervisors who were not participating in the study but who were on the video recordings I used for analysis. I had the doctoral supervisors sign releases of information so I could view the group's video recordings with the understanding that I would not be analyzing any of the doctoral students' interactions with the participants.

Data Gathering

Once I gathered consent forms from the participants, I collected and secured DVD video recordings and was given access to digital recordings captured via a cloud based program called Panopto. The recordings were participants' in-class practice counseling sessions in the prepracticum course. I also collected and analyzed two final video recordings and transcripts that two of the participants from my group submitted at the end of the course. I analyzed the video recordings to identify instances or sequences of talk where feeling reflections were used. In the recordings, I paid closest attention to conversational turns that immediately preceded the FR technique and those that immediately followed and kept a record of those instances for later transcription as outlined in the next section. I gave myself latitude in determining which turn sequences were relevant to analyze because I did not want to narrow my findings by placing artificial limits on what turns I would analyze. The selections varied depending on the particular session but all analyzed turn sequences included an examination of the turn where the FR skill is used by the CIT.

The data I collected from participants in this study was sensitive due to the nature of the practice counseling session experience. As a part of this course, CITs who are in the role of client are encouraged to share information from their own life experiences for their practice counseling sessions. Therefore, I followed proper research protocols to ensure data confidentiality and security. I protected the identity of the participants in transcripts by using ‘counselor’ and ‘client’ in place of their names. In addition, hard copies of transcripts and video recordings were stored in a secure location when not in use. Digital copies of transcripts were kept on a hard drive that was encrypted and password protected.

Transcription Process

Transcripts are an integral tool for analysis in CA. Transcripts are used for analysis because they serve as quick access to the data and can show a wide range of interactions for comparison at a glance (ten Have, 2007). However, transcripts are not to be considered a substitute for the data and researchers should make efforts to return to the recordings as needed to capture the essence of the conversational interaction. CA researchers are also encouraged to create their own transcripts rather than use a transcriptionist (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984). By creating their own transcripts, CA researchers are able to get closer to the “lived reality” (ten Have, 2007, p. 95), by capturing details that escape the ordinary listener. Transcription is also a time intensive process that requires close attention to detail (Schenkein, 1978). For this study, I identified turn sequences which included the use of FR skills, and created two sets of transcripts of the identified sequences. First, I created standard transcripts for the identified instances. Rapley (2007) suggested creating a standard transcript for ease of

reading and to engage in *unmotivated looking* at the data (Sacks, 1984; ten Have, 2007).

Unmotivated looking refers to the action of reviewing a transcript for interesting phenomena with no preconceived ideas about what one will find.

After creating the standard transcripts, I utilized the detailed system created by Gail Jefferson, a colleague of Harvey Sacks to create a Jeffersonian transcript of each instance I had gathered. Attached as an Appendix is the Jeffersonian transcription key of the symbols used in the transcripts created for this study. In the 1960s, Jefferson, created a transcription method tailored to CA to improve the level of conversational detail over what could be found in a standard transcript (ten Have, 2007; Rapley, 2007). Jefferson's transcription system more thoroughly captured the nuances of a conversational sequence than an ordinary transcript, and has been adopted into common use by CA researchers today (ten Have, 2007). Jefferson's transcription system provides a guide for transcribing the spoken word and notations for documenting other conduct occurring in a conversational interaction such as emotional expression, pauses, interruptions, voice tone and volume (see Appendix). This level of detail is warranted because CA researchers take nothing for granted in their analysis. For my study, conversational details including words and other actions involved in conversational interaction were noted in my transcription and considered in my analysis. Once I created the standard and Jeffersonian transcripts of the relevant conversational sequences, I began my data analysis.

Data Analysis

In this section, I provide a framework that helped guide my analytic process for this study. I identify and discuss relevant considerations for each of the steps in the framework. I also outline how collections are built in CA. I finish this section by

discussing how I developed and set parameters on my analysis to ensure a comprehensive collection of instances.

General Analytic Considerations

CA researchers are interested in how the participants in the conversational interaction interpret what the other is saying in order to shape their response, and they utilize these conversational exchanges to inform their analysis. The interactional understanding that is continuously developing as one participant responds to another in a conversation is called *intersubjectivity* (Sidnell, 2010, p. 12). Data is considered *prima facie* evidence of what is occurring in the interactional process, and knowing what the participants in the interaction are thinking or feeling is unnecessary for analysis (Gale, 1996). In fact, one of the benefits of using CA in this research study is analysis revealed taken-for-granted aspects of conversational interactions individuals would have had difficulty recalling if they were asked about them after the fact.

Another important consideration for my study was to recognize that talk-in-interaction is contextual and can be both *context sensitive* and *context free* (Sacks et al., 1974, p.9). In other words, interactants in a conversation are oriented to a specific context, and at the same time all conversational interactions have general rules that transcend what is occurring in any specific conversational interaction. Furthermore, actions in conversation are shaped and constrained by this interactional context (Gale, 1996). My research was concerned with analyzing conversational interaction attending to the particular context of a practice counseling sessions for a basic skills course, as well as developing abstract generalizations of talk-in-interaction that transcend context (Sidnell, 2013).

Analysis Procedures

CA does not prescribe a particular formula for data analysis, and generally calls on the use of analysts' interpretive abilities to conduct their analyses (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). There are many ways CA researchers can accomplish their analysis of the data, none of which are required or preferred over any other approach to analysis (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; ten Have, 2007). As ten Have (2007) has asserted, there is not "one best way" (p. 120) to conduct a qualitative inquiry. Since Sacks and his colleagues first introduced CA, there have been a large number of researchers who have contributed to the CA literature base using the methodology to research a wide spectrum of conversational phenomena. As a result, researchers' analytic procedures have varied, but there are some commonalities among their approaches to analysis.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) stated analysis in CA is a state of mind rather than a clearly delineated set of steps. They referenced Schenkein (1978) who used the term "analytic mentality" (p.1) when describing CA researchers' approach to analysis. He noted despite the differences in the CA research presented in his edited book, there were some common features in how researchers approached their analysis. In particular, he observed a close scrutiny to the data; efforts to characterize the data in some way; a preoccupation with sequential organization in conversation; detailed exhibition of the orderliness of conversation; and the building of careful descriptions of the conversational phenomena they were studying as common themes in the researchers' process of analysis. Other authors (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997; ten Have, 2007) have outlined some suggested steps for analyzing data in CA. I used as a general

guide for my analysis a consolidation of the authors' suggested steps for analysis. I provide an overview of each of the steps along with definitions, descriptions, and relevant considerations for each step.

Step 1: Begin analysis of turns and sequences in the transcript. The first level of my analysis was to identify turns and sequences in the transcripts of the data. In CA, the most basic unit of a conversational interaction is a turn or *turn construction unit* (TCU) (Schegloff, 2007, p. 3), and conversational interactions are comprised of a series of *turns* (Sacks et al. 1974, p. 7). A TCU is an utterance in the form of a sentence, a phrase, or a single word and is defined by what action it allows participants to accomplish. An action could be a request, a proposal, or a demonstration of surprise (ten Have, 2007). *Sequences* of talk refer to a collection of turns. The most basic of these sequences is a two-turn adjacency pair such as a greeting or question/answer sequence (Schegloff, 2007).

Considering this first step, my task was to review the video recordings I collected to identify relevant sequences that are inclusive of an FR skill. I reviewed the sequence without a preconception of what was occurring, but had an understanding of the interaction as a researcher familiar with the context of this interaction. I brought a common sense perspective to what was occurring as the participants viewed it (ten Have, 2007). In this initial step, I began to develop a picture of what was happening based on a close examination of the turn sequences. I reviewed subsequent turns to help inform my analysis of previous turns. In addition to talk, I noting other conduct in my analysis such as gaze, gestures, body posture, and emotional expression. These are important areas of which to make detailed observations as a part of the analysis process (Sidnell, 2013).

Step 2: Identifying Organization. The second step involved identifying any type of organization of the turns that may have been present. ten Have (2007) recommended four specific organizations analysts attend to in their data: turn-taking organization or the structure of how participants implement their turns at talk; sequence organization or how the sequence of turns was organized; repair organization meaning what is the structure of repair that is manifest between participants; and organization of turn design or how participants create their turns to fit within the context of the conversation and with the context of what their participant is saying in the interaction. The following is a further illustration of one type of organization - turn-taking organization. There are specific turn allocation rules in CA. After a turn, the speaker can select another individual to speak, or someone can self-select if the first speaker does not select anyone, or the current speaker can continue to speak (ten Have, 2007). A *transition relevance place* (Schegloff, 2007, p. 4) is where completion of a turn is imminently possible and the next speaker transition starts to become relevant though the transition may not necessarily occur (Schegloff, 2007). The main goal of this step was to work through the data turn-by-turn to identify the type of organization in the conversational interaction may be present.

Step 3: Identifying Interactant Practices. The focus in this step was to review the data to identify the participants' conversational practices which are relevant to the identified organizations (e.g. how the interactants take turns, the initiation of a sequence; instances of repair). An example of a practice that arose in this study is *repair*. Repair signifies trouble in a conversation generally by way of hearing, speaking or understanding the other speaker's turn (Sidnell, 2010). The start of a repair sequence

begins with the turn signifying the source of trouble. The speaker who is the source of the talk which causes misunderstanding in the interaction can initiate repair or someone else can initiate repair. Repair was one of the CA practices that I found in my data which I will discuss further in Chapter 3.

Step 4: Formulating Tentative Criteria for Description. Once I systematically analyzed the data by performing an initial analysis of turns and sequences along with identifying organization of the talk and interactant practices, I formulated tentative criteria to describe what was occurring in the instances I analyzed. This criteria evolved because as I describe in the next section on building collections, I analyzed several sequences so the criteria shifted and grew as I developed a formal description of the comprehensive collection of instances I gathered.

Step 5: Making Notes on Phenomena of Interest. I kept notes about phenomenon I was discovering as I went through my analysis and returned to those notes periodically as the formal description developed. This step happened at various times in the process of reviewing and analyzing my recordings and transcripts. I also kept notes of relevant analytic points that came up in my meetings with my advisor in the event that new perspectives on my analysis arose from those conversations.

Step 6: Exploring Institutional Context if Applicable. *Institutional talk* (Drew & Heritage, 1992) was an area of relevance for this study in light of the educational setting from which I collected my data. Institutional talk means conversational interactions that take place in institutional contexts (Drew & Heritage, 1992), and covers a wide range of conversational interactions including those that may occur in a doctor's office, courtroom, or classroom. A focus on this type of analysis was to determine what

procedures individuals use to perpetuate the “institutional nature of the institutions themselves” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 138). The analysis of institutional talk is not a separate tradition, but rather an extension of CA analysis (Drew & Heritage, 1992).

Institutional interactions, in contrast to ordinary and mundane talk, are generally characterized as more restricted forms of communication with explicit and implicit guidelines to which all parties to the conversational interaction are oriented (Drew & Heritage, 1992; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). As an example, the conversation between a lawyer and witness in a courtroom setting is generally limited by the rules of the court. Psychotherapy has been cited as a form of institutional talk (Peräkylä, Antaki, Vehviläinen, & Leudar, 2008). Institutional roles of relevance for the participants in this study were CIT, counselor and client in a practice dyad, and future counselor. These roles played a part in my analysis because the participants oriented to the roles in their dialogue.

Analysis in CA is not customarily a linear process (ten Have, 1997) and was not in my analysis process for this study. These analytic steps were not taken in order, and previous steps were revisited as needed throughout the process of analysis. I used these outlined analytic steps as a guideline for my research, but I also remained flexible in how I approached my analysis. In light of the inductive nature of this research and lack of a defined and consistent model for CA analysis, it was imperative that I maintained some latitude in how I approached analysis. Significant and unexpected findings may have been overlooked if I had followed a restrictive and linear analysis procedure. At the same time, having an analytic framework was helpful in maintaining a systematic process for reviewing the data. ten Have (2007) has described a process of doing analysis in rounds,

and my own analysis was recursive in nature. In addition to using the basic steps for analysis, I built collections of sequences in order to reveal patterns and to develop a formal, generalized description derived from analytic findings of multiple instances.

Building Collections of Instances

It is a common task in CA research to build collections of a particular phenomena for the purposes of identifying patterns in talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). In fact, ten Have (1986) noted in some sense CA analyses are always comparative as the conversational devices used in one instance can be found in many others. Sidnell (2010) asserted an important reason for developing collections is different instances can uncover different facets of a phenomenon. Sacks' (1992) early work in CA included analyzing the first turn sequences in a collection of phone calls to an emergency psychiatric hospital. He identified patterns of conversational interaction that showed how a psychiatric worker responding to a call impacted the success of obtaining the caller's name. The main aim of analyzing a collection of instances is to develop a formal description that can be generalizable to a collection of instances (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). In addition to identifying multiple instances and analyzing them, another goal of CA is to develop analytic findings particular to a specific instance (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). As Sidnell (2013) has noted, as a CA researchers I needed to remain attentive to the specific case with its particular circumstances so the focus of analysis was on the individual instance I am analyzing along with the body of instances as a whole.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008) identified three common principles of CA that are relevant when building a collection. These include developing rigor in the description of the data; maximizing generalizability in the cases; and paying particular attention to any

deviant cases that may occur in the data (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Deviant cases, which will be discussed in more detail in the Validity section, are instances that do not fit the analytic description developed from the collection. An additional aspect pertinent to deviant cases is *conditional relevance* which is the notable absence of a turn recognized by the speaker of the previous turn (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). This speaker recognition shows the relevance of the turn in the sequence under analysis and can further assist in developing a robust description of the data.

Building an *analytic account* (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008, p. 104) from a collection of instances or turn sequences requires the researcher to identify a phenomenon, develop a formal and robust description of that phenomenon and then return to the data to further refine that description with additional instances of the same phenomenon to generalize the analytic account. For this study, the phenomenon with which I was concerned was the FR sequence. In addition to the analytic steps I outlined in the previous section, I engaged in an evolving and recursive process of analysis whereby I began with a single sequence for analysis, and then returned to the data for another sequence which was analyzed and compared to the first sequence. The process was repeated in order to develop a robust description of the phenomenon based on multiple instances of data.

Deviant cases (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2007; Peräkylä, 2011) were an important element of my analysis as I built my collection. There are two analytic options for addressing deviant cases. The first option is to determine whether the deviant case bolsters the existing description. The second option is to see if there is a need to return to the data to reformulate a description that is inclusive of the deviant case. In one

noteworthy study, Schegloff (1968) conducted an analysis of 500 telephone call sequence openings. He found a consistent pattern with 499 of the instances he analyzed which was that the person answering the phone would speak first. He found one deviant case where the caller spoke first after a few moments of silence on the line. As a result of this deviant case, Schegloff revisited his data and revised his analysis to reflect a new description that would also explain the deviant case in his collection of telephone openings. In this study there were deviant cases that aided in developing a richer description of the collection of instances.

Sidnell (2010) provided some practical suggestions on how to manage an analysis of a collection. He stated it is best to start with examining those sequences that are most clear and simplistic without a lot of activity occurring in the sequence. He also suggested the analyst begin exploring what is happening in the instances without initially attending to the phenomenon of interest. After doing that, he recommended analysts sort through instances and create subsets of the collection which allows a researcher to see when instances may fall into more than one subset of analysis (e.g. repair, adjacency pair). According to Sidnell (2010) there are times analyses come together and other times when there are no identified conversational practices tying all the cases together. When cases do not come together that should be construed as a sign of the rigor of the method and not discounted by the analyst (Sidnell, 2010). In my case, I identified multiple CA practices that were occurring in the data. In the next chapter, I provide an overview of each of the practices with exemplars to demonstrate how these practices were carried out by participants.

Parameters of Collection and Analysis

Requirements regarding the number of instances needed to make up a collection are not clearly delineated in the CA literature. Thus, the main consideration for my collection building was to gather a comprehensive set of instances from the participants from whom I collected data. As I proceeded with my analysis, I assessed how many instances to transcribe and analyze to ensure that I developed a robust collection of instances to support a formal description.

Validity

Though CA research is qualitative in nature, researchers in the field of CA have adopted the term validity to evaluate the rigor of their research. The meaning CA researchers attach to validity diverges from how the term is used in quantitative research. The set of validity criteria for CA is unique to its methodology. The following is a list of validity considerations unique to CA research. Peräkylä (2011, p. 367):

1. Transparency of analytic claims
2. Validation through next turn
3. Deviant case analysis
4. Questions about institutional character of interaction
5. Generalizability of CA findings
6. Use of statistical techniques.

To follow is a discussion of the relevant validity considerations. The use of statistical techniques is a validity consideration that is not applicable to my study, and is not be covered this section.

Transparency of Analytic Claims

Apparent validity (Peräkylä, 2011) refers to the fact that when a reviewer looks at an analysis they are convinced of its transparent truth. While the methods for discovering practices in conversational interaction are complex, some of the results of those analyses can be deceptively simple and recognizable to most outside observers. In such instances, the observers themselves have done and have seen others do the same thing in their own conversational interactions so they instantly recognize the data supports what the analysis suggests (Peräkylä, 2011).

Validation Through Next Turn

Next turn validation is also known as a proof procedure (Sacks et al., 1974; ten Have, 2007). This procedure is another way of testing validity claims via the interaction itself. In order to see whether an analysis is correct, a reviewer can look at subsequent turns to determine whether the speaker of that turn understood the prior turn similarly to the analyst. At the foundation of CA is the idea conversational turns are constantly being interpreted by the speakers in the conversation and those interpretations are evidenced in the subsequent turns (Peräkylä, 2011). This procedure could be loosely compared to a member check in other qualitative research studies where researchers are confirming whether they are interpreting a participant's data accurately. In CA, rather than speaking with the participants to gain confirmation analysts find confirmation in the data itself.

Deviant Case Analysis

Deviant case analysis is critical to validity, and essential to thorough CA work because deviant cases are a valuable resource for hypothesis testing. Deviant case analysis refers to looking for exceptions to orderly patterns of conversational interaction.

In a CA analysis, a researcher is encouraged to pay special attention to these deviant case instances that differ from the normative ones (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Peräkylä, 2011). There are two types of deviant cases. One type of deviant case is where interactants reference their response is a departure from what is expected which provides additional support for the analyst's interpretation of normative interactional processes. Another type is when the deviant case does not fit the hypothesis a researcher has developed from their analysis of the data, and there is no indication the speaker is oriented to the normative processes of the interaction. This occurrence should prompt researchers to return to their data to reformulate their analysis (Peräkylä, 2011) as was done in the analysis Schegloff (1968) conducted of the 500 telephone openings.

Institutional Character of Interaction Questions

When CA researchers are considering the context of conversational interactions in an institutional setting, they must decide on which grounds they are relying to make their claims of situating the conversational interaction in an institutional context (Peräkylä, 2011). As with other aspects of CA, participants must orient themselves to the institutional features at hand in order for the institutional context to have relevance in the analysis. There are hazards to researchers who assume or impose institutional context to data when it is not there, as such assumptions can prematurely end analysis. There are also times when phenomena can be better explained outside the context of an institution.

For this reason it can be helpful for researchers to compare institutionally situated sequences with ordinary sequences to see if there may be other ways of explaining the data outside of an institutional context (Peräkylä, 2011).

