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Abstract

This study uses conversation analysis to identify literacy development in adult ESL classroom book club discussions. The investigation focuses on the interactions of three university students participating in a six-week book club about *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone*. The longitudinal microethnographic analysis reveals the students’ development of interactional routines for enacting topic transitions. Two student strategies are examined: (a) the development of a group routine for reading discussion questions aloud; and (b) the use of the transition markers *okay* and *next*. The students’ establishment of these strategies during the six meetings provides evidence of literacy development during classroom book club discussions. Additionally, the research adds to the currently small corpus of conversation analysis book club studies. Full transcripts for the six book club meetings are also provided.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

Book clubs have a long history – dating back to the 1600s in America and several centuries prior in other countries – and have been a source of discussions, support, and intellectual growth for a variety of groups in many different social contexts. Currently, book clubs are gaining in popularity with the general public\(^1\) (Atlas, 2014; Daniels, 2002; Hoffert, 2006; Wu, 2011); many books are now published with a list of discussion questions in the back, and author Margaret Atwood has likened book clubs’ appeal to that of the eighteenth century salons of Paris and the improvement societies of the Victorians (Atwood, 2000, preface; Daniels, 2002). Paralleling this growth in popularity in the general public, book-club use in both first-language (L1) and second-language (L2) reading classes is burgeoning (Daniels, 2002, pp. 3-9). Instructors and curriculum developers maintain that classroom book-club use results in increased student motivation and greater student engagement with the texts (for example, Burda, 2000; Pitton, 2005); however, little research has been conducted to investigate specific instances of literacy development in English-as-a-second-language (ESL\(^2\)) students’ book club discussions. This study describes how adult ESL students demonstrate literacy development as they establish interactional routines over the course of six weekly classroom book-club discussions about J.K. Rowlings’ *Harry Potter*.

When researchers and educators consider literacy development, it is crucial to keep in mind that notions of literacy – what it means to be “literate” – have shifted considerably over the

---

\(^1\) Daniels (2002), for example, states that in the United States, the number of book clubs doubled from 50,000 to 100,000 in the decade from 1990 to 2000. Wu (2011) cites that whereas a Google search for “book club” in 2003 returned 424,000 hits, by 2011 it returned 40 million. In a 2014 *New York Times* article, Atlas claims that some estimates put the number of Americans actively involved in book clubs at 5 million.

\(^2\) In this thesis, English as a second language (ESL) will describe adult L2 learners, whereas English language learners (ELL) will refer to K-12 students.
past several decades. Early conceptions focused exclusively on individual ability to decode and encode text and therefore emphasized discrete skills and the assessment of such skills— a perspective that literacy researchers Mike Baynham and Mastin Prinsloo refer to as “a unitary process, one where ‘readers’ and ‘writers’ are generalized subjects without any social location and who are more or less efficient processors of text” (2009, p. 2). More recently, however, social models of literacy have gained favor. With the work of such researchers as Shirley Brice Heath (1983), Brian Street (1984), and Cazden et al.\(^3\) (1996), literacy has been defined “not as an issue of measurement or of skills but as social practices that vary from one context to another” (Street, 2009, p. 21). Cazden et al. (1996) have also broadened the concept of literacy with the term “multiliteracies,” arguing that literacy pedagogy needs to expand to include (a) literacies beyond the textual, including “the visual, the audio, the spatial, the behavioral, . . . and electronic hypermedia”; and (b) literacies that reflect the growing diversity both locally and globally, with phenomena such as multiple Englishes and “communication patterns that more frequently cross cultural, community, and national boundaries” (p. 5).

This newer understanding of literacy (or literacies) has driven curriculum shifts in schools and individual classrooms, with instructors looking to update the older, traditional methods of the teaching of discrete skills with newer, more socially interactive forms of literacy teaching. Book clubs appear to be one instructional tool for these instructors. However, analyzing the effectiveness of book clubs in the classroom proves difficult, and measuring student engagement or motivation can be tricky. Instructors who are curious about implementing book discussion groups to facilitate their students’ literacy development often must rely on

---

\(^3\) Cazden et al. are also known as The New London Group.
anecdotal evidence when deciding whether to add such discussion groups to their own curriculum.

The current study uses conversation analysis (CA), a well-respected analytical method employed primarily by sociologists and linguists, to examine how adult ESL students in a classroom book club demonstrate literacy development through their establishment of interactional routines during their weekly discussions. CA is a fine-grained analysis of naturally-occurring spoken interaction. Conversation analysts engage in a rigorous process of recording conversations and then meticulously transcribing those conversations using well-established transcription conventions that have been developed and codified for the past several decades (Hellermann, 2008, p. 31). Participants in a conversation continuously negotiate and co-construct that conversation; by transcribing and analyzing such minute details as overlapped speech, timed pauses, tempo, and intonation, conversation analysts can bring to light the interactional routines that the participants use in the construction of their conversation. Under the lens of a social model of literacy, such interactional routines illustrate literacy development. With respect to the current study, CA has allowed the researcher to unearth the interactional routines that three