Generalizability

The basis of much of the work done in CA research is comparative analysis through building a collection of sequences of data. The purpose of analysis in CA research is making abstract generalizations from specific turn sequences. The idea of generalizability in CA work is distinct from its traditional usage in quantitative terms. What can be difficult about claiming generalizability in CA is the relatively small amount of data typically associated with a CA analysis. According to Peräkylä (2011), a generalizability claim is dependent on the type of CA research referenced. If the research is based on ordinary conversation then generalizability of findings can be assumed in part because universal features of talk have been identified in previous studies.

With analyses that pertain to institutional settings, the question is whether findings from a specific study generalize to other settings. In cases like medical consultations, there is a large body of CA research that has been done on these types of interactions so a study on medical consultations would be building on a pre-existing base of knowledge from the other studies. Another occurrence might be looking at a particular phenomena across different types of settings. If one can find “the generic from the particular” (Peräkylä, 2011, p. 375) then claims of generalizability are possible.

Other Considerations

There were some additional considerations arising from the use of video recordings in my study. While I was not directly observing the participants, they were aware I would be analyzing their conversational interactions at a later time. Maxwell (2013) suggested *reactivity* is not a serious validity threat in participant observation studies. In fact, while reactivity is mainly a concern in quantitative studies, in qualitative

studies researchers are not seeking to eliminate it. Rather they are looking to understand how they are potentially influencing participants in their study. According to Maxwell (2013), typically participants are more affected by their setting than any researcher observation. In my study, the recording on participants' interaction may have influenced how participants interacted with each other. This was an unavoidable aspect of data collection in CA, and may have been mitigated by the fact participants were already being recorded in the prepracticum class for other purposes. The issue of recording was not a relevant factor because the participants themselves did not discuss being recorded.

I have outlined the various validity considerations for which I needed to account in my research on this project. CA has distinct validity concerns to those in quantitative research. Validity issues like deviant cases are seen as beneficial issues as they help better develop a formal description of a collection of instances. Other considerations such as the nature of video recording and its influence on participants was not relevant in this study since participants themselves did not discuss the recording in their interactions.

Summary

CA was the preferred methodology for use in my study of conversational sequences that include the implementation of the FR skill by CITs in practice counseling sessions. CA has been used previously in psychotherapy research and was an optimal methodology for this study. Using CA, I was able to observe and analyze the in-situ dynamics of a practice counseling interaction using microskills that could not be captured by other quantitative and qualitative methods that use surveys, interviews, or experiments.

CA is a strictly inductive and rigorously empirical approach to conversational interaction. Analysis is done without any preconceptions or theoretical assumptions about the data. My role in the research was to interpret interactions into conversation analytic terms. I outlined a general framework that guided my analytic process, and at the same time approached my analysis with flexibility due to the inductive nature of the research and lack of pre-set guidelines for data analysis. I selected and analyzed collections of FR sequences to identify patterns and formalize descriptions to develop analytic generalizations. In building my collection, I developed robust analytic findings to support a formal description of the multiple instances.

Although CA is categorized as qualitative research, it prescribes to a unique form of validation in its research that is different from what is traditionally considered quantitative validity. I have outlined the various validity considerations to which I needed to attend as my analysis progressed. I have also discussed other considerations such as recording participants that were not applicable to my analysis because the participants did not orient to being recorded in their conversations.

CHAPTER THREE: ANALYTIC FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine what was occurring in the conversational interaction between CITs and their peer clients when the reflection of feeling skill was implemented in their practice counseling sessions. In this chapter, I present my findings and outline a formal description for the collection of instances I analyzed. I do this by identifying and describing conversational practices and concepts specific to CA that were prominent in the data collection. In the sections to follow, I provide Jeffersonian transcript exemplars to detail how these CA practices were enacted. In line with standard analytic procedures (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008), I identified generalizable features of interactional practices in my collection while also attending to the particular analytic details of single instances.

There were a total of seven participants in the prepracticum group I studied. These participants engaged in dyadic practice sessions that were the basis of the data I have analyzed. In the corpus of data, there were a total of 224 feeling reflections (FRs) of which 97 were what I have called *unaltered* FRs. An unaltered feeling reflection is: “You feel [emotion word].” This was the preferred FR format for the skills course. There were also *altered* FRs in the data. These FRs were either phrases that contained a combination of discrete skills including an FR, or they were phrases that resembled FRs but did not exactly fit the preferred format outlined above. Altered FRs were included in the analysis but the main analytic focus was on turn sequences containing unaltered FRs.

The specific CA practices and concepts outlined in this chapter include the following: formulations, adjacency pairs, repair, epistemic rights, preference organization, affiliation/alignment, emotion talk, and institutional talk. Many of these CA

practices are closely related and in some cases even overlap with each other. As an example, formulations are one part of an adjacency pair. Preference organization can have an impact on affiliation in a conversational context. It is a common occurrence to have multiple discrete CA practices, such as those identified above, occurring at the same time in a conversational interaction. The reason I have attended to the myriad CA practices occurring in the interactions for the purposes of providing a richer, more nuanced description of the corpus of data I have analyzed. In this chapter, I identify each CA practice and provide a description of the practice along with examples of how the practice was used by my participants. I also point out connections between the CA practices where applicable. The transcripts are marked ‘Co’ for counselor and ‘Cl’ for client to preserve my participants’ confidentiality. Line numbers, arrows and bolding guide readers to the relevant information in the exemplars provided for each section.

Formulation

The most basic CA practice that participants used was “formulation” (Heritage & Watson, 1979, p. 125). FRs are a type of formulation. Formulations capture the essence of what another speaker has said in a preceding turn (Heritage & Watson, 1979). They are used in a multitude of contexts (Heritage & Watson, 1979; Davis, 1986) and play a particular role in therapeutic settings (Antaki, 2008; Hutchby, 2005; Bercelli, Rossano, & Viaro, 2008) to show the counselor is following the client’s account (Antaki, 2008). Formulations also transform client accounts through both “getting the gist” (p. 31) of what a client is saying and also selectively reflecting back to the client what has been heard (Antaki, 2008; Heritage & Watson, 1979). FRs can be categorized as formulations because by definition an FR is a way of therapeutic responding that identifies clients’

stated or implicit emotional expression (Ivey et al., 2014). In this study, my participants were using an FR as a formulation to summarize the affective content of what their clients had said in a previous turn in their practice counseling sessions. I found in my analysis of the data that formulations (which will be referenced in this chapter as FR formulations) fell on a continuum from explicit to implicit. In some instances counselors would use the client's exact feeling word in their FR formulation (explicit) and in others they would draw on a word that the client had not used (implicit). It was noted more often that CITs acting as the counselor would make explicit FR formulations from the client's prior turns. However, there were FR formulations that were more implicit where the counselor provided an FR formulation with a feeling word that had been expressed in a different way by the client or had not been provided at all. In the following exemplars I will show examples of explicit and implicit formulation. Exemplar 1 shows the practice of explicit formulation. In line 2 the client uses the emotion word 'angry' which then prompts a formulated FR of 'angry' by the counselor in line 5.

Exemplar 1

- 1 Cl:→ [[detailed story about family]] ...and u::m I'm just like really
 2 **angry** about it↑ And I °don°-I've never felt an::ger
 3 Co: °Mm[m°]
 4 Cl: [tow]ards somebody before↑(.)
 5 Co:→ You feel ↑[**an:gr**y]↓

Exemplar 2 is on the explicit side of the continuum as well. In line 29 the client uses the word 'lonely' and the counselor responds in line 31 with an FR formulation using the same word 'lonely.'

Exemplar 2

- 28 Cl: A::nd so:: I'm like an o::dd du::ck no matter where I ↑go:: (hhhh)
- 29 → and so it's kind of **lo::nely** in that sense like (.) I can't really have
- 30 someone to rela::te ↑to:: in a sense like [()]
- 31 Co:→ [Mm hm. You feel
- 32 **lo::nely.**]

The CIT in Exemplar 3 delivers an FR formulation in line 15 that is close to the explicit end of the formulation continuum. In this case, the CIT uses a feeling word 'scared' (line 15) to respond to a client's repeated use of the word 'worried' (lines 13-14) in her previous turn. The CIT did not use 'worried' because CITs were limited to using five feeling words in their FRs (scared, angry, sad, lonely, and happy). In this case the CIT needed to take the client's word of 'worried' and re-formulate an FR of 'scared' to stay within the scope of the feeling words she was instructed to choose for her FRs.

Exemplar 3

- 12 Cl: He is ju::st (.) shouldering e::verything ((breathy voice)) right
- 13 → no::w a::nd (.) I::: (ye::ah) I'm jus-I'm **worried** that I'm just no::t
- 14 I'm not doing eno::ugh? I'm **worried** that I'm not a good partne::r.
- 15 Co:→ °You feel ↑**sca::red**°

Participants also used more implicit FR formulations such as the one in the following Exemplar 4. The student client is talking about helping a relative with school work and then reports that the relative received a good grade on that school work. The CIT does not have a specific feeling from which to draw but formulates an FR of 'happy' in line 211 based on the client's previous turn. While no explicit feeling words

were used by the client, nonverbal cues including facial expression (line 210) and tone of the client's disclosure provided the counselor with information for her FR formulation of 'happy.'

Exemplar 4

- 204 Cl: a:::nd we decided that that was what tha::: poem was going to be
 205 about. I'm like you tell me what you want in the poem?
 206 Co: Mm hm
 207 Cl: the words and everything↑ and I'll just make it rhy:::me.
 208 Co: [°(Hmm.)°]
 209 Cl: [a::nd] that way we were able to::: to::: (boost) it out↑ and he
 210 → actually got hunderd percent on it. ((smiling))
 211 Co: → °Mm:::° YOU FEEL ↑HA::PPY.

FR formulations were used by the participants of this study to convey affective understanding in conversation. CITs used FR formulations that were on a continuum from explicit to implicit drawing from the emotional content of their clients' prior turn. Formulation is one component of a turn sequence called an adjacency pair that will be discussed in the next section.

Adjacency Pairs

Early in my analysis process, I noticed the turn sequences containing the counselor's FR formulations and the client's turn following the FRs had a unique structure. Most participants acting as clients in the dyad would respond to FRs with some form of a 'yes' or 'no' response. Clients' responses were frequently followed by an elaboration on their response to the FR formulation. A question that arose early in

the analysis was if, hypothetically, an FR is by definition a reflective statement and not a question, why could clients not respond any way they chose or not respond at all? There were no responses in the corpus like ‘You really get what I’m saying’ or ‘That’s not really how I’m feeling.’ As I continued on in my analysis, I discovered the student clients were saying those types of things, but they were within the structure of a specific CA-identified turn sequence called an “adjacency pair” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 74). Schegloff (1968) conducted a seminal study on adjacency pairs and found paired conversational turns that occurred in telephone greetings. This idea expanded to other conversational units such as greetings, question/answers, and in the case of this study, formulation-decision pairs. An example of an adjacency pair is a typical greeting sequence where one person says a greeting like ‘hello’ which is called a “first pair part” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 74) and the other speaker responds with ‘hello’ or a related greeting called a “second pair part” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973, p. 74). First and second pair parts in an adjacency pair have a dependence on each other called “conditional relevance” (Schegloff, 1968, p.1083). Conditional relevance means that with the first pair part of an adjacency pair comes the expectation that a second pair part will follow (Schegloff, 1968). In the present study, this rule was evidenced by the fact that FR formulations were almost always paired with a yes/no-type response and frequently some form of elaboration.

Participants’ FR formulations were the first pair part in the formulation-decision adjacency pair structure that I found. Generally, a formulation turn calls for a “decision” (Heritage & Watson, 1979, p. 141) turn to follow. The decision turn serves as the second pair part of the adjacency pair. According to Heritage and Watson (1979)

recipients' decision turns include an element of confirming and disconfirming the formulation, a practice which occurred with the clients in my study. Responses to formulations make sense because in these practice sessions the clients have "epistemic authority" (Heritage & Raymond, 2005) or privileged access and firsthand knowledge related to their own experiences. Thus, the counselor's proffered formulation invites a response to show whether the formulation fits a client or not (Bercelli et al., 2008).

Formulation-decision adjacency pairs were evident in the vast majority of instances in the corpus of data. In many of the instances, the decision turn included an elaboration expanding on a response to the FR formulation. Exemplar 5 is one example of an adjacency pair turn sequence. The first pair part of the formulation-decision turn sequence is the counselor's FR formulation of 'sad' in line 29. The second pair part is the client's response with a confirmatory 'I do feel sad. Yeah' in the turn immediately following the FR formulation (line 30). An elaboration on the confirmation comes right after with 'I don't want to have a rocky relationship' in lines 30 and 31.

Exemplar 5

- 29 Co: → You feel sa::d.
- 30 Cl: → °**I do feel sad**°. (Yeah) (.) Cuz I:: don't wa:nt to have a ↑°rocky
- 31 relationship with my [[relative]] right now°↑ ((smacks lips?)). It's
- 32 really hard for me↑ and I've tri::ed↑ to come to him and sort
- 33 those things ↓out↑ and he's been unwilling to::: (really talk)-
- 34 actually he's been v::ery upset every single time I bring it up and
- 35 insted of:: um (3.1) instead of owning up to some responsibility

- 36 on his part for the contention↑ that there is between us↑ he'll get
 37 extremely defensive and:: start putting it back on me:: um-

Exemplar 6 demonstrates the concept of conditional relevance. An important attribute of conditional relevance is that it proves the existence of an adjacency pair. If the second pair part is not forthcoming, its absence is noticeable (Schegloff, 1968). Participants in my data showed how the absence of the second pair part became apparent because the speaker of the first pair part sought out a response in a subsequent turn. While there is not a complete absence of a response to the FR formulation in this exemplar, the client only provides a confirmation without an elaboration. Immediately following client's affirmative response in line 46 there is an extended silence of approximately 4.4 seconds in duration (line 47). What follows in line 48 is the counselor 'wondering' about where the fear is 'coming from.' The client interprets this utterance as a request to elaborate on his previous response to the FR because he responds by providing an expanded explanation in the next turn (lines 49-54).

Exemplar 6

- 43 Cl: Uh uh. Um::: (1.3) (tutut) (tsssss) it's scary to me the grade that I
 44 got so [um]
 45 Co: → **[You] feel ↑sca:red↓.**
 46 Cl: → **Yeah. (1.7) °I feel scared°.**
 47 → **(4.4)**
 48 Co: → **I'm wondering where that fear is co::ming °from°?**
 49 Cl: → **(Eh) I'm just not shure (1.6) um (3.7) (.hhhh) ((yawning, rubbing**
 50 **leg)) just get scar-I don't wanna have to re-take the cla::ss**

51 (whatever) and so (2.8) ((smacking lips)) guess it wouldn't be the
 52 end of the world but I don't want to have to take () to compare
 53 myself to others and so that will just heighten that and I'll be like
 54 'Uhhh, like everyone else (is not going to retake it) I have to'
 55 ((imitating voice))

Exemplar 7 below is another example of conditional relevance. The counselor formulates an FR of 'scared' in line 130. After a 1.6 second pause in line 131, the client follows with an affirmative response 'Yeah I feel scared talking about this right now actually' in line 132. Then both client and counselor overlap talk with 'Yeah' and 'Because' (lines 133-134) followed by the counselor stating 'Wondering what's going on there' in line 135. In the client's next turn starting in line 136 the elaboration occurs. Again, this an example of conditional relevance because the counselor's inquiry in line 135 shows that there is a missing elaboration that she is seeking from the client's second pair part response in line 132.

Exemplar 7

130 Co: → You feel **sca:red** right no::w.
 131 (1.6)
 132 Cl: → Yeah I feel scared talking about this right now< actually
 133 Co: → [Yeah]
 134 Cl: → [Because[:::]]
 135 Co: → [Won]dering (.) what's going o::n the:re.
 136 Cl: Um::: well it's the ↑pro::gram↓ is what I'm invested in and if-if I
 137 say that I'm scared I can't< I scared I'm scared I'm not going to be

138 able to handle these things together the::n someone my look at that
 139 and say “Oh::: [[client’s name]]’s not gonna be a counselor, ()
 140 can’t be a counselor. And so::: it’s scary to think about tha:::t.
 141 Um::: all the< time and money and who I am invested in it and then
 142 thinking maybe I couldn’t so that’s why it’s::: sca::ry but I think
 143 um (2.9) ((smacks lips)) I think it’s po::ssible, °I think something
 144 that the (Lord) would want me to work through° and improve
 145 myself and find how ta-how to deal with it the mo::st um beneficial
 146 way [so::]

Exemplar 8 represents a deviant case in the data corpus. In this example, the adjacency pair turn sequence is not present. This exemplar shows how the client may not have immediately responded to a first pair part but was still oriented to the adjacency pair structure of formulation-decision. In lines 50-60, the client is referencing some difficulties in a class she took in her undergraduate program. The counselor gives a FR formulation of ‘angry’ in line 61 which overlaps with the client’s continuation of her story. The immediate next turn (line 63) does not contain a response to the counselor’s FR formulation. Instead it is a continuation of the story from the client’s previous turn. A first analytic impression of this instance is that the client did not hear the FR formulation due to the overlapping talk or chose not to respond in that moment. However, after a succession of turns following the original FR the client eventually refers to the formulation of ‘angry’ in line 74. This suggests the client did hear the FR formulation and while she failed to respond in the turn immediately following the FR she did eventually address the formulation later in the turn sequence.

Exemplar 8

- 50 Cl: ...so I went to the head of the department day one 'This is what
 51 I'm gonna do. It's gonna take me a whi::le to d::o ↑ it but this is
 52 what I'm gonna d-.' '↑ Oh ye::ah I'll sign the papers no problem.'
 53 ((imitating voice)) So:: I'm in the program for a ye::ar and it takes
 54 about a ye::ar to do:: thi::s and I go to hand her the paper and
 55 she's- 'Oh:: well I have to have a me::eting with so- everybody
 56 else.' ((imitating voice)) (And I'm like) like 'Oka::y?' and so they
 57 come back and say 'OH WELL:: WE'RE NOT going to sign this
 58 pa::per' a(hh)nd I(hh) sai(hh)d 'I spent a ye::ar telling you this is
 59 what I was gonna do::↑ and you were okay with it?' [and now
 60 you're telling me you're]
- 61 Co: → [You feel
 62 an::gry.]
- 63 Cl: NOT:: okay with it.' So I:: said 'I'm do::ne. You just wasted a
 64 ye::ar of my↑ li::fe. I'm done' a(hh)nd s(hh)o I(hh) told everybody, I
 65 said 'I QUI::T (I'm not going to college) (.) get me trained in some
 66 vocational (.) THI::NG I'm just do::ne.
- 67 Co: I wonder how that affected you::r (.) your dire::ction cuz you had
 68 this direction and no::w
- 69 Cl: [(It, it was, it was really a struggle)]
- 70 Co: [(It was this, there) was this ba::rrier]

71 Cl: Ye::ah it was a huge ba::rrier. And it was like ‘What the (crap) do I
 72 do:::’ It’s like I wan- I thought I had this diRE::CTION, I
 73 to(hh)tally was li(h)ke °this is°, everything’s gonna line up and
 74 → everything so a lo::t of **a::nger** (huhh) (and a lot of) and I did a lot
 75 of the::rapy at this time too.

Analysis of the data strongly supported the adjacency pair structure of formulation-decision. This structure was utilized by the CITs and their clients as a way of negotiating the conversational interaction involved in the implementation of FRs and client’s subsequent response. The analyzed instances also showed that clients who did not immediately respond to FR formulations still oriented to the adjacency pair by returning to the formulation later in the talk. A consideration to follow in the next section is how the structure of an adjacency pair may inhibit or alter the mechanism of repair in a conversational interaction.

Repair

Participants used the CA device “repair” (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977, p. 361) in its many forms as they negotiated the formulation-decision adjacency pair turn sequence. Repair has been described as “...the self-righting mechanism for the organization of language...” (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 381). Repair is a highly organized interactional practice employed when there are troubles in talk. The basic premise behind repair is that participants in conversations prefer to avoid trouble in talk and they manage to do this by using repair practices to correct whatever may be going wrong (Schegloff et al., 1977). The main problems repair addresses are problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding talk (Schegloff, et al., 1977).

Repair is done in a sequential manner and includes two components: the initiation of the repair and the subsequent action undertaken to perform the repair (Schegloff et al., 1977). Essential concepts related to repair are what are called “self-initiated repair” (Kitzinger, 2013, p. 230) or “other-initiated repair” (p. 238) and “self repair” (Schegloff, 2007, p. 101) or “other-repair” (p.101). Speakers prefer the person who started the trouble in a conversation be the one to recognize and repair the trouble talk and there are certain rules for how repair is accomplished. If the speakers who have caused the conversational difficulties conduct their own repair, the repair will happen in the same turn, in the “turn’s transition space” (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366) which is the place where the next turn can occur, or in the third turn following the “trouble-source turn” (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 366).

If the speaker who caused the conversational trouble does not self-repair, the recipient of the trouble talk may choose to implement other-initiated repair. In this type of instance, they will bring the trouble to the speaker’s attention such as asking a question requesting clarification of the trouble talk. The other-initiated repair turn most frequently occurs in the turn immediately following the trouble turn (Schegloff, 2007). While self-repair is preferred over other-repair, it does not always occur and those responding to the trouble talk are put into a position to repair the conversation themselves.

Self-repair

A standard example in CA of self-initiated, self-repair can be found in the following Exemplar 9. In responding to the FR formulation of ‘angry’ in line 341, the client stops herself in the middle of her turn where she appears to be starting to say the

word ‘yeah’ but cuts off and then proceeds to correct herself and offer a prefaced ‘well’ followed by a ‘guess’ at a different feeling which is ‘scared.’ In line 342, the cut off word ‘ye-’ and shift to ‘well’ is the self-initiated, self-repair in this turn sequence.

Exemplar 9

- 341 Co: → You feel an::gry.
- 342 Cl: → **I-I ye-we::ll** (.) I **guess** I feel **sca::red**, A::ngry, I definitely feel
- 343 angry around my...

Another example of self-initiated, self-repair can be found in Exemplar 10. Here the counselor uses the FR sad (line 55) and the client responds with an initial “Yeah” which she changes to a “well” prefaced “no” response (line 56).

Exemplar 10

- 55 Co: → Hm::: (.) °and you feel **sa:::d**°.
- 56 Cl: → **Ye:::ah ↑well ↑no:::↓** and that’s tha::: (.) I’m like(tskhhh). I:::
- 57 I’m:-I’m not feeling much and I’m wondering if that’s::: a
- 58 pro(hh)blem.

In this next example of repair in Exemplar 11, the CIT is using an altered FR formulation beginning in line 48. The client responds in line 50 with an overlapping affirmative response of ‘Yeah’ and then equivocates in line 52 with ‘I mean’ and then a word cut off (‘wa’) followed by a minimizing word ‘little’ in her response ‘I am little angry’. This is another example of self-initiated, self-repair found in the data.

Exemplar 11

- 48 Co: → I sense a little an:::ger an:::d (.) or I’m sensing an:::ger >in that<
- 49 especially when ((slams fist on arm rest)) with the (.) [the fi::st]

- 50 Cl: [Ye::ah]
- 51 Co: sla::m there=
- 52 Cl:→ =Ye::ah, anger< I mean wa (.)-I I-I a::m a little a::ngry ah on
- 53 two ↑different, two different fronts. I'm an::gry↑ tha::t I'm no::t
- 54 spe::cial. Um (.) eh:: special's the wrong wo::rd.

Other-repair

Other-repair is another phenomenon to consider in analysis of the data as connections have been made between other-repair and disagreement (Schegloff et al., 1977). The practice of other-repair is rare in conversation (Schegloff, 2007). However, the structure of the skills practice in this study makes the action of other-repair more applicable because counselors were constrained in what they were able to say in the interaction which ostensibly left the client with the repair work. A review of the data suggested other-repair was occurring in clients' turns to correct the feeling word provided by the counselor. In Exemplar 12, the counselor provides an FR formulation of 'angry' in line 311 which the client corrects by identifying 'guilt' as the more salient emotion for her in line 313.

Exemplar 12

- 311 Co: → You feel ↑a::ngry.
- 312 Cl: → Ye::ah. (2.4) (hhhhh) (.) And:: I-I fe::el (hhh) I do::n'
- 313 → know. There's a lot of gu::ilt surrounding thi::s topic I
- 314 thi::nk. I'm no::t >quite sure why but at the same time<
- 315 um:: like I felt ↓gui::lty↑ sa::ying that I don't wa::nt to be
- 316 like my [[relative]]↑ cuz that's not the way I wa::nt (.) ta

311 think about it like um: I'm kind of jealous of other people
 312 that say li::ke 'When I grow up I want to be just like my
 313 [[relative]].'=

In Exemplar 13, there is trouble talk along with attempts at repair initiation and action on both sides. The CIT makes an initial FR formulation 'happy' in a questioning tone in line 4. There is a two second pause followed by the client repeating the question in line 6. This is indicative of other-initiated repair, and a response with a tentative 'yes' spoken as a question. In the following line 7, the client accomplishes a repair action in her clarification that the happiness is 'overshadowed' and then checks in with the counselor to see 'if that makes sense' which suggests a further attempt to repair by addressing the lack of understanding in the interaction. In line 9, the counselor demonstrates her continued lack of understanding by inviting repair through asking the client to explain further. The client is unable to do this at first (line 10) but eventually provides an expanded explanation (line 17) that she's waiting for 'the other shoe to drop' which is what is overshadowing the happiness.

Exemplar 13

1 Co: Well I'm wondering because that you-you talked about finding
 2 me:aning.
 3 Ca: [Mm, hmm]
 4 Co: → [In-in]-in this program ↑specifically↓ (.) if you feel ↑**happy**↓?
 5 (2.0)

- 6 Ca: → Uhg (hhhhh) (.) °Do I feel happy↓° (.) ((smacking lips))
- 7 Ye:::s? (1.3) but it:::s (1.9) oversha:::dowed almost °if that
- 8 makes sense?°
- 9 Co: → °(Well) why don't you explain that.°
- 10 Ca: °(I don't know how)°.
- 11 Co: Huhuhu[huh].
- 12 Ca: [Hhhh]hhhh. You're just supposed to-just read my mind=
- 13 Co: =There-there's happiness there.=
- 14 Ca: Ye:::ah.
- 15 Co: A::nd?
- 16 Ca: And it's still::: see I-and I think self doubt plays a ↑role but it's
- 17 → almost like (.) it's like **I'm waiting for the other shoe to drop↑**
- 18 °maybe that's it°. Because there's been times in my life (when I've)
- 19 been really happy and then, like the other shoe drops and like the
- 20 rug gets pulled out from underneath me↑

Repair was used in all its forms by participants in this study at various times in the data. While self-repair is the preferred method of correcting troubles in talk, there is evidence in the data that demonstrates that clients take on a greater role in managing conversational troubles by virtue of the fact that they are less constrained in speaking in their turns than are the counselors.

Epistemic Rights

In CA, “epistemics” (Heritage, 2013, p. 370) refers to the knowledge claims that “interactants assert, contest, and defend in and through turns at talk

and sequences in interaction” (p. 370). Participants in the present study negotiated the process of asserting epistemic rights in their practice counseling sessions. Heritage and Raymond (2005) have proposed that in evaluative assessments, epistemic rights or rights to knowledge claims take a certain form. The form consists of “first position assessments” (p. 16) and “second position assessments” (p. 16). It is notable that the first position/second position structure mimics the framework of the formulation-decision adjacency pair structure in that the first position assessment is the FR formulation made by the counselor and the second position assessment is the decision or response and elaboration by the client. Like the counselors in this study, speakers who make a first position assessment are asserting rights to the knowledge claims in their assessment simply by being the first to provide an assessment. Alternatively, speakers in the second position assessment are considered to be at a disadvantage simply because their assessment comes second in the conversational sequence (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Participants in this study managed the first and second assessment positions in various ways.

First position assessments can be downgraded, upgraded, or remain neutral through the use of certain language. Speakers can downgrade first position assessments to show lack of epistemic superiority through using terms like “seems like” or “sounds.” Another option to downgrade a first position assessment is for speakers to use “tag questions” (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, p. 20) that give recipient speakers the opportunity to provide their own assessment of a given situation. Assessments may also be upgraded mainly through the use

of a “negative interrogative” (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, p. 21) such as the question ‘isn’t she?’ added to the end of an assessment. There are also “unmarked first assessments” (Heritage & Raymond, 2005, p. 19) where speakers use no supplemental language to upgrade or downgrade the assessment to strengthen or weaken their position. FR formulations could be placed in this category by virtue of the neutral and concise structure of the FR.

Speakers of second position assessments must complete the assessment turn sequence with a response due to the adjacency pair structure of this conversational turn sequence. In second positions, clients are tasked with managing the claims made in the first position assessment (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). The following Exemplars 14 and 15 illustrate how clients manage their second position assessment turn. This turn includes their response in agreement or disagreement with the first position assessment (FR formulation) and elaboration.

Exemplars 14 and 15 are unusual due to the fact that they were immediate disagreements with the first position assessment which is an uncommon occurrence in the corpus of data that was analyzed. In Exemplar 14, the client is discussing that she feels she is ‘cracking’ under the pressure and trying unsuccessfully to deal with a hectic life related to school and family. The counselor’s FR formulation/first position assessment is that the client feels ‘angry’ (line 20). The client immediately follows the FR formulation turn by stating disagreement with the formulation and providing an explanation of why she feels ‘scared’ instead of ‘angry’ thereby re-asserting her epistemic authority

over her personal experience. The client modulates her response with ‘probably more’ in line 21 as a way to minimize potential for trouble talk and retain affiliation in the relationship.

Exemplar 14

- 15 Cl: ...I ju:::st I ju:::st am feeling like (like I) thinking like you know
 16 (Looney Tunes) like when the statue BR::EAKS and it has all those
 17 LI::NES N like I feel like that like I feel like all the pressure
 18 ((gesturing toward head)) is just like this and I feel like I-I’m
 19 cracking and starting to °disintegrate°.
 20 Co: → >Yeah you feel an::gry?<
 21 Cl: → **No< I feel sc(hh)-no probably more ↓sca::red** than an↑gry
 22 UM::: just that like I’m going to be able to keep my stuff
 23 toge:::ther () I::: am cracking like I’m-I’m breaking under the
 24 pressure of all of this and I-I want to keep trucking um:: and I-I then
 25 I’m also seeing that I’m not making the progress that I want to be
 26 making and I:::-I’m just I’m like really sca:::red that I’m not gonna
 27 get over this...

In Exemplar 15, the client talks about her difficulty controlling her food intake and how it is affecting her physically. In the opening turn of the exemplar (line 134), she is discussing where she does have control and structure in her life. The counselor’s first position assessment is an FR formulation of ‘scared’ (line 151) to which the client initially agrees with a head nod. However, the client then reverses course and disagrees (line 152) thus re-establishing her epistemic rights to the information being discussed. As

in the previous example, the client uses ‘not necessarily’ (line 152) to temper her disagreement.

Exemplar 15

- 134 Cl: I can’t control it. ((crying)) ((sniff)) ~And that’s hard for me
 135 because I’m usually ve::ry (.) ve::ry structured.~
- 136 Co: °Mm hm::°
- 137 Cl: ~And this to me is just another form of stru::cture.~ (.) [Like]
 138 Co: [Thi::s.]
- 139 Cl: me=
 140 Co: =this=
 141 Cl: =Like me:: doing my homework=
 142 Co: =Okay.
- 143 Cl: and me:: (.) ya know leaving a::t eight in the morning and getting
 144 ho::me at midni::ght. Like that is::~ (.) something that I control, I
 145 control when I leave the house and I control when I get ho::me
 146 a::nd me ya know going right from school to:: the library, going
 147 right from school to [[building on campus]] to do my ho::mework
 148 or:: >I like to mix it up and I go to Starbucks sometimes< (.hhh)
 149 BU::T tho::se thi::ngs are my contro::l and it’s also my structure
 150 [because I]
- 151 Co: → [You feel sca]:::red.
- 152 Cl: → ((slight nodding)) I:: uh ↑no::: no:t necessarily↓ because I::
 153 am:: (.) not h(hh)ard on myself [but]

- 154 Co: [Okay?]
- 155 Cl: I'm::: (.) very much like 'Ok now school is do:::ne an:::d you
- 156 ha:::ve this, this, and this to do::.

The following Exemplar 16 demonstrates another example of a client asserting her epistemic rights to the knowledge they are discussing. In a preceding FR formulation-decision pair from this session, the client and counselor have discussed the client feeling 'angry' about a current family matter (exemplar not shown here). Looking now at Exemplar 16, the counselor makes a different FR formulation/first position assessment of 'sad' in line 53. The client delays disagreement by silence of 1.6 seconds, and then she rubs the chair arms with an audible inbreath and outbreath. After that, she provides an initial agreement (line 55), but the way she voices 'sad' is drawn out with a downward pitch change to upward pitch leaves an impression that she is not in complete agreement with the formulation of 'sad.' She follows with 'like I said' (line 56) reminding the counselor of their previous exchange and claiming epistemic authority over the knowledge claim, that she 'mostly' feels angry (line 56). In lines 59 and 60, the counselor endorses the client's second assessment by noting client's body language as matching the 'angry' feeling.

Exemplar 16

- 48 Cl: Not fight aga:::nst um::: but money ((clears throat)) pulls people
- 49 apart from each o::ther and that kind of sucks. B[ut]
- 50 Co: [°Mm°].
- 51 Cl: Um:::

- 52 (1.2)
- 53 Co: → >You feel ↓sa:d.<
- 54 (1.6)
- 55 Cl: → ((rubbing chair arms)) °(.hhh)° I(hh) **I do feel ↓sa(hhhh)d↑** (hh)um
- 56 but **like I said I mostly fill an(hh)-an(hh)gry↑**=
- 57 Co: =°(Mm hm)°= ((smiling))
- 58 Cl: =ya(hh) kn(hh)ow mostly fill like [()] ((throws back head))
- 59 Co: → ((in sing song voice)) [Your] body language (is)
- 60 definitely ↑sa::ying↓ you feel ↑a::ngry↓ ((gripping arms of chair))

The following is another example of how participants asserted their epistemic rights. In Exemplar 17, line 59 the counselor formulates an FR of angry. After 2.1 seconds of silence, the client responds in line 61 with an outbreath followed by ‘I don’t know’ signifying probable disagreement with the formulation. However, in lines 62 and 63 she entertains the idea that she might be angry at some point in time if she were to ‘catch [herself] doing it,’ the ‘it’ being treating other people unfairly as she had been treated as a child.

Exemplar 17

- 56 Cl: Um:::: (.) a::nd just< because of the way that that had made m::e
- 57 fe:::el↑ if I were to do that to someone else that jus:::t (kk) (.)
- 58 (hhhhhh). No one should have to ↑feel that way.
- 59 Co: → °You feel an:::gry°.
- 60 (2.1)

61 Cl: → (hhh). **I don't know** if (.) angry is quite it ↑ (.) beca::use I-I don't
 62 catch myself:: if I we-If I were↑ to catch myself doing it yes I
 63 would be very angry with myself:: Kind of like a '(You)
 64 hypocrite'(hhh[hh])

These exemplars show how participants worked to establish epistemic rights to the knowledge claims that were assumed by the counselor with their use of the FR formulation. The counselors made first position assessments which gave them the privileged position to make knowledge claims even though it was the clients' experience they were referencing. In response, clients re-asserted their claims in their second position assessments which put them at risk for not following the rules set out by preference organization which will be outlined in the next section.

Preference Organization

While epistemic considerations relate to negotiating knowledge claims, preference organizations function to maximize the potential for affiliation and social solidarity (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). In this section, I will show how participants engaged in preferred and dispreferred responding through agreements and disagreements with the counselors. Both preference and agreement/disagreement are closely tied in CA in that they can be paired together as preferred/agreement or dispreferred/disagreement. However, not all agreements are preferred nor all disagreements dispreferred so how they are paired is dependent on the context (Pomerantz, 1984). In the context of this study, participants in a majority of the instances agreed with the FR formulations showing that agreements were the preferred response and disagreements were dispreferred. However,

closer examination of the data revealed that many of clients' 'agreements' to FR formulations were in fact disagreements in disguise.

The term 'preference' in the CA sense means certain principles are followed by participants to guide their actions and reactions in an interactional context (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2013). Preference is not meant to signify an internal state of being but rather the intersubjective understanding constructed by participants in a conversation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). While the concept of preference can cover many different facets of talk-in-interaction, this section will be focusing specifically on the participants' responding in particular. In most talk, there are preferences for responses: answers over non-answers and agreements over disagreements (Hayano, 2013).

Participants in this study generally conformed to the rules related to preferred agreements and dispreferred disagreements. Preferred agreement responses are generally delivered in a brief format with very little hesitation while dispreferred responses tend to be delayed and indirect. Other features of dispreferred/disagreements can include silence and responses prefaced with words like 'well' (Pomerantz, 1984). Most agreements are preferred and disagreements are dispreferred, but there are exceptions such as when someone is being self-deprecating where agreement would be a dispreferred response (Pomerantz, 1984).

In many instances, agreement and disagreement response types can take on different features and follow divergent courses in conversation depending on the interactional situation. Both agreements and disagreements can be "strong" (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 74) or "weak" (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 74). In particular, a disagreement may begin with an agreement token, but turn into a statement of disagreement which occurred often

in the data. In fact, turns with both elements of disagreement and agreement tend to operate for the purposes of demonstrating disagreement of a given assessment or formulation (Pomerantz, 1984).

The participants' agreements and disagreements were also "upgraded" (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 66) or "downgraded" (Pomerantz, 1984, p. 68). Upgrading and downgrading are connected to strong and weak agreements and disagreements in that upgrading can strengthen an agreement and downgrading can weaken it. In Exemplar 18, the counselor voices an FR formulation in line 14 which is met by 1.4 seconds of silence. Following the silence in line 16, the client offers a 'Yeah. I-I think I do' followed by a downgrade to 'a little worried.' While this would be considered a weak agreement, the downgrade can prompt disagreement in the talk (Pomerantz, 1984).

Exemplar 18

- 14 Co: → And you feel sca:::red.
- 15 → (1.4)
- 16 Cl: → ↑Ye::ah. I-I think I d:::o? Just::: I'm a little wo:::rried tha:::t
- 17 um::: that I:::m not at-at a place where I ca::n, (.)

Exemplar 19 illustrates an upgraded agreement. The client responds to the FR formulation angry with an upgrade of 'so angry' in line 42.

Exemplar 19

- 41 Co: °Hm.° You feel ang::ry↓.
- 42 Cl: → I fee::l, like, s:::(hhh)o a(hh)ngry at them but
- 43 they don't (.) ↑do anything about it. And I've expressed
- 44 m:y, my anger (.) to them and said 'You know, it makes me angry=

Strong disagreements tend to occur immediately following the assessment turn or in this case the FR formulation. A strong disagreement has mostly elements of disagreement. There were no instances in the collection that could be identified as a strong disagreement response. Exemplar 20 shows initial evidence of a strong disagreement in that there was an immediate response of ‘no’ in the turn subsequent to the FR in line 20. However, the client mitigated her response with ‘probably more’ in disagreeing with the FR in line 21.

Exemplar 20

- 20 Co: → >Yeah you feel an::gry?<
- 21 Cl: → **No< I feel sc(hh)-no probably more ↓sca::red** than an↑gry
- 22 UM:::: just that like I’m going to be able to keep my stuff
- 23 toge:::ther () I:: am cracking...

Participants made attempts to avoid disagreements with the FR formulations whenever possible. Many of the instances I reviewed for my analysis showed clients’ disagreement with the FR formulations through responses that contained mixed elements of agreement and disagreement. In Exemplar 21, the client offers a dispreferred disagreement response which gives the appearance initially that it will be an agreement. What is especially significant about this instance is that she automatically agrees with the cut off ‘yeah’ at the start of the turn (line 342) which provides further confirmation that agreeing is the preferred response. However, she then changes course with a ‘well’ prefaced ‘I guess I feel scared.’ She then revisits the FR formulation of ‘angry’ qualifying when she feels angry.

Exemplar 21

- 341 Co: → You feel an::gry.
- 342 Da: → **I-I ye-we::ll (.) I guess I feel sca::red**, A::ngry, I definitely feel
- 343 angry around my....

Exemplar 22 is another example of dispreferred disagreement. The client's turn starts with a recognition that he is 'sad' in line 9 for certain individuals. The counselor then offers as an FR in the next turn (line 10). Following the FR formulation of 'sad' there is a 1.3 second pause followed by initial agreement 'Yeah yeah I guess' (line 12) which is turned into disagreement through use of the words 'comforted' and 'more at peace' (lines 12-14).

Exemplar 22

- 5 Cl: (.) U:::mm I don't know it's just it's ju-um:: I guess. It's just a
- 6 reminder of me
- 7 → that that's the::re and so um:: (2.0) and (2.6) seeing some people
- 8 sa::y it's sa:::d
- 9 → (1.8) and I guess I fe::el **sa:d** for the individuals who are hu::rt by it.
- 10 Co: → You feel ↑sa::d.
- 11 → (1.3)
- 12 Cl: → °Yeah yeah I guess I feel sa::d° (3.2). I:: was more co:::mforted
- 13 by that (coming out there). I was mo:::re um::: >I-I guess I kinda
- 14 → **was more at pe:::ace**

Exemplar 23 shows how a dispreferred disagreement occurred over the course of multiple turns. In response to the FR formulation of 'happy' (line 10), the client responds

in the affirmative and repeats the FR formulation in line 11. However, as the turns progress, one gets the sense that ‘happy’ might not fit for the client. In line 16, the client starts the turn with an ‘and’ which she self-repairs to ‘but’ shifting to past tense with ‘I was still happy’ (line 17) and then in the same turn she reveals that ‘as the weeks have gone by my feelings are going down’ (lines 18-19). This is a sentiment to which the counselor attends in a subsequent turn (line 24).

Exemplar 23

- 3 Co: So [client] wha-what would you like to talk abo::ut today::?
- 4 (1.7)
- 5 Cl: Uh(hhhh) today u::m I’ve been thinking a lot about how I’ve been
- 6 feeling (.) in °(the)° counseling program. When I first started the
- 7 program it was s:::o exci::ting:: and s:::o ama::zing::-and every day
- 8 I’m going home feeling like this is where I need to be:: and this is
- 9 s:::o incredible I’ve-I love this.
- 10 Co: → You feel ↑happy↓.
- 11 Cl: → **I ↑d::o↓ I feel happy.** A:::nd whenever anything went WRO::NG
- 12 ya know I did go to my own counseling to talk about some issues::
- 13 or there were (0.9) personalization things like ‘Who::a. Wha-why is
- 14 this such a big deal for me’-I would talk to my counselor so that was
- 15 taking some time=
- 16 Co: =Hm::
- 17 Cl: → **A:::nd-but I was still happy** like I can handle this this is grea::t.
- 18 → And as the weeks have gone by:: my:: (0.7) **my ↑fee::lings are**

- 19 **going ↓do::wn=**
- 20 Co: =°Hm°=
- 21 Ka: =down, down. And then I've-I haven't had that for a while I've been
- 22 rea::lly (.) really doing well. So I've I've kind of been thinking
- 23 what's:: what's going on with me:: (0.8) a::::nd u::::m=
- 24 Co: → **=You're not sure why those feelings are going down.**

The main focus of preference organization in this study was on client responses to FR formulations. In a majority of instances, clients provided preferred agreements or managed disagreements in such a way as they initially appeared to be agreements. Those who provided dispreferred disagreements tended to delay their disagreement in their response turns.

Preferred responses tend to be affiliative and dispreferred responses tend to be disaffiliative (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). The way clients responded to the FR formulations showed how important it was for them to provide a preferred/agreement response to the FR formulation. They either provided a preferred/agreement response or carefully managed their dispreferred responses which contained elements of agreement and disagreement in order to maintain affiliation in the dyadic relationship.

Affiliation and Alignment

In this section, exemplars will be used to show how participants engaged in affiliative and disaffiliative actions in the instances that were analyzed. The CA practice of affiliation and its corresponding practice alignment have connections to preference organization (Lindström & Sorjonen, 2013). “Affiliation” (Stivers, 2008, p. 35) has a broad application and generally pertains to the practice of voicing support and

endorsement of a storyteller's particular "stance" (p. 37). "Stance" (Stivers, 2008, p. 32) refers to the teller's affective position with regard to the story they are telling. It is frequently used during the course of trouble telling and can be communicated verbally and non-verbally (Lindström & Sorjonen, 2013). Frequently, affiliative responses will come with matching intonation (Peräkylä & Sorjonen, 2012). This matching can also be referred to as "stance mirroring" (Peräkylä & Sorjonen, 2012, p. 114).

"Alignment" (Stivers, 2008, p. 34) is a term that is sometimes used synonymously with affiliation but has a slightly different connotation. Alignment is a conversational device used to yield the conversational floor to the person telling a story. In this study that would be the counselors using alignment to allow the clients to tell their stories. To express alignment with a storyteller, the speaker will use aligning response tokens such as 'mm hm' and 'uh huh' instead of speaking in full turns. Disaligning activities include competing for a turn at conversation or failing to recognize that the speaker's story is still in progress. This disalignment can have the effect of being disaffiliative. Alignment will be referenced in this study in terms of the counselors' use of aligning response tokens or minimal encouragers to follow their clients' stories.

A counselor's talk is presumed to be affiliative by design. Some types of utterances are privileged as affiliative in certain circumstances (Lindström & Sorjonen, 2013). FRs would be in this category as they are meant to show empathy and be affiliative in nature. In the following exemplars, there is a sense that the clients are responding to the counselors' affiliative and aligning turns by examining their words and affect. It is also evident that the more obvious displays of emotion by the client enable the CITs to more accurately pinpoint an FR formulation. In Exemplar 24, the client is

discussing an inability to be a support for her husband or her children. She starts to cry which prompts the use of immediacy by the counselor (line 1) and an affirmative response by the client (line 2). The client continues her story with the counselor interjecting brief aligning response tokens (lines 6 and 9). The counselor then states an FR formulation of ‘sad’ in line 12 with which client agrees and states ‘I hurt’ (line 14). The counselor repeats the word ‘hurting’ (line 15) in the next turn to communicate further affiliation with client.

Exemplar 24

- 1 Co: → °(It looks like you’re getting emotional[too:::])°
- 2 Cl: → [I ↑a::m] ((sniffs, welling
3 up)). (hhhhh). (.) Ye::ah I:: (.) I::: want to be:: °like° ↑pre::↓sent
4 and (all in all out sort of::). I want to-I want to be all ↑in and I want
5 my kids to feel [like I’m all]
- 6 Co: → [Mm hm:::]
- 7 Cl: in and (.) and ‘specially (.) espe::cially °like when my kids are like°
8 in° an emotional kind of like cri::sis=
- 9 Co: → =[Mm hm]
- 10 Cl: [ti::me] and I want to be there for them, and I ((starts crying))
11 ↑°wa::sn’t yesterday° for ~[[client’s child]] ~((crying)).
- 12 Co: → °You feel sa:::d.
- 13 Cl: → °I ↑do:::° (.) ~And I know he was hu::rting, and like when he hurts
14 I::: hu::rt a::nd I::=
- 15 Co: → =You’re ↑hu::rting.

- 16 Cl: °↑Ye::ah° ~I want to:: show hi::m, ↑and I want to ↑he::lp hi::m (.)
 17 kinda pro::cess and-and know that he's not alo::ne↑~

In another example of affiliation, Exemplar 25 shows that the counselor draws on the client's repeated use of the word 'afraid' in line 76 in formulating an FR of 'scared' (line 78). The counselor's FR is followed by the client repeating 'I do' twice (line 79) emphasizing her agreement with the formulation.

Exemplar 25

- 76 Cl:→ and yeah, I'm just **afraid** that< (.) I ca::n't and I'm **afraid** I'm not
 77 eno::ugh.=
 78 Co:→ =You feel **sca::red**.
 79 Cl:→ **I do:::** (.) **I do:::** I (.) I wa::nt (hh)him to kno::w like that he is my
 80 primary relationship

While there is a presumption that counselors' actions will be affiliative, clients were active participants in maintaining affiliation in the conversational interaction. In analyzing the data, I found clients maintained affiliation through the use of preferred responding. Clients frequently responded to FRs on a continuum from strong agreements to weak agreements. Also, many of the dispreferred disagreement responses initially appeared to be agreements. Other ways that clients attempted to maintain affiliation in conversation was through the use of tentative or mitigating language which will be noted in Exemplar 27 below. In this Exemplar 26, the counselor uses an FR formulation of 'happy' in line 209. As an affiliative action, the client shows strong agreement with the counselor. She starts her agreement with 'I do' (line 210) and ends her turn in line 212 with upgraded language 'really' to state that she feels 'really' happy.

Exemplar 26

- 206 Cl: ...of myself, that I:: I wa::nt to be:: a counselor. This is my go::al
 207 and that I was afraid to let anybody el::se i:n on that goal so yeah
 208 it feels good to be able to let people i:n?
 209 Co: → You feel ha::ppy.
 210 Cl: → **I do::**. I feel less alo::ne↑ (.) a::nd (oh wait) and I-and I kno::w
 211 that I'm not going to be:: without struggling↑ on thi::s↑ (.) u::m
 212 → (.) °and that's okay°. **I feel really happy.**

Exemplar 27 is a series of turns in a sequence used here to illustrate how the affiliative process unfolds sequentially across turns. This exemplar is also used as an example to show how both client and counselor participate in the affiliative process in conversation. The session was analytically significant due to the fact there were a number of disaffiliative turns during the course of the session. This finding was rare in the data. The interactional process between the CIT and the student client shows how both worked at various times to maintain affiliation in the interaction over the course of the session. In the first part of this session, the client is talking about feeling disconnected from other people who share her medical condition. The counselor uses the FR 'scared' (line 83) and the client then provides a response (line 84) that appears to be a preferred agreement but 'scared' and adds 'lonely' to suggest that the counselor does not have a completely accurate formulation.

Exemplar 27a

- 83 Co: → You feel ↑sca::red↓.

- 84 Cl: → YE:::AH-(and then-and-it's(hhh))-↑SCA::RED and lone::ly and
 85 then it's just kinda dumb because it's all like...

In Exemplar 27b which comes later in the session, the CIT uses an FR formulation of 'scared' again (line 124). In the next turn, the client has a developing dispreferred response (line 125) where she at first states 'yeah' and then uses 'well' to preface her disagreement which is that she is 'not really scared.' The client then equivocates with a 'yes and no.' In the same turn (lines 126 and 127) she offers an alternate explanation for what is actually going on for her which is 'irony' at the thought of working in a hospital setting because she was in hospitals so much as a child.

Exemplar 27b

- 120 Cl: Ye:::ah and then (it was also) iro::nic be(hhh)cuz I always said
 121 there is no wa::y I'm going into the medical fie::ld. I spent the first
 122 half of my li::fe (.) (go::ing) going in and out of hospitals, why
 123 would I want to spend the rest of my li::fe?
 124 Co: → You feel sca::red,=
 125 Cl:→ =And so-ye::ah-and then s-well ↑no::t really sca::red yes and
 126 → ↓no:: but it's mo(hh)re li(hh)ke this who::le ya know like
 127 → ir::ony↑ of like (oh, okay I'm gonna) work in a hospital [no::w]

In the next turn (line 130), the counselor asks the client to elaborate on what she means by her previous 'yes and no' response. The client offers a response that hospitals 'has triggers' for her, meaning they cause her anxiety fear which she frames in the past tense. At the same time she states is not afraid (line 149-150) because her personal experiences would help her in the job she is referencing. Notably in this passage there is

a lot of other-initiated repair turns by the counselor such as his ‘you’re triggered by the hospital’ (line 138-139) and ‘what’s triggered’ question in line 141. In addition, he asks “That’s the yes?” (line 146) to which she responds in the affirmative (line 147). In this section and throughout the session there is frequent latching talk where speakers start their turns without pausing after the previous turn as well as overlapping talk. These actions can be disaffiliative in conversation.

Exemplar 27c

- 130 Co:→ [Can you] speak more to that actually? **Yes:: yes and no?**
- 131 Ca: Um-(hhhh) [(The:::re)]
- 132 Co: [How is that] how is that feeling ye::s and no::.
- 133 Ca: Because the ho::spital has triggers for °me°.
- 134 Co: °Hm:::°.
- 135 Ca: Like, I’m always triggered by a °hospital°. There’s a sense of
- 136 ↑SME::LL. There-like rubbing alcoho:::l like (ggghhhh) ((puking
- 137 sound)) that sets me OFF:::. And so::: I kn[ew I was sca::red]
- 138 Co: → [() you, you’re]
- 139 → triggered by the hospital?
- 140 Ca: Yeah I’m to::tally triggered.=
- 141 Co:→ =**Like wha::-wha::t’s triggered.**
- 142 Ca: Um::: the anxi::ety like (just this:: well it’s just like the) (past)
- 143 emotions I felt↑ like so the anxie:::ty, the fe:::ar, like the
- 144 nervousness? Hospitals do::n’t equal °good things°. (.) SO::: IF
- 145 I:::

- 146 Co:→ **So that's::: that's::: the ye::s?**
- 147 Ca:→ Ye::ah that's the ye::s. That like I knew my triggers were going to
- 148 ha::ppen↑ especially if I worked in the °surgical ward° (and) then
- 149 → it's like so tha::t sca::red me:: and then the **no of li::ke (.) I:::**
- 150 **knew I had my::: um expe::rience to really help these ↓kids.**

Further in the session (Exemplar 27d), the client is speaking about her experiences developing her skills writing poetry and the freedom of expression she derives from the practice. There is no explicit reference to 'scared' in the client's turn (lines 266-276) preceding the FR formulation. Previously the client equivocated on the FR formulation of scared in Exemplar 27b. Despite this, the counselor formulates an FR of 'scared' again in line 277. There is a 1.5 second pause and then the client responds with a higher pitched 'no' followed by 'maybe at the time' in line 279. This is a deviant case from the data as there were very few instances in the collection where a client voiced immediate disagreement to an FR. Depending on the context, disagreement can be disaffiliative so it is generally avoided in conversation when possible.

Exemplar 27d

- 266 Cl: When I ↑fi::rst did my fi::rst poetry like I just had these tho::ughts
- 267 and it's like I'm just gonna write and see where it go::es. And like
- 268 I had a friend who he (1.1) wa::s and is:: a big poetry writer, he's
- 269 always like 'just wri::te, ↓just wri::te' and so::: I just sta::rted
- 270 experimenting wi::th it? I () I kind of am a wri::ter but no:::t? It's
- 271 just it comes and go::es and::: so that was the first time that I ever
- 272 really messed with poetry as a free::: flowing thi::ng not because

273 school made me write somethi::ng↑ and so I was just
 274 experimenting with it and then this really turned out that it was the
 275 dar::ker crap that came o::ut because that is what I was expressing
 276 and so for ↑me::: [I ()]
 277 Co:→ [You feel sca:::red.]
 278 → (1.5)
 279 Cl: → ↑NO::: ((high pitched voice)) (1.4) MAYBE at the ti::me↑ I
 280 don-(I could see tha::t) like right no::w I wouldn't say::: like I'm
 281 ↑sca::red but I could see in the pa:::st ye::ah that's where it was
 282 coming from↑ was from that sca::redness (.hhh) a::nd so::: um::: it
 283 was just a way to get it o::ut I guess and no::t (.) and (who) really
 284 know wh::y it was darker if it was because it was easier to
 285 expre::ss it in tha::t way↑ or-in versus just actually talking abo:::ut
 286 it? And::: (hhh)=

Although there was disagreement, there is silence of 1.5 seconds (line 278) preceding the client's response. The delivery of the 'no' is high pitched followed by another pause and then a concession that 'maybe' there was a time she was scared which suggests that she is mitigating her disagreement. The delay and mitigating language suggests the client may still be trying to maintain a level of affiliation with the counselor.

A short time later, in Exemplar 27e, the counselor similarly seeks to maintain affiliation with the client by using immediacy in a turn to determine if the client feels pressured in the moment to express herself with him (line 358-359). The client denies feeling pressured (lines 360-361) and also says there needs to be a right time to 'go

there.’ Immediately following in line 366 the counselor uses an FR formulation of ‘scared’ again. Repeated use of the FR formulation ‘scared’ is not affiliative in this interaction.

Exemplar 27e

- 351 Cl: =Ye:::ah it’s li::ke there’s not that pre::ssure (.) to acknowled-
 352 well I want to say acknowledge but I don’t know why I use that
 353 word. But it’s no::t the pressure to:: react a ↑certain way ↑almo::st
 354 like I can acknow::ledge that I have this but-I::: can choose what I
 355 want to do with it without that pre::ssure. Ya know like I don’t
 356 have to be like ‘O(hhh)kay I’m gonna go:: do::: ssssservice to:::
 357 ma::ke up-I don’t know.”=
 358 Co: → =**So::: do yo::u do you think that pressu::re’s between ↑u::s?**
 359 Is that pressure here?
 360 Cl: → No:::I just naturally don’t (do it) (hhh)just really **it really has to**
 361 **be the right ti::me (.) for me to even >go there.** CUZ LIKE THE
 362 SCARED LIDDLE GIRL< (2.1) (hhh) like she randomly popped
 363 up that one time. A::nd I-it was just really weird like and I still
 364 didn’t understand tha::t. But it’s almost like (hhh) I dealt with
 365 he:::r=
 366 Cl: → =You feel sca::red.

The client still attempts to maintain affiliation by delaying a dispreferred response through 2.4 seconds of silence (line 374) and an ‘I don’t know’ (line 375). Again there is a series of overlapping and latching turns which can cause disaffiliation. The exchange

then shifts to talking about the client feeling scared in the past tense (lines 381 and 382).

The client states that she did feel scared but in line 386 says she is not sure what she feels now. In a raised voice says that if she ‘really’ thinks about it now she is not sure that she ‘feels that way’ (lines 388-390).

Exemplar 27f

374 (2.4)

375 Ca: → Mm::: °I ↑**don’t know**°↓ I-[well]

376 Co: [You j]ust keep using the word

377 ‘weird’ and I’m trying ta=

378 Ca: =I don’t know beca:::use u-cuz it ↑was weird↓ because she ha::dn’t

379 popped up in a re:::ally re:::ally lo::ng ti::me (.) and so it was just

380 a we::ird (ek) fact that she popped up.

381 Co: → **And so you-you di::dn’t feel sca::red.**

382 Ca: → **I did at the time.**

383 Co: Oh you did.

384 Ca: And, b[ut like] at this mo:::ment

385 Co: [°(sorry)°]

386 Ca:→ **I don’t really know what I feel-like I don’t fe:::el one emotion**

387 **extre<** (.) extremely ((waves arms/hands, land hard on armchairs))

388 ya know s:::o, it-it’s like when you said it’s I feel SCA::RED IT

389 RE:::ALLY LIKE IF I REA::LLY THINK

390 → ABOUT IT (2.7) **I don’t know if I would say I °feel that**

391 **[(way)°]** ((waving arms, makes a sound landing on armrests))

In this next series of turn, the client states that the counselor is pushing her to go ‘deeper’ (line 441) in the session. In line 441, she uses tentative and mitigating language to soften her assertion and maintain affiliation. She says ‘kinda like’ and shrugs and then says ‘it’s just like it’s just not the right’ (line 442-443). There is no latching or overlapping talk between line 443 and 444 but the counselor makes a disaligning action by speaking in lines 444-445 when the client has not finished her thought. Later in lines 455 the client mentions that the session has ‘gone in circles’ which is confusing for her again notably she uses ‘almost’ to mitigate her assertion.

Exemplar 27g

- 439 Cl: =Ah:: cuz you know like I have gone from (.) one extreme to
 440 → another but like re::ally cu(hh)rrently ri::ght no::w↑ **it’s like ya**
 441 **know you want me to go deeper**↑ and it’s **kinda like** (1.6)
 442 ↑(erm::) ((gestures, shrugs)) I () **it’s just like it’s just not the**
 443 **ri::ght**
 444 Co: → **So you-you think that ((pointing to self)) I wan-I want you to**
 445 **go de::eper.**
 446 Cl: Well because you want to talk about ‘scared little girl↓’ (.) [a::nd]
 447 Co: [And]
 448 so that’s that’s de:eper for you.
 449 Cl: YE::AH it’s deeper and it’s like wi-a::nd (.) re:ally
 450 it’sssss(hhhhh) °it’s° like, I’ve had other sessions ya know and
 451 we’ve had other sessions where it’s like the ma::gic (is like um ya
 452 know right there it could be really great) and↑today it’s kinda

453 li::ke I do::n't kno::w really what I feel or what I even re::ally
454 was wanting to get out of thi::s (.) °cuz it's::° ya know
455 → (nnnnn) I don't kno-**it's almost like it's gone (in circles)** or it's
456 just gone from one e:nd to another:: and I-°I don't know (like this
457 is kind of like a)° confusing(sssst) sess(hh)ion↑ because I
458 RE::ALLY DON'T KNO::W LIKE I THO::UGHT [I]

In lines 460-462, the counselor states in a louder voice an FR formulation of ‘scared.’ This turn is received with a loud and extended sigh (line 463) evidencing that the client is tired of the repeated FRs of ‘scared.’ The client’s sigh is followed by humming (line 463) and finger movements which act as a delay in the turn. In attempt to re-establish affiliation the client says ‘I don’t know’ ‘maybe I’m just blocking too much’ (line 464-465). However, risking disaffiliation she follows in line 465 with an emphatic ‘I really don’t feel scared’ (line 465-466). She then offers an alternate FR formulation of ‘lonely’ (line 467) for the counselor to use. Much earlier in the session (Exemplar 27a) the client had used the word lonely. Despite the client’s repeated use of the word lonely, the counselor does not use a formulation of lonely in the remaining part of the session thus causing more disaffiliation in the session.

Exemplar 27h

460 Co: → [I] WONDER IF
461 YOU'RE FEELING ((scratches leg, slight smile)) SCA::RED
462 RIGHT NOW↑
463 Cl: → (HHHHHH) (.) ((humming, moving fingers)) °(Let me feel). (I
464 → dunno)° I jus(hhh)t re(hhhh)ally can't I dunno maybe (I'm) just

465 → **blocking too much** (I could see that). But I RE::ALLY ↓do::n't
 466 **(.) feel ↑sca::red↓. Like if you said I feel lonely** I could say
 467 tha:::t like °‘Oh yeah, I do feel **lonely**’° because... [continues on
 468 with story about a relative]

In Exemplar 27i, the counselor interrupts the client's story in an effort to re-direct her back to the FR 'scary' (lines 483-484). He interprets her shifting to the story about a relative as her not wanting to talk about being 'scared' (lines 486-487). Client again declines to endorse his formulation of 'scared' (line 489) and he interrupts her to ask if he is right that she does not want to talk about it. Once again, the counselor's actions are creating disaffiliation as he is not reflecting he has heard her repeated denials of being scared. He asks 'Is that right, do you know want to talk about it?' in lines 491-492 instead of offering an FR of 'lonely' as was mentioned by the client in line 490. In doing so, he is asking an "ancillary question" (Heritage, 2011, p. 164) which is a question related to the subject at hand but comes in place of a needed empathic response. The client attempts again to re-affiliate with the counselor by conceding that she might not have 'the words to talk about it' (line 495).

Exemplar 27i

483 Co: → ((smiling)) [Carol] I'm noticing ↓sorry um::: (.) we were
 484 **talking about the kinda scary thi::ng=**
 485 Cl: =Ye::[ah::]
 486 Co: → [A:nd] the:::n it-it-it appears you don't want to talk
 487 **about it-it's** not that you just ↑do::n't have no feeling it-it seems
 488 you d-you ↑do::n't want to talk about it.

- 489 Cl: → Cuz it's really li:::ke I don't know what I'd be scared of right
 490 no::w. Because it's like 'Ye::ah, I'm lo:::nely [()]
 491 Co:→ [IS THA]T IS
 492 THAT RIGHT do you do you not want to talk about it↓
 493 Cl: But I ju(hhh)st don't like you say you like (well you want to talk
 494 about it) it's kinda like we::ll (.) I don't re:::ally I GUESS more
 495 → it's like I don't have the wo:::rds↑ to talk about ↑it:: maybe
 496 that's it↑. Like I do:::n't (.hh)

The counselor follows this attempt by repeating the FR 'scared' in line 501. He does this with a smile suggesting he realizes the repeated use of the FR formulation of scared is causing disaffiliation in the conversational interaction. The client responds with a forceful outbreath and brief laugh in line 502. She asserts she is getting 'annoyed' and recognizing potential trouble with that admission, she quickly changes direction in the turn by saying 'but no' (line 503). The counselor interrupts and presses her 'Are you annoyed at me?' in a louder voice (lines 505-506). At the same time, the counselor is gesturing and smiling in an attempt to soften the confrontation. Client denies that she is annoyed with the counselor saying she does not know what she is 'annoyed with' (line 508).

Exemplar 27j

- 501 Co:→ You feel sca:::red. ((smiling))
 502 Cl:→ (HHHHHEH) (It's like I) more like I'm getting ↓anno:::yed↓
 503 → ((voice pitch and timbre changes)) is what I'm °feeling°. **BUT NO**
 504 it's all like re:::ally like I sit here and I think about it [()]

- 505 Co: → [ARE YOU]
- 506 ANNO::YED AT M::E? SO::RRY↓=((smiling, puts left hand
- 507 to chest))
- 508 Cl:→ =NO::::. (.) I'm just I don't °know what I'm annoyed with°.

In the next Exemplar 27k, the counselor attempts to re-establish affiliation by starting to say 'if you are then I just' in line 512. The client latches in her next turn (line 513) and reaffirms she is not annoyed and she says she would tell him if she were. This response could be perceived as telling the counselor to stop asking her. This appears to be the case as the counselor responds with a quiet 'ok' (line 514) which closes the subject. The client then goes on to revisit the FR scared and states that she is not in the 'right frame of mind' (line 519) in that session to talk about the 'scared little girl' (line 521). She further states in lines 525-526 that she has to be 'in the right zone' to talk about these deeper issues.

Exemplar 27k

- 512 Co: → If you are then I just=
- 513 Cl:→ =NO: it's like if I was anno::yed at you °I'd tell you ()°
- 514 Co:→ [°Ok°.]
- 515 Cl: [But like] I don't really understand like where you're getting this-
- 516 like yes and no I get where you're getting that sca::↓redness↑. But
- 517 it's like:: (.) I really am sitting here thinking like 'Ok::: what do (I
- 518 wanna to talk about' like (hhh) it's like I said
- 519 → before, like I really have to be in that ri:::ght (.) frame of
- 520 mi::nd↑ I guess like it's-I can't just like okay >I'm gonna talk

- 521 **about (.) ‘scared little girl’** and we’re gonna get °(through it)°
 522 ,like that doesn’t ever-has ne:ver worked for me. ((moving around
 523 and gesturing a lot, twisting right foot))
 524 Co: [(Never)]
 525 Cl: → [Like I really] have to be like ‘Okay(hhh) I’m **in the ri::ght**
 526 **zo:::ne.**’=
 527 Co: =And that’s all [that’s all] fine
 528 Cl: [Ye:::ah]

In Exemplar 271, the counselor requests confirmation from the client she does not want to talk about ‘it’ (lines 534-536) which the client endorses (line 537). The counselor explains how he came up with the FR scared in an extended turn (lines 543-545). He suggests she is scared to talk about ‘it’ because she is not in the right frame of mind. The client again seeks to maintain affiliation in this interaction by conceding ‘and it could be that’ in the following turn (line 548).

Exemplar 271

- 534 Co: → **I’m just so you don’t. want. to. talk. ab-eh-you-you don’t.**
 535 **want. to. talk. about it beca::use because you feel you feel**
 536 **you’re not in the ri::ght frame of mi:::nd.**
 537 Ca: → **YE::AH** like [I guess]
 538 Co: [°Ok°]
 539 Ca: it’s almost li::ke it’s not going to be as free fro::wing↑ free flowing
 540 as it could ↑be[:::]
 541 Co: [Yeah]

- 542 Ca: [if we talk]ed about it now.
- 543 Co:→ **I GUESS that's where I'm getting the sca::red is-is you're**
- 544 **sca::red (.) you're sc-you're scared to talk about it because**
- 545 **you're afraid that you're not in the right frame of mi::nd and it**
- 546 **might maybe you ↑fill it might or think that it might come across::**
- 547 **un::↑truthfully↓.**
- 548 Ca: → **And it could be ↓tha::t.** And I reall-I (ssss) cuz I try to think
- 549 about like in the pa::st when I get into those zo:::nes and it's
- 550 rea:::lly (hhh) (.) sometimes they come out of nowhere and I can
- 551 go with it↑ but sometimes it's re::ally like:: it's almost like it ha::s
- 552 to be:: (1.3) I have to be ↑thinking ↑about it:: before I go into a
- 553 session. Like I have to really be like something has to tri::gger me::
- 554 (and to be like) okay I'm really feeling these things::: they're
- 555 sticking with me::: let's go talk about it.

As shown in this exemplar series, the negotiation of alignment and affiliation is a delicate process in a conversational context. Affiliation has a connection to preference organization in that preferred responding is considered affiliative and dispreferred responding can be disaffiliative. The participants worked to maintained affiliation in most instances and when non-affiliative talk arose, the participants attempted to re-establish alignment and affiliation in the conversational interaction.

Emotion Talk

According to Peräkylä (2013), emotion work is at the core of counseling work. Emotion talk was highly relevant for my analysis due to my focus on FRs. One of the

most critical aspects of counselor training is learning how to manage emotion talk in a counseling session. In using the word ‘talk’ in this section I am referring to both verbalizations and nonverbal forms of emotional expression. This section will cover both of those types of emotion talk. In the first part, I will be discussing the analytic findings related to emotion words that were used during practice counseling sessions and in the second part of this section I will be showing how participants managed emotional expression from an interactional context.

In the Formulation section, I provided an overview of how CITs formulated their FRs from emotion words that clients had used in previous turns. In this section, I review how clients used emotion words after the counselors’ FR formulations. What I found was regardless of whether clients agreed or disagreed with the FR formulation in their ‘decision’ turn, they would revisit the feeling words used in formulations in subsequent turns. In some instances, they would continue to discuss an FR several turns after the formulation turn.

The exemplars to follow will illustrate how clients referenced FR formulations in later turns. In Exemplar 28, the client formulates an FR of sad in line 27. The formulation is an implicit one since the client did not mention feeling sad in her previous turns. The client endorses the FR formulation of ‘sad’ in her immediate response to the FR (line 28) and repeats the word ‘sad’ in her elaboration (line 33). Several turns later she uses the same feeling word saying ‘it wasn’t just that I was sad’ (line 79-80). She phrases her statement in the past tense and adds that she was also ‘very lonely’ (line 80) at some point in her life previously.

Exemplar 28

- 27 Co: → =You feel sa:::d.
- 28 Cl: → **Yeah::: (. Yeah**, that wasn't an a-it-it was::: -not a fun time in my
- 29 life and ss-you know most days I-I could handle it because I
- 30 became accustomed tuh ↑it:::
- 31 Co: °Mm hmm°
- 32 Cl: Um:: but there were other days when it jus:::t it was really hard to
- 33 → deal with and I was really **sad** and I-it-I did come home cry:::ing
- 34 sometimes. (.)

Several turns later the client returns to 'sad':

- 79 Cl: → Ye::ah and it wasn't just::: when I was younger it wasn't just that I
- 80 → was sa:::d it was also very lo:::nely.

This next Exemplar 29 is another series of turns from the same session. This exemplar demonstrates how clients referenced FR formulations several turns later. In this case, the counselor uses an altered FR formulation of 'lonely' in lines 114-115. The client does not endorse the FR formulation in her response turn (lines 116-120). She brings up the word 'connect' (line 119) as a contrasting word to lonely to explain why she does not feel lonely.

Exemplar 29

- 114 Co: =Mm, hm::: (. You ↑haven't said this but I ↑wonde::r if::: (.) you
- 115 → feel lo:::nely in-in some aspects of (.) your li::fe.

116 Cl: → UM:::↑ (hhhhh) (.) (Well-I-don-No:::) I no I reall-**I don't**
 117 **think that I d::o feel so lo::nely.** Um I::: (.) uh (.) yeah, I-I
 118 actually feel really lu::cky that (.) I do have somebody that I
 119 → **connect** with really on a great deep level:::↑ um someone that's
 120 willing to work ha::rd=

In this next part of Exemplar 29, it is evident that the FR formulation of lonely from line 115 is still being considered by the client several turns after it was first delivered by the counselor. The client reiterates the word 'connected' (lines 152, 157) to describe her relationship with her spouse as if reaffirming to the counselor that she is not lonely.

Exemplar 29 (continued)

150 Cl: SO::: uh I am just, (.) yeah I feel as I have these struggles and I
 151 share them with him (and it actually has) helped me feel more
 152 → **connected** with him↑, and also made me want to be mo:re aware:::
 153 and intentional wi::th um::: how I support (and interact<) with
 154 hi::m um realizing that I wasn't always as suppo::rtive as-as now I
 155 wish I would have be::en and even the::n I thought I was being
 156 more supportive than I really was:: uh:: so
 157 → ye:ah but I-I (.) I fe::el just re::ally **connected** with hi::m (as I
 158 go) through this:::

In this last portion of Exemplar 29, many turns later the client revisits the FR formulation of lonely. She states that she 'was really lonely' (line 176), but now she is more 'connected' (line 178) with her spouse.

Exemplar 29 (continued)

176 Cl: → Um:: I was at that point **I wa::s really lo::nely** (.) uh:: but no::w
 177 that I'm having some more shared experiences with ↑hi::m um I
 178 → fe::el just yeah more **connected** with hi:m (.) and-and my kids are
 179 also older too so I'm able [converse]

Participants in my study oriented to FR formulations in many ways. Clients responded to them immediately following the FR. The exemplars provided examples of how FR formulations were also addressed in subtler ways sometimes much later in the session. Without a closer examination it was not always evident clients were revisiting counselors' FR formulations.

Another aspect of the data that received analytic attention in this study pertained to interactions where clients were emotionally expressive. The two types of emotional expression that were most evident in the data were laughter and crying. Laughter (Jefferson, 1984; Jefferson, 1985) and crying (Hepburn & Potter, 2007) have been the subject of previous CA studies. Most studies on emotional expression have explored the individual psychological experience and there are very few studies that have explored how emotion manifests from an interactional perspective (Hepburn & Potter, 2007).

A core purpose of teaching FRs to CITs is to build their skills in identifying and reflecting feeling in session. Therefore, it was important to explore how displays of emotion were carried out by the student client and received by the student counselor. Much of the corpus lacked evidence of explicit emotional expression by clients in response to CIT's FR formulations.

Laughter

I noted laughter was often paired in my data with the FR formulation of ‘angry.’ Analysts have determined laughter can be used in many ways in interaction. One way is “troubles resistance” (Haakana, 2012, p. 184). With troubles resistant laughter, the speaker is not inviting the recipient to join them in laughter. Rather the expectation is recipients will respond in a way that treats the trouble seriously (Haakana, 2012). In the data, I found cases where CITs did join in the laughter and other instances where they did not. In Exemplar 30, the client responds to the FR formulation (line 97) with forceful laughter and a raised voice (line 98). The CIT responds with a head nod but does not join in the laughter (line 100).

Exemplar 30

- 97 Co:→ You feel ↓a:::ngry.
- 98 Cl:→ **YE(HH)AH I D(HH):::O!** ((forceful laughter)) I WAS LIKE< (.)
- 99 and no:::w (.) I dunno what his purpose (.) is::: to do with thi[:::s.]
- 100 Co: ((head nodding))

Similarly, in Exemplar 31 the client is interspersing laughter specifically within certain words. Where “laugh particles” (Hepburn & Potter, 2010) are placed can signal a participant’s difficulty with the words they are speaking (Jefferson, 1985). In this next instance, the laugh particles are strategically placed to distort the word anger (line 42) which may be a difficult emotion for the client to express. The counselor does not join in the laughter.

Exemplar 31

- 41 Co: → °Hm.° You feel **ang::ry**↓.

- 42 Cl: → I fee::l, like, s:::(hhh)o a(hh)ngry at them but
 43 they don't (.) ↑do anything about it.

In Exemplar 32, the client also pairs laughter with a raised voice (line 94). The laugh particles are brief and contained in the word 'hard' (line 94). In this instance the counselor joins the client in the laughter (line 95).

Exemplar 32

- 93 Co: You feel an:::gry.
 94 Cl:→ I ↑do::: angry-I worked RI:::LLY HAR(hh):::D-I
 95 Co:→ [Heheheheh]
 96 Cl: [THIS WASN'T] SUPPOSED ((slaps leg once)) TO HAPPEN and
 97 (.hhh) uh and yet here we ar::e.

All these instances illustrate the strategic placement of laughter in the client's talk. The laughter occurred in responses to FR formulation of 'angry' and the insertion of laugh particles in certain words suggested the speaker's potential difficulties with those words. The pairing of laughter with the FR formulation of 'angry' was a preliminary finding of interest and would be worth exploring further with more data.

Crying

A reason that CA researchers have been interested in studying the act of crying in interaction is to expand the concept of crying from being considered a simple discrete act to one that is recognized as a complex interactional feature that can take different forms depending on the situation (Hepburn & Potter, 2007). An important element in CA research is how crying is exhibited and recognizable in the interactional process (Hepburn & Potter, 2012). Actions such as sniffing, elevated pitch and tremulous speech

are all indicators of crying (Hepburn & Potter, 2012) and are subject to analysis. Crying was an infrequent occurrence in the corpus. When crying did occur, the counselors aligning and affiliative actions were of particular interest.

In Exemplar 33, the client has been discussing her disappointment with her grade she received in a class. She provides a verbal forecast of her emotional state in the initial turn - ‘I’m...weepy right now’ (lines 27-28) The counselor responds with an aligning token of ‘mm hm’ (line 29) and then the client reports that talking about ‘this’ (line 30) is hard and commences tearing up. This prompts an FR formulation of ‘sad’ (line 31) from the counselor along with a slight nod and concerned expression.

Exemplar 33

- 27 Cl:→ Um::: beca:::use (.) I’m super ~like tired and< (.) **weepy right**
 28 **n[ow so:::]~**
 29 Co:→ [**°M m hm::°**]
 30 Cl:→ ~**talking about this is kind of ha:::[rd.]~** ((tearing up))
 31 Co:→ [You] fe:::el ↑**sa:::d**.

Exemplar 34 is a deviant case from the same session. Here the client has difficulty expressing herself due to the sniffing and audible in and outbreaths. In contrast to the previous example, the counselor chooses not to attend to the emotional expression and instead draws from the content of the client’s disclosures such as ‘I still got’ the grade in lines 190 and 195. The counselor offers an FR formulation of ‘happy’ in line 197 which seems to be out of place in this exchange. The client initially agrees with the formulation of ‘happy’ with extension in the ‘do’ word followed by a pause (line 198) but

then provides a dispreferred response indicating that in part she is not happy (lines 198-199).

Exemplar 34

- 183 Cl: ...go through what they're going thro::ugh. ((sniffs)) A:::nd part of
 184 me is like 'I-I got [[client's grade]] (..) even tho::ugh I'm si::ck. I
 185 mo::ved, I ha:::d, I took three days off for Thanksgiving and those
 186 were not re(hh)stful, re(h)laxing days. Those were you know get
 187 up early go to bed la::te (..) type of days::: um::: so I didn't really
 188 feel like I took three days off::: from homework because li::fe
 189 ste(hh)pped (hh)in and li(hh)ke occ:::upied all of those days (.hhhh)
 190 → bu::t (.) **I still got** a [[client's grade]] even tho::ugh I'm
 191 exha::usted, I'm:: like stretched very thin (.hhh) a:::nd to me::: I
 192 wished that I had gotten you know that half a point h::igher
 193 something to get a [[grade]] ((sniffs)) um::: because a [[client's
 194 grade]] is not what I was expecting↑ but in any other sense of that
 195 → gra:::de↑ (.) **I still got** a [[client's grade]] even tho::ugh I'm
 196 stru::ggling a lot with outside factors. ((sniffs))
 197 Co:→ You feel ↑ha::ppy↓.
 198 Cl:→ **I do:::** (.) even::: I feel ↑ha::ppy about the grade **but I don't feel**
 199 **ha::ppy about the consequences [of that gra::de.]**
 200 Co: [°Mm:::°]

Exemplars 35 and 36 are excerpts taken from the same session. In this session, the client reports she has no control over her eating habits and is enduring ridicule from

friends and family as a result. In Exemplar 35, the counselor responds with aligning response tokens like an ‘mm hm’ in line 121, an affiliative FR formulation of ‘sad’ in line 124, and repetition of the client’s words ‘you can’t control it’ in line 128.

Exemplar 35

- 119 Cl: =°Ye::ah°. (1.1) Well also I’m trying not to cry because that’s like
 120 my ma::in (.) my go-to emoshen ((voice faltering)).
- 121 Co: → °Mm hm::↑°.
 122 (.)
- 123 Cl: bu:t::
- 124 Co: → You feel ↑sa:::d↓.
- 125 Cl: ~I d::o ((welling up)), and it’s:: (1.3) sad mostly cuz I ca(hh)n’t
 126 contro::l ((crying)) (.) can’t control my life enough to be able to be
 127 like (.) a healthy person(hhh).~
- 128 Co:→ **You °can’t control (it)°**
- 129 Cl: I can’t control it. ((crying)) ((sniff)) ~And that’s hard for me
 130 because I’m usually ve:::ry (.) ve:::ry structured.~
- 131 Co: °Mm hm::°
- 132 Cl: ~And this to me is just another form of stru::cture.~

Exemplar 36, from the same practice session, shows more affiliative behavior from the counselor with the extended ‘mm’ token (line 296) to align with the client and supplement the counselor’s FR formulation of ‘sad’ in line 292.

Exemplar 36

- 292 Co: → You feel sa:::d.

- 293 Cl: I do::: like (.) ((starts crying)) ~sometimes I feel like I'm no::t
 294 good eno::ugh
 295 [for the::m?]~
 296 Co:→ [Mm:::::::::]
 297 Cl: ((sniffing loudly)) ~A:::nd (.) it's::: I was always pretty
 298 comfortable with myself↑um::: ((sniffing)) and maybe partly the
 299 comfort contributed to tha to the gain in weight bu::t ((sniffing))
 300 um::: (.) having it brought up all the ti::me really made me start
 301 looking at myself and being like am I really↑ ((sniffing)) am I
 302 really fat? Am I rea::lly ((sniffing)) this person and sometimes (I
 303 don't even) view myself as that (.) type of person~

Emotion talk was a salient part of my analysis because it was central to my study on FRs. There were instances where affiliative and empathic responding did take place. However, also noted were instances where there were unexpected and potentially disaffiliative responses that occurred. A notable example was Exemplar 32 when the counselor joined the client in laughter when talking about anger. In this case, the counselor may have been attempting to be affiliative but her actions could also lead to disaffiliation if the client was not seeking for the counselor to join in the laughter with her. Another example was the counselor's FR formulation of happy in Exemplar 34 when the client was crying. Not attending to the client's emotional expression may have been perceived as not being empathic or affiliative.

Institutional Talk

“Institutional talk” (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 4) is defined as a conversational interaction involving at least one person who is affiliated with an institution (Drew & Heritage, 1992). The institution in this study was the university counseling program where participants were CITs learning their basic skills. One step of my analysis process outlined in Chapter 2 involved exploring how institutional talk applied to the present study. There have been many institutional layers to consider with this study. Participants were students in a counseling program learning basic skills. Thus, their interactions in the practice sessions were all influenced by the constraints of institutional talk. In previous parts of this chapter, I have reviewed institutional talk used by the CITs, namely the FR which is the focus of the study.

The CITs were also assuming roles of counselor and client which added another layer to their conversations. Participants demonstrated how they oriented to these roles by abiding by the language constraints of their roles as student counselor and client in a practice counseling session. The clients also talked about these roles during these practice sessions. Clients were more likely to explicitly talk about the roles due to their ability to speak freely whereas CITs in the role of counselor were limited to using basic skills as their mode of communication. In Exemplar 37, the client voices feelings of ‘anger’ in line 20 and then in a mimicking tone pre-empts the counselor’s FR with his own thus demonstrating that he is aware of their roles as counselor and client in the interaction. He is anticipating that counselor will use a FR upon his mention of a feeling to which the counselor then responds with an FR formulation in line 22.

Exemplar 37

- 18 Co: [So you're experiencing some
19 stre:ss right now.
20 Cl: → Yea::h (1.4) **An::ger. I feel ↑an::gry↓** ((said in a mimicking,
21 imitative tone)).
22 Co: → **You feel ↑an:gry↓**. Hm::.

In Exemplar 38, the counselor's opening to start the dyadic practice session is met with the client saying 'I kinda want to make a joke and say not much' (line 2) further acknowledging that would be 'inappropriate' (line 3) presumably referring to the fact they are playing roles in a practice counseling session. She then she shifts to a conversation which she shared with the CIT earlier in the day outside of their current practice session.

Exemplar 38

- 1 Co: (hhhhhh) ((smile)). So [[client]] what< what's on your mi::nd.
2 Cl: → Um:: (hhhhhh) **I kinda want to make a joke and say not mu::ch**
3 → but um:: (.) **that would be inappropriate** (hhhhhuh). I:::so so
4 I-I shared with you earlier toda::y already that I ju::st (.) I feel like
5 I've kind of turned a co::rner↑ um:: (.) not necessarily like with my
6 counseling skills like per se:::↑ but with my perception of:: (.) like
7 what I'm doing here what my what I'm doing he::re um:::=
8 Co: =You feel ↑ha::ppy↓.
9 Cl: I ↑d::o I fee::el re::ally ha::ppy about tha::t.

In some cases, such as Exemplar 39, the student clients talked about their role as students in the counseling program.

Exemplar 39

- 7 Cl: totally is becuz ye know it's just like the ↑the::ory thing↓. I get why
 8 we're learning the theories and I-and I don't struggle so much in
 9 that class because I did a lot of theories in my under↑gra::d? but to
 10 think that I have to be able ta-defend a theo↑ry? °backwards and
 11 forwards and upside down?° and I don't know what I wa-what
 12 theory I am yet↑ like that's a terrifying↓ thought, like what if I
 13 don't have a theory? (hh[hhhhhh])
 14 Co: [You feel] scared=
 15 Cl: =Yea::h, and it's like I ↑KNOW I HAVE A ↓THEORY↑ because
 16 they te::ll us we have a theories °but (I'm like but what is it)?°

In Exemplar 40, the client is referencing his future career as a professional counselor. He is talking about the conflict of reconciling his religious beliefs with his emerging identity as a counselor. He makes a comment 'I just don't want anyone getting the wrong idea' (lines 94-95) which in this context 'anyone' is most likely directed to the instructors in the course and his peers. The counselor formulates an FR of 'scared' (line 96) which the client confirms and then further explains his conflicting perspectives (lines 97-101).

Exemplar 40

- 92 Co: [Hm:::]
 93 Cl: pra::y about it and get direction to know how (2.4) how I can deal

- 94 → with that situation beca::use (.) **I just don't want anyone getting**
- 95 → **the wrong I idea**. I=
- 96 Co: → =Yeah, you feel sca::red.
- 97 Cl: → Ye::ah I support my client, I help my client, I want the::m to be
- 98 ha::ppy. I want them to do the things that they want to do that will
- 99 be healthy and beneficial for the::m based on their val::ues and their
- 100 outlook in li::fe. I also (.) um if it comes up in a wa::y< want the::m
- 101 (.) (if I) (hhh) °I don't know see that's the thing, I don't [know°]

From the beginning, institutional talk was a consideration for this study because the data was derived from an institutional context . CITs oriented to institutional talk by adopting in their practice counseling sessions counselor and client roles and engaging in counselor and client talk. Clients also expressed institutional talk through the content of their disclosures. They had more freedom to talk in the interaction so their orientation to institutional talk was more explicit. Some of the institutional topics they explored were their roles as students and emerging counselors.

Summary

Talk is a complex, multifaceted interactional process that requires delicate work for both participants in the conversational interaction to accomplish. Many of the CA practices and concepts that were discussed in this chapter had relationships to each other. The constraining features of an adjacency pair can affect the repair process. Dispreferred disagreements risk disaffiliation but evidence epistemic authority. Emotion talk calls for affiliative and empathic responding which can be easier to discern with crying than laughter. Negotiating the roles of student and counselor in an institutional setting is yet another facet of this study.

In this chapter I have identified the CA-relevant practices that emerged from analysis of the data. FRs were situated as formulations in the practice counseling sessions. An adjacency pair structure was evident in the pairing of FR formulations and responses. This structure was identified as a formulation-decision pair. Repair in interactions occurred in the form of self-repair and other repair. Epistemics played a role in negotiating knowledge claims between counselor and client. Preferred agreements and dispreferred disagreement was another prominent feature in the interactions between student counselors and student clients. The manifestation of affiliation, disaffiliation, and alignment was explored across cases and over the course of a single dyadic session. Emotion work particularly with laughter and crying was analyzed and institutional talk examined in the interactional processes that unfolded in these practice sessions. The Discussion chapter will provide a summary of the present research study and link findings from the study to the relevant literature in counselor education and the

counseling field. Implications, limitations and recommendations for future research will also be explored.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

The findings showed CITs' conversational interactions in their practice counseling sessions were organized through the use of a range of CA practices. In this final chapter, I review my research process and provide practical implications and recommendations for counselor educators, CITs, and professional counselors. I situate my findings in the context of existing literature in counseling, counselor education, and CA. I conclude by reviewing potential limitations and offering suggestions for future research.

Summary of Findings

Research in the domain of skills training for counseling students has been ongoing since Rogers' early research efforts began in the first part of last century (Rogers, 1951). The discrete skills training model developed in large part by Ivey and colleagues (Ivey, 1971; Ivey et al., 2014) has been a standard training protocol for many counseling programs over the past several years. However, studies on microskills training in more recent years have been limited and methodological concerns have been noted regarding earlier studies (Baker et al., 1990; Hill & Lent, 2006; Ridley et al., 2011). Studies that focus on implementation of counseling from an interactional context are even more rare (Strong & Zeman, 2010, Wickman & Campbell, 2003). This study was a first to use CA to analyze videos capturing in-vivo conversational interactions between CITs in order to describe more fully what is happening when feeling reflections (FR) are used in a practice counseling session.

The purpose of the present study was to find out what is happening in the moment-to-moment interactional process when FRs were used by CITs. For this reason,

I chose CA as my methodology as it allowed me to review and analyze turn by turn the co-construction of skill implementation as it was being accomplished. I built a collection of instances to determine what patterns existed across the instances and to develop a formal description of the corpus of data. FRs were of interest because they are a foundational microskill used for conveying empathy and accurately reflecting emotional content in a client's disclosures. They were also ideal for analysis because of their uniformity and recognizable structure in the data.

As a researcher, I was sensitive to the inductive orientation of CA while also aware that there were contextual factors to consider. I avoided pre-emptively theorizing or bringing any preconceptions to the data analysis. I also attended to the context of my prior experience with the prepracticum class as a master's student and doctoral student and the CA-based philosophy that talk-in-interaction is orderly and that order can be found in careful analysis of the data. To preserve the inductive nature of CA my research question was as follows: What is occurring in the conversational interaction between the CIT and student client when the reflection of feeling skill is implemented in a practice counseling session?

In my analysis, I identified a breadth of CA-related practices which included formulation, adjacency pairs, repair, epistemic rights, preference organization, affiliation, emotion talk and institutional talk. The most fundamental of the CA practices that I identified was formulation. I found that FRs were a formulation and further noted they fell on a continuum from explicit to implicit. FR formulations were paired with decisions to create a formulation-decision adjacency pair. In this conversational structure, the counselors' FR formulations called for clients' decisions which came in the form of

yes/no responses and elaborations.

Another CA practice called repair was revealed in all of its forms. Acting as a way to fix conversational troubles, both clients and counselors used repair at various points in their interactions. Clients were likely to be most responsible for repair due to the fact that they had fewer restrictions in speaking during the practice counseling sessions. Repair was also used for the purposes of gaining a better understanding of what a participant was trying to say and for correcting talk. Repair shares connections with preference organization and affiliation as all of those CA practices work for the purposes of maintaining social order and avoiding conflict in talk.

The negotiation of epistemic rights was also evident. The counselors' FR formulations were classified as first position assessments which have greater epistemic rights than second position assessments. For that reason, clients were disadvantaged simply by their second position as recipients of FR formulations even though they had primary access to the knowledge claims asserted by the FRs. Since the FR had no additive language to make the counselors' epistemic position stronger or weaker, clients were left to re-assert their rights to the knowledge claims made with the FR. Some clients did this by disagreeing with the FR that was presented, a response which was potentially problematic because it was not the preferred response and could cause conversational trouble. As a result, frequently they used mitigating language to soften their responses when a disagreement occurred in the clients' second position assessments.

Clients had to balance epistemic claims with preference organization. Preference organization refers to a set of actions used in the practice sessions to negotiate interaction in a way that maintained positive social contacts between counselor and client.

Preference organization was occurring between the participants by the way clients responded to the FR formulations. In analyzing how the clients structured their preferred or dispreferred responses, it was clear the preferred response for an FR was an agreement and a dispreferred response was a disagreement. Clients avoided strong disagreements in their response turns and either indicated agreement or responded with a mix of agreement and disagreement. They used these mixed agreements/disagreement responses for the purposes of maintaining affiliation in the dyadic relationship and avoiding potential trouble in the conversational interaction.

Affiliation and alignment practices were also present in the data. Affiliation was demonstrated in various ways by the participants depending on their roles. Counselors used FRs and aligning tokens and clients used preferred responding and mitigating language to maintain affiliation. Aligning actions took place mainly through the counselors' use of minimal encouragers. Despite the fact that counselor talk by its nature is inherently affiliative, there was a particular session in the corpus that showed elements of affiliation and disaffiliation. The session showed how the participants worked to re-establish affiliation when it was lost in the conversation. Affiliative actions were also connected to instances of emotion talk.

Emotion talk in clients' responses occurred through words and the nonverbal expressions. One notable phenomenon was that clients often attended to the formulations by adopting the FR words in their subsequent responses to the counselors' FR formulations. Clients generally responded to the FR formulations in the immediate turn following the formulation which fits with the adjacency pair structure I found for the FR formulation-decision pairs. There were also instances where clients referenced the

formulation in later turns in their sessions. The way clients responded to FR formulations was not always obvious upon initial review of the data especially if their responses were found several turns after the FR formulation.

Clients' overt nonverbal expressions of emotion were infrequent. However, crying and laughter were the most prominent expressions of emotion that occurred in the data. Laughter was often used as a way to hide discomfort with a FR formulation of 'angry.' Close examination of the transcribed data showed how clients would obscure certain words with laughter particles. In some cases, counselors joined in the laughter and in others they did not. The CA literature on laughter has indicated joining in laughter may not be invited or affiliative with troubles-resistant laughter (Jefferson, 1984). Therefore, attention should be paid to when laughter occurs in talk and what its purpose might be.

Crying was the most obvious form of emotional expression although it did not happen very often in the practice sessions. Counselors' responses to crying varied. In one instance, it was evident the counselor was employing a combination of affiliative and aligning skills to respond to the client. There was also a deviant case where the client used an FR that seemed counter to the affective expression of the client. Only preliminary conclusions may be drawn from the analysis regarding laughter and crying in this corpus since data was limited.

Institutional talk was a factor from the beginning because the participants belonged to an institution. CITs oriented to multiple institutional roles in this study, namely their roles were student, future counselor, or the practice dyad roles of counselor or client. The participants' use of counseling-specific language in the practice sessions

was further evidence of institutional talk. While the focus of this study was on the participants' use of FRs in their practice counseling sessions, all of their 'counselor talk' was institutional talk. The data showed clients also used institutional talk and oriented to their roles as client, student, and future counselor through explicit discussion of those roles in the practice counseling sessions.

Implications

The analytic findings from this study provide practical implications for counselor educators, CITs, and professional counselors. The findings also add to current research base in a number of ways. In this section I provide an overview of the implications of these findings on training for CITs and counselor educators and some considerations for professional counselors. I further discuss how this study contributes to the literature in counselor education and counseling in addition to how these findings can augment existing CA literature.

Contributions to the Practice of Counselor Education

In my analysis, I demonstrated how discrete counseling skills are actually used in an interactional context. Hutchby (2005) stated "Relevance of analyses such as this one is, therefore, that conversation analysts can reveal the practical skills that counsellors use...to accomplish outcomes amidst the contingencies of turn-by-turn talk-in-interaction" (p. 308). Describing how to implement basic skills such as active listening can be nebulous for beginning CITs as instruction is not always clear (Hutchby, 2005). This study has several specific points of guidance for educators training CITs in basic skills. In this section, I will provide an overview of each of the CA practices (formulations, adjacency pairs, repair, epistemic rights, preference organization,

affiliation/alignment, emotion talk, and institutional talk) that were in the findings and I will discuss how the findings can assist CITs and counselor educators in the training process.

The complex nature of the CA practices I found are useful for CITs and instructors alike in helping them to pay close attention to what is happening with both the counselor and the client. Frequently, the focus in basic skills training is on the CITs. However, the role of the client can be a valuable part of the educational process as well. When analyzing the data, I found the practice session interactions were co-constructed by counselor and client which suggests CITs may want to shift how they view their role as counselor in the training context. In particular, CITs may consider how their role is inextricably linked to that of the client. As much as the skills they use can impact the client, the client's response to their intervention will be impacting what they say as well. Similarly, instructors may want to approach skills training with an interactional mindset rather than focusing solely on the work of the student counselor. To do so, it is vital that they use student clients as an integral part of the training process as outlined in this section.

Formulation. Formulation is a critical skill for CITs to develop as it is foundational to the therapeutic process and can have a big impact on the counseling interaction. I identified FRs as simple formulations used to address affective content provided by the student client. FRs were simplistic due to the sentence stem structure of "You feel" followed by one of five feeling words – scared, happy, lonely, sad, angry. I noted most participants' FRs were on the explicit side of the continuum which supports Skovholt and Ronnestad's (1992) findings CITs have a tendency to be more rigid in the

beginning phases of their training. The present findings suggest the beginning CITs are going through a process of matching clients' feeling words to create a formulation rather than enacting a more complex and sophisticated therapeutic intervention to recognize and reflect emotional expression.

Further, in keeping with the five feeling words, the CITs' formulations may have been limiting in terms of providing opportunities for CITs to initiate further affective exploration. At the same time, the simplicity of the FR may have been helpful to those students who needed concrete interventions to use when learning these new skills. It will be important for educators to balance the developmental needs of CITs with the need to challenge them to build higher order skills related to identifying and processing clients' emotions. Instructors may want to pay attention to the explicitness of the formulations over time and consider ways they can facilitate CITs' movement from explicit to more implicit formulation as they gain skill proficiency. This can be accomplished through detailed examination of transcripts of practice session recordings to determine where explicit or implicit formulations are occurring. As formulations are identified, CITs and instructors should attend to how the interaction between counselor and client impacts the implementation of those formulations.

Adjacency pair. Rogers (1986) suggested FRs should be re-labeled as "Testing Understandings" (para. 6) and "Checking Perceptions" (para. 6) to better identify the use of an FR as a skill used to explore a client's inner world. The current findings suggest the FR formulation-decision pair actually does operate in the sense of testing understanding or checking perceptions. Instead of acting as a reflection, the FR may be received as a formulaic assessment that requires a response of confirmation and

disconfirmation followed by an elaboration. Instructors and CITs should explore whether the FR formulations in their practice session follow the same pattern. If they do, instructors and CITs should consider that in adjacency pairs, the first pair part constrains what can be said in a second pair part (Raymond, 2003). That means clients in this study were limited in how they responded to the FR formulations that counselors provided. Affective exploration may be curtailed by the structure of the FR so finding ways to communicate an FR that will allow clients more freedom of expression may be helpful.

Repair. Repair plays an essential role in the organization and maintenance of trouble-free talk. It is preferred that the speaker who causes the difficulties in a conversational interaction be the one to rectify those difficulties. Due to the brief, standardized structure of the FR, the opportunity to create trouble in a conversation by incorrectly identifying clients' emotional experience was quite high. The findings from this study suggest clients carried a disproportionate amount of the burden of managing repair in the conversational interaction. CITs in a basic skills training experience should consider how clients may be managing repair in the conversation if CITs are limited in how they implement their discrete skills. CITs and educators should be aware that the lack of flexibility in the structure of the FR may lead to limited emotional exploration by CITs and clients. Providing CITs with the option to use more tentative FR formulations may allow clients to feel more open about agreeing or disagreeing with the formulation. The tentativeness provides clients the freedom to provide an authentic response to the formulation and remove their responsibility for managing potential trouble in talk.

Epistemic rights. Epistemic rights were an essential factor to consider in this analysis to see how the participants were negotiating and asserting knowledge claims in

their interactional process. The first position assessment and second position assessment structure suggested clients do a great deal of work re-asserting their epistemic rights due to the nature of the FR formulation-decision model. As the FR formulation is considered an unmarked first assessment in the data, counselors did not downgrade their first position assessments or use any tag questions to cede epistemic authority to clients. As a result, clients as speakers in the second position assessment were tasked with re-asserting their epistemic authority themselves. Participants in an interaction are balancing their rights to knowledge with their desire to maintain equilibrium and affiliation in conversation. CITs should be aware of this potential conflict as they are implementing skills in practice. As a way to mitigate this conflict, instructors and CITs can explore ways to downgrade the student counselors' epistemic position to allow clients to take authority over their own experience. Instructors can teach CITs to incorporate downgrades in the form of tentative delivery of FRs as well as through the use of tag questions such as 'Is that right?' Regardless of training approach, CITs and instructors should be mindful of how a counselor's epistemic position can affect how client's manage their epistemic rights and their desire to be agreeable in order to avoid trouble in talk.

Preference organization. Preference organization is a multifaceted system participants use when choosing courses of action in a conversational interaction (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). In the corpus of data, I noted participants made attempts to avoid disagreements with the FR formulations. This occurred because, in general, speakers find agreements avoid trouble in talk and promote affiliative behaviors whereas disagreements have the opposite effect (Pomerantz, 1984). As most clients in the study

were compelled to respond in agreement through the rules of preference organization, there was evidence clients were not spending much time contemplating their responses to the FR formulations. This was apparent in one exemplar I reviewed where the client immediately responded with a “yes” then changed course mid-word to a disagreement response. It appeared as if the initial agreement was an automatic response. In this regard, the mechanization of FRs as proposed by Rogers (1986, 1987) and others (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Mahoney, 1986; Martin, 1990) may be a relevant concern because the adjacency pair format lending itself to automatic responding.

Instructors and CITs may want to make note of the preference organization occurring in their practice counseling sessions. The agreements and veiled disagreements found are evidence clients were responding in a preferred way in the practice counseling sessions. Depending on how instructors choose to teach FRs, it is important they understand clients may be responding in a preferred way rather than providing an authentic response to the FR formulation. CITs may want to follow up to investigate whether those responses are truly what clients are feeling in the moment. The first step could be to assume a downgraded epistemic position allowing clients more freedom to agree or disagree with the FR formulation in the moment. Another potential option would be to check in with the client on the accuracy of the counselor’s FRs. This could be done by stopping mid-practice session and doing a check-in with the client perhaps via a reflecting team approach. Another option might be for counselors to make sure they are using a combination of discrete skills in the counseling session to allow clients varied opportunities to respond to the skills being used.

Affiliation and alignment. Both practitioners and researchers acknowledge the therapeutic relationship is a vital component of counseling (Peräkylä, 2013). As such, the practices of “affiliation” and “alignment” (Stivers, 2008) play a critical role in the context of an encounter between counselor and client and in similar ways between CITs in a practice session acting as counselors and clients. In this study clients and counselors, both managed affiliation in their interactions. In analyzing the extended Exemplar 27, I found a critical element of affiliation is listening carefully to what the client says. The client provided several verbal and nonverbal cues about how she was feeling. In one instance, the client even provided an alternate FR of ‘lonely’ that was never taken up by the counselor. Carefully viewing and transcribing sessions can help CITs gain a greater awareness of their affiliative behavior. It can give CITs opportunities to learn how to be more affiliative through the interventions they choose at a given time. Similarly, one can look at use of aligning tokens like minimal encouragers and find ways of incorporating those tokens with affiliative interventions to help maintain an affiliative position in the counseling interaction.

It can be difficult to maintain affiliation and easy for conversational interaction to become disaffiliative. Both student counselors and student clients need to be aware at all times of how they impact the interaction. Affiliative and empathic responding are also important components for emotion talk. The findings revealed CITs as counselors and clients both had a stake in maintaining an affiliative interaction. While the counselors’ FR formulations were presumed to be affiliative, clients also took a role in managing affiliation through preferred responding and mitigating language.

Emotion talk. Emotion talk was an important consideration because it was linked so closely to the study of FRs. My analysis focused on emotion words and nonverbal emotional expression arising from FR formulations. I found the clients responded to the counselors' FR formulations in the next turn and at times several turns later. An important point is FR formulations shape the direction of counseling sessions whether clients disagree with them or not. Attention should be paid to any occurrences where clients' response to counselors' FR formulations or other emotion talk. CITs can diagram or map their FR formulations in their transcripts to see how the FRs and responses unfold throughout the session. Simple reliance on the response immediately following the FR formulation may not be a sufficient indicator of the clients' understanding of the formulation.

Emotional expression was another notable phenomenon in the data. CITs need to be aware of when laughter is used in their practice sessions and how they respond to the laughter. When counselors join in clients' laughter, it may inhibit clients from more fully exploring their difficult experiences. While it can feel affiliative to join with the client, it may not always be welcomed or useful to the counseling process. The expression of crying helped make affiliative responding easier for CITs due to the overt nature of the emotional expression.

Institutional talk. Institutional talk manifested with the CITs in both their orientation to their roles and how they engaged in counselor talk. Clients also talked explicitly about their multiple institutional roles including their roles as students and future counselors. CITs and instructors should be aware the CITs are managing different institutional roles as they practice their skills. Allowing CITs a chance to process their

experiences with the multiple roles outside of the practice sessions may further assist them in their learning process.

General considerations. Counselor educators and CITs should strive to be students of the interactional process that unfolds in practice counseling sessions if they are not already. While CITs have been critical of the time-consuming aspect of transcription process (Strong, 2003), repeatedly viewing videos of counseling sessions and transcribing the sessions provides instructors and students a rich amount of information about the skills training process from an interactional perspective. CITs and instructors would be well served to watch and transcribe even small portions of the practice sessions on a regular basis. From my experience in this study, I have found repeated listening to the data and creating detailed transcripts of the interaction is helpful for fine-tuning one's hearing to potentially overlooked features of the interaction. It would be ideal for CITs and instructors to learn how to create Jeffersonian transcripts as standard transcribing fails to catch the minute details that can go unnoticed in an interaction between the CIT and client. It might also be useful for CITs to conduct mini-analytic sessions using CA principles. Counselor and client dyads could pair up to watch and transcribe the same sections of a practice counseling session. They could then compare how they perceived the interaction based on their analysis of the section. This same process of comparing impressions could occur between CITs and their supervisors and instructors.

I also discovered how critical the student client is to the training experience. Clients play a large part in shaping the interaction so their input should not be taken for granted in the training process. The client role should become a focal point in the

training experience and instructors may want to consider the ways they can utilize the role more fully as an instructional device. As an initial step, CITs should be directed to attend carefully to what their clients are saying in the moment and later when watching video recordings of their practice sessions. As an example, CITs should carefully examine the immediate turn following an intervention like an FR to see whether a client agrees or disagrees with their intervention. If the client agrees, CITs should listen for delayed responses through silences or use of filler words like ‘well’ as dispreferred responding typically occurs with delay. Detailed transcription of practice sessions can aid in this exploration and help students see how the interaction is unfolding step by step.

It might also be helpful to instruct CITs acting as clients to respond in unexpected ways in role plays. They could manipulate their responses to interfere with standard conversational processes occurring in the practice sessions. This approach may help counselors see more clearly what happens when the orderliness of conversation is disrupted. These deviant cases could also help them focus on what happens when there is trouble in talk and how they can manage it. For example, instead of responding affirmatively or with a delayed dispreferred response, clients could be directed to respond in strong disagreement to FRs to see how that would alter the conversational interaction. Clients could also initiate repair if an incorrect FR is given to provide counselors the opportunity to correct themselves if necessary.

Contributions to the Profession of Counseling

This study also has implications for professional counselors. The results can be used to show counselors how the details of the interactional process have a significant impact on how counseling occurs. Just as for CITs, the practice of transcription and

analysis in CA could help professional counselors continue to develop their counseling skills as they move through their career. In the era of increasing accountability and evidence based practice, CA serves as a beneficial applied analysis strategy that potentially could be used to supplement outcome measures as a form of ‘evidence’ that counseling is effective. It would also help counselors raise their awareness of the detailed interactional process thus increasing their skills in counseling.

Contributions to Counselor Education and Counseling Literature

This study has several implications for existing literature in the counselor education and counseling field. There have been contrasting views on the effectiveness of the training of microskills like FR. On one side, there has been criticism and concern raised about the mechanized use of the FR skill particularly by Rogers who has been given credit for the FR skill (Brink, 1987; Kramish, 1954; Mahoney, 1986; Martin, 1990; Rogers, 1986, 1987). Rogers (1975) felt FRs were not representative of his counseling approach nor were they a fit with his definition of empathy. Conversely, there has been support of microskills training as a way of introducing discrete counselor skills training in an efficient and effective way (Ivey et al., 2014; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

The purpose of the present study was to move from a debate about whether FRs are effective to an exploration of what is occurring in the interactional process when an FR is used. The findings revealed a process that is intricately co-constructed by both the CIT and the client. Several CA practices were noted in the dyadic practice sessions which demonstrated the FR could not be easily categorized as a skill delivered mechanically nor could its efficacy be determined without further exploration of the interactional process defining its use. The findings suggest a paradigm shift in research

on skills training may be in order due to the identified interactional process of accomplishing these skills.

This study supplements CA studies done by Wickman and Campbell (2003) and Strong and Zeman (2010). In both studies, the researchers conducted detailed analyses of instructional training sessions to determine how certain therapeutic approaches were being enacted from an interactional perspective. Wickman and Campbell (2003) analyzed the session with Rogers and a client named Gloria in a famous demonstration film of Rogers' client-centered therapy from *The Three Approaches to Psychotherapy* (Shostrom, 1965, as cited in Wickman & Campbell, 2003). The purpose of Wickman and Campbell's (2003) study was to determine how Rogers' core conditions of genuineness, empathy, and unconditional positive regard (Rogers, 1961) were being accomplished in this demonstration. The video has been used widely as a training tool in counselor education and programs for other helping professions (Wickman & Campbell, 2003). In a similar vein, Strong and Zeman (2010) analyzed a training video done by Allen Ivey. They transcribed a video recorded training session by Ivey in order to analyze how he was accomplishing the use of microskill confrontations in an instructional video. In these studies, researchers were able to determine the participants were accomplishing various tasks in their talk-in-interaction.

The present study focused on the FR, a discrete skill used to reflect a client's feeling and convey empathic understanding. I expanded on the previous studies which used demonstration videos as the basis of their analysis to analyzing video recordings of CITs from actual practice counseling sessions. Through my analysis, I developed a robust description of the practices that were occurring in the conversational interaction

between CITs and clients when FRs were implemented. Similar to how previous studies (Strong & Zeman, 2010; Wickman & Campbell, 2003) revealed co-construction of therapeutic talk, I found CITs learning FRs went through a similar co-constructing process that impacted the use of FRs.

This study adds to the limited literature base supporting the use of CA in a counselor training context. Strong (2003) incorporated the use of CA and discourse analysis in basic skills training. His purpose was to help students become sensitized to the interactional process in their practice counseling sessions. Strong (2003) wanted students to recognize how their use of skills helped shape the counseling conversation. To accomplish this task, he had his students transcribe and analyze video of their practice sessions. Students found benefit in the exercise of watching and transcribing their videos. These benefits have been supported in previous literature related to skills training (Ivey, 1971; Ivey et al., 2014; Rogers, 1951; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). Transcription has also been recommended (Strong, 2003). My findings show the close examination of transcripts and videos reveals CA practices that are useful for instructors, supervisors, and CITs in the learning process.

The present study also fills a gap in the literature related to the general study of microskills training in counselor education. Ridley et al. (2011) noted recent research on microskills training has been limited. Authors (Baker et al., 1990; Hill & Lent, 2006; Ridley et al., 2011) have also noted previous studies have methodological weaknesses. This study revisited microskills training from a different research perspective, and has shifted focus from what the counselor is doing to an empirical review of what is occurring in the interaction.

These findings also supplement the developmental literature on trainees in the helping professions by providing an interactional perspective on how beginning CITs learn basic skills. Developmental studies have suggested CITs need structured training at the beginning of their programs (Gibson et al., 2010; Hill et al., 2007; Ronnestad & Skovolt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenburg & McNeill, 2010). The microskills training approach is developmentally appropriate for CITs considering they are coming from a rigid, concrete mindset and are seeking external direction at their beginning stage of training (Ronnestad & Skovolt, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenburg & McNeill, 2010). These findings confirm those views in terms of the implementation of FRs. The explicitness of CITs' FR formulations suggested they were implementing FRs at their most rudimentary level rather than using more sophisticated therapeutic skills to engender emotional exploration.

Competency (Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003; Swank et al., 2012) and self-efficacy studies (Lent et al., 2006; Urbani et al., 2002) have been a more recent focus of research related to counselor training. While focusing on these domains is valuable, the co-constructing process of skill implementation points to how important both participants are to the use of basic skills. As a result, these findings suggest an alternate view of training from solely focusing on the counselor's skills to exploring how each member of the dyad is contributing to the process is warranted.

Contribution to Conversation Analysis Literature

Findings have shown there is orderliness in talk-in-interaction and has provided further support for a number of CA-identified practices. In this case, I discovered many CA practices which have been the subject of study by other CA researchers. My study

augments other studies done in the area of psychotherapy, particularly family therapy (Friedlander et al., 2000; Gale, 1996; Tseliou, 2013; Wickman & Campbell, 2003). I used CA to analyze a therapeutic interaction and found similar CA practices like affiliation and emotion talk. Few studies have been done with a specific focus on counselor skills training and fewer using CA. The findings of the present study further help expand the nascent research base of CA and skills training by developing a detailed formal description of the CA practices occurring in practice counseling sessions by CITs.

Limitations

There were some potential limitations with this particular study. One of the limitations was this study focused on a specific group of seven students in one program at a particular time. It is probable other counseling programs have different ways of teaching CITs basic skills so these findings may not be as applicable to their beginning skills courses. Some programs may not use microskills training as the foundation of their skills development. However, what is notable about the study is the findings did support the orderliness of talk-in-interaction and demonstrated specific CA practices widely applicable to different conversational contexts and to many different types of training situations.

This study was also focused on the FR, a microskill that was taught in a specific way, using the standard phrasing ‘You feel [emotion word].’ Instructional texts on microskills training highlight various ways to implement the FR (Egan, 2010; Hill, 2007; Ivey et al., 2014) and in this course CITs were taught to deliver FRs in that particular way. At the same time, the use of the skill in a prescribed format made comparative analysis easier. The ease of analysis lent itself to creating a formal description that

highlighted important conversational features that may not have been accessible with a more varied approach to FR delivery.

An unexpected circumstance which may have impacted some of the data was the periodic presence of a doctoral supervisor in the room during the practice sessions. The doctoral supervisors were in the room to provide live supervision. They were not participants in this study so their verbal input was not analyzed. However, their presence in the practice sessions may have had an effect on how the participants interacted and how the counselors implemented their basic skills. Similarly, there were students and doctoral supervisors observing from behind a one-way mirror. CA researchers do not necessarily find these types of conditions problematic in data collection and only make note of them if the participants orient to these circumstances themselves. Except for one instance previously highlighted, the analysis did not show participants' orientation to the doctoral supervisors or other observers.

By design, this study looked at limited segments of conversational interaction. Specifically, the focus was on FR turn sequences. Parsing out data from longer sequences may have had an impact on what was found in the data. There may have been details in other parts of the interactions that would have added to the findings had they been analyzed as well. It would be helpful to review other microskills being used by the counselors as well as analyze the use of multiple skills in extended turn sequences. However, this study's main focus was reviewing specific instances of data that contained an FR so further exploration would be outside the scope of this current study.

Transcription was another potential limitation in my study. At times, it was difficult to hear what the client was saying which necessitated me to fill in words I

thought I heard to my transcripts. There were also choices I made as to what transcription details to add such as notating elongation in words or raised pitch. How the same piece of data is transcribed by different analysts can vary greatly thereby affecting analysis of the data. To address this issue, I collaborated with my advisor in reviewing my findings and he provided an additional perspective by inspecting and verifying that he understood the findings the way that I did.

Future Research

There are several directions future research endeavors can take from the present study. This study could be used as a starting point to analyze other discrete microskills individually and collectively. Strong and Zeman (2010) have used CA to study how Ivey implemented confrontation in his instructional microskills video. Further research could be done to focus on CITs using different discrete skills in their practice counseling sessions. Studies could also be conducted to analyze data to reveal the interplay of practices occurring through the use of multiples skills.

Expanding on this study to look at CITs working with actual clients would also allow for comparative data to be collected and analyzed to see how practices change or remain the same with clients who are not fellow students and what changes may occur over time. When CITs work with clients who are not a part of the institutional environment where the practice sessions took place, it is likely that clients will respond differently to skills with which they are not familiar. Findings from this proposed study could provide additional context to the findings in the present study.

It would also be enlightening to analyze data from CITs' training with a developmental perspective in mind. It may be helpful from an instructional standpoint to

see how skill implementation changes over time if it does. To that end, it would also be beneficial to see longitudinally how individual CIT's skills change over the course of the program and in post-graduate practice. FRs may be an accessible microskill to use for such a study. Similarly, this approach could be used for supervisors-in-training who are working with their supervisees. Specifically, CA research could be done on conversational interactions involving supervisors providing feedback to their supervisees to determine how feedback is provided and how the interactional process involved in feedback evolves over time.

Future studies could be done to explore the utility of watching videos and creating transcripts of practice counseling sessions. Rogers (1951) and Ivey (1971) supported the use of recordings in their training approach. Strong (2003) also used transcription with his students. My own experience with this process offers some additional support. Qualitative and quantitative studies could be done to determine whether repeated watching of videos and/or using a detailed transcription like Jefferson's method is a beneficial or effective component for counselor training.

CA is a methodology that also would be helpful for studies centering on other aspects of counselor education training. Studies using CA could be done to analyze the conversational interactions between CITs and doctoral supervisors in the prepracticum class and throughout the progression of the program to provide needed insight into interactional processes like giving and receiving feedback. Analysis could be done on theory-based role plays performed by CITs in the first stage of learning counseling theories. These analyses could be used to determine what types of orderly practices were occurring in the process of applying theoretical approaches to dyadic practice sessions.

CA could also be used to analyze how skills such as suicide assessments are implemented in the classroom role plays. CA can be used in other classroom contexts to determine what is occurring between the instructor and CITs in their conversational interactions related to courses such as multicultural counseling potentially to see how CITs are acquiring greater knowledge, awareness, and skills in their multicultural training.

Conclusion

This study focused on determining what was occurring in the conversational interaction between student counselors and student clients in a practice counseling session. The findings from this study have filled a gap in the literature related to the research of microskills in an interactional context. While some studies have been completed to show what is happening in a therapeutic interaction between counselors and clients, using CA to study the conversational interaction of CITs is new. I have outlined many practical implications related to each of the CA practices in my findings, as well as a general suggestion that CITs, counselor educators, and practicing counselors become students of the interactional process involved in skills training. This study also adds to the research base of counseling and counselor education and CA by providing an alternate perspective via CA of skills training from an interactional context .

There were some limitations noted for this study. The specificity of the participant pool and training program may have affected the findings. Periodic inclusion of doctoral supervisors in the practice sessions may have impacted the interactional process. The scope of the analysis was limited to FRs which may have left details out that would have been beneficial to the analysis. Transcription may vary depending on the

person transcribing so that the details to which I attended in my transcript may be different for others.

There are several recommendations for future research. Studies could be done on other microskills or researchers could broaden the scope to look at several different discrete skills and how they operate in conjunction with each other. Additional CA research could also be generated with a non-institutional and developmental perspective in mind analyzing data across time and with clients that are not other CITs. There are many other applications for using CA research in other educational contexts in a counseling program including feedback between instructors and CITs, theory and practical role plays, and dialogues in classes such as multicultural counseling course to see how CITs are gaining knowledge in these important areas of counseling.

References

- Aladağ, M., Yaka, B., & Koç, I. (2014). Opinions of counselor candidates regarding counseling skills training. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 14*(2), 879-886.
- American Counseling Association (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Antaki, C. (2008). Formulations in psychotherapy. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar (Eds.). *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 26-42). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. Part II: Preference organization. In Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structures of social action* (pp. 53-56). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York, NY: Basic Books
- Bercelli, F., Rossano, F. & Viaro, M. (2008). Clients' responses to therapists' reinterpretations. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar (Eds.). *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 43-61). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bergman, D.V. (1951). Counseling method and client responses. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 15*, 216-224.
- Brems, C. (2001). *Basic skills in psychotherapy and counseling*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Brink, D.C. (1987). The issues of equality and control in the client- or person-centered approach. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 27*(1), 27-37.

- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2016-CACREP-Standards.pdf>
- Crews, J., Smith, M.R., Smaby, M.H., Maddux, C.D., Torres-Rivera, E., Casey, J.A., & Urbani, S. (2005). Self-monitoring and counseling skills: Skills-based versus interpersonal process recall training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 83, 78-85.
- Davis, K. (1986). The process of problem (re)formulation in psychotherapy. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 8(1), 44-74.
- Dickson, D. (2006). Reflecting. In Hargie, O. (Ed.), *The handbook of communication skills* (3rd. ed.) (pp. 165-194). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) *Talk at work*. (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duys, D.K., & Headrick, T.C. (2004). Using markov chain analyses in counselor education research. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44, 108-120.
- Ericksen, K., & McAuliffe, G. (2003). A measure of counselor competency. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 43, 120-133.
- Etringer, B.D., Hillerbrand, E., & Claiborn, C.D. (1995). The transition from novice to expert counselor. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 35, 4-17.

- Eysenck, H.J. (1952). The effects of psychotherapy: An evaluation. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 16*, 319-324.
- Friedlander, M.L., Heatherington, L., & Marrs, A.L. (2000). Responding to blame in family therapy: A constructionist/narrative perspective. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 28*, 133-146.
- Furr, S.R., & Carroll, J.J. (2003). Critical incidents in student counselor development. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81*, 483-489.
- Gale, J. (1996). Conversation analysis: Studying the construction. In Sprenkle, D.H., & Moon, S.M. (Eds.). *Research Methods in Family Therapy*. (pp. 107-124). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gibson, D.M., Dollarhide, C.T., & Moss, J.M. (2010). Professional identity development: A grounded theory of transformational tasks of new counselors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*, 21-38.
- Gockel, A., & Burton, D.L. (2014). An evaluation of prepracticum helping skills training for graduate social work students. *Journal of Social Work Education, 50*, 101-119.
- Haakana, M. (2012). Laughter in conversation: The case of “fake” laughter. In A. Peräkylä, A., & M-L Sorjonen (Eds.). *Emotion in interaction*. (pp. 174-194). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hayano, K. (2013). Question design in conversation. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.). *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 395-414). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell

Publishing, Inc.

- Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2007). Crying receipts: Time, empathy, and institutional practice. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(1), 89-116.
- Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2010). Putting aspiration into words: 'Laugh particles', managing descriptive trouble and modulating action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1543-1555.
- Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2012) Crying and crying responses. In Perakyla, A., & Sorjonen, M-L (Eds.) *Emotion in interaction* (pp. 195-211). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Heritage, J. (2013) Epistemics in conversation. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.). *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370-394). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J.M. (1984). Introduction. In Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structures of social action* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Heritage, J.C., & Watson, D.R. (1979) Formulations as conversational objects. In Psathas, G. (Ed.). *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. (pp. 123-162). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers, Inc.

- Hill, C.E., & Lent, R.W. (2006). A narrative and meta-analytic review of helping skills training: Time to revive a dormant area of inquiry. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice Training*, 43(2), 154-172.
- Hill, C.E., Sullivan, C., Knox, S., & Schlosser, L.Z. (2007). Becoming psychotherapists: Experiences of novice trainees in a beginning graduate class. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 44(4), 434-449.
- Hill, C.E. (2010). *Helping skills: Facilitating exploration, insight, and action* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Hutchby, I. (2005). 'Active listening'" Formulations and the elicitation of feelings-talk in child counselling. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(3), 303-329.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ivey, A.E. (1971). *Microcounseling: Innovations in interviewing training*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Ivey, A.E., Normington, C.J., Miller, C.D, Morrill, W.H., and Haase, R.F. (1968). Microcounseling and attending behavior: An approach to prepracticum counselor training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 15(5), 1-12.
- Ivey, A.E., Ivey, M.B., & Zalaquett, C.P. (2014). *Intentional interviewing and counseling: Facilitating client development in a multicultural society* (8th. ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structures of social action* (pp. 346-369). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Jefferson, G. (1985). An exercise in the transcription and analysis of laughter. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.) *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 3) (pp. 25-34). London: Academic Press.
- Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.). *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Kramish, A.A. (1954). Problems in the non-directive therapist's reflection of feeling. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 201-209.
- Kuntze, J., van der Molen, H.T., & Born, M.P. (2009). Increase in counseling communication skills after basic and advanced microskills training. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 175-188.
- Lent, R.W., Hoffman, M.A., Hill, C.E., Treistman, D., Mount, M., & Singley, D. (2006). Client-specific counselor self-efficacy in novice counselors: Relation to perceptions of session quality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53(4), 453-463.
- Lindström, A. & Sorjonen, M-L. (2013). Affiliation in conversation. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.). *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 350-369). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Lyons, C., & Hazler, R.J. (2002). The influence of student development level on improving counselor student empathy. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 42, 119-130.
- Mahoney, M.J. (1981). Clinical psychology and scientific inquiry. *International Journal of Psychology*, 16, 257-274.
- Mahoney, M.J. (1986). The tyranny of technique. *Counseling and Values*, 30(2), 169-174.

- Martin, J. (1990). Confusions in psychological skills training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 68, 402-407.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Nassar-McMillan, S.C., & Niles, S.G. (2011). *Developing your identity as a professional counselor: Standards, settings, and specialties*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- O'Byrne, K., Clark, R.E., & Malakuti, R. (1997). Expert and novice performance: Implications for clinical training. *Educational Psychology Review*, 9(4), 321-332.
- Paladino, D.A., Barrio Minton, C.A., & Kern, C.W. (2011). Interactive training model: Enhancing beginning counseling student development. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 50, 189-206.
- Peräkylä, A. (2011). Validity in research on naturally occurring social interaction. In Silverman, D. (Ed.). *Qualitative research: Issues of theory, method, and practice*. (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Peräkylä, A. (2013). Conversation analysis in psychotherapy. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.). *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 551-574). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Peräkylä, A., Antaki, C., Vehviläinen, S., & Leudar, I. (2008). Analyzing psychotherapy in practice. In A. Peräkylä, C. Antaki, S. Vehviläinen, & I. Leudar (Eds.). *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 5-25). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structures of social action*. (pp. 57-101). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B.J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social interaction as sense making practices. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 64-91). London, UK: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rawls, A.W. (2004). Conversation analysis. *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. 146-50. *SAGE Reference Online*. Retrieved from http://studysites.uk.sagepub.com/ritzerintro/study/materials/reference/77708_5.1r.pdf
- Ridley, C.R., Kelly, S.M., & Mollen, D. (2011). Microskills training: Evolution, reexamination, and call for reform. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 39(6), 800-824.
- Rogers, C.R. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy: Newer concepts in practice*. Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rogers, C.R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rogers, C.R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Rogers, C.R. (1975). Empathic: An unappreciated way of being. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 5, 2-10. Retrieved from http://www.sageofasheville.com/pub_downloads/EMPATHIC_AN_UNAPPRECIATED_WAY_OF_BEING.pdf
- Rogers, C. R. (1986). Reflections of feelings. *Person-Centered Review*, 1(4), 375-377. Retrieved from <http://www.institutohumanista.com.br/ReflectionsofFeelings-comentariodeRogers.pdf>
- Rogers, C.R. (1987). Comments on the issue of equality in psychotherapy. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 27(1), 38-40.
- Rønnestad, M.H., & Skovholt, T.M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development*, 30(1), 5-44.
- Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). *Structures of social action*. (pp. 21-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.
- Schegloff, E.A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. In J. Baugh and J. Sherzer (Eds.). (1984) *Language in use: Readings in sociolinguistics* (pp. 69-99).
- Schenkein, J.N. (1978). Sketch of an analytic mentality for the study of conversational interaction. In Schenkein, J.N. (Ed.). *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 1-6). New York: Academic Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J. (2013). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.). *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 77-99). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Skovholt, T.M., & Ronnestad, M.H. (1992). Themes in therapist and counselor development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 505-515.
- Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(1), 31-57.
- Stoltenberg, C.D., & McNeill, B.W. (2010). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Strong T. (2003). Engaging reflection: A training exercise using conversation and discourse analysis. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 43, 65-77.

- Strong, T., & Zeman, D. (2010). Dialogic considerations of confrontation as a counseling activity: An examination of Allen Ivey's use of confronting as a microskill. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*, 332-339.
- Swank, J.M., Lambie, G.W., & Witta, E.L. (2012). An exploratory investigation of the counseling competencies scale: A measure of counseling skills, dispositions, and behaviors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 51*, 189-206.
- ten Have, P. (1986). Methodological issues in conversation analysis. *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique, 27*, p. 23-51. Retrieved from <http://www.paultenhaven.nl/mica.htm>
- ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Toerien, M. (2014). Conversations and conversation analysis. In Flick, U. (Ed.). *Sage Handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 327-340) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Tseliou, E. (2013). A critical methodological review of discourse and conversation analysis studies of family therapy. *Family Process, 52*, 653-672.
- Urbani, S., Smith, M.R., Maddux, C.D., Smaby, M.H., Torres-Rivera, E., & Crews, J. (2002). Skills-based training and counseling self-efficacy. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 42*, 92-106.
- Wickman, S., & Campbell, C. (2003). An analysis of how Carl Rogers enacted client-centered conversation with Gloria. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81*, 178-184.

Woodside, M., Oberman, A.H., Cole, K.G., & Carruth, E.K. (2007). Learning to be a counselor: A prepracticum point of view. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 47, 14-28.

Appendix

Transcription Symbols based on Gail Jefferson's System

(Taken from: Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide by Paul ten Have (2007), p. 215-216;
Glossary of transcript symbols: An introduction by Gail Jefferson (2004) in Conversation Analysis: Studies from the first
generation by Gene H. Lerner (ed.); and The conversation analytic approach to transcription by Hepburn & Bolden (2013) in The
Handbook of conversation analysis by Sidnell & Stivers (eds.))

Sequencing

- [*A single left bracket* indicates the point of overlap
-] *A single right bracket* indicates the point at which an utterance or
utterance part
- = *Equal signs*, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of the next
indicates no 'gap' between the two lines. This is often called *latching*.

Timed intervals

- (0.0) *Numbers in parentheses* indicated elapsed time in silence by one tenth of
seconds, so (7.1) is a pause of 7 seconds and one-tenth of a second.
- (.) *A dot in parentheses* indicates a tiny 'gap' between utterances.

Characteristics of speech production

- word *Underscoring* indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude; an
alternative method is to print the stressed part in *italics*.
- word: *Colons* indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound.
- word::: Multiple colons indicate a more prolonged sound.
- word-word *A dash* indicates a cut-off or rapid shifting between words in a single
utterance.

.,??,	<i>Punctuation marks</i> are used to indicate characteristics of speech production especially intonation; they are not referring to grammatical units; an alternative is an italicized question mark: ?
.	A <i>period</i> indicates a stopping fall in tone. Also used to signify staccato tone if used between a series of words (e.g. word. word. word).
,	A <i>comma</i> indicates a continuing intonation, like when you are reading items for a list.
?	A <i>question mark</i> indicates a rising intonation.
,?	The <i>combined question mark/comma</i> indicates a stronger rise than a comma but weaker than a question mark. The absence of an utterance final marker indicates some sort of ‘indeterminate’ contour.
↑↓	<i>Arrows</i> indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance parts immediately following the arrow.
WORD	Upper case indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk. Note that caps words do not necessarily denote yelling.
°word°	Utterances or utterance-parts bracketed by <i>degree signs</i> are relatively quieter than the surrounding talk.
°°word°°	Double degree signs means barely audible talk.
<>	Left/right carats bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate slowing down of speech in relation to other utterance/utterance parts within a turn.
><	Right/left carats bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate speeding up of speech in relation to other utterance/utterance-parts in turn.

- >word Single right carat preceding a word signifies that the word is abruptly started without an accompanying interruption on speaker's part
- word< Single left carat following a word signifies that a word is cut off or ended abruptly without an interruption on another speaker's part.
- .hhh A *dot-prefixed row of hs* indicates an inbreath. Without the dot, the *hs* indicates an outbreath
- w(h)ord A parenthesized *h* or a *row of hs within a word* indicates breathiness, as in laughter, crying, etc.
- (£) *British pound symbol within parentheses* indicates smiling voice or suppressed laughter
- (~) *Tilde in parentheses* signifies tremulous voice.

Transcriber's comments

- () *Empty parentheses* indicate the transcriber's inability to hear what was said. The length of the parenthesized space indicates the length of the untranscribed talk. In the speaker designation column, the empty parentheses indicate inability to identify a speaker.
- (word) *Parenthesized words* are especially dubious hearings or speaker identifications.
- (()) *Double parentheses* contain transcriber's descriptions rather than, or in addition to, transcriptions
- A *horizontal arrow* is added to exemplars to show what part of the transcript is being highlighted for analysis in an exemplar transcript.

Additional annotations added by this author

[[]] Changed/redacted information in transcript to preserve anonymity of participants

.... Continuation of dialogue after end of transcript

‘ ’ Indication that participant is quoting another person in their utterance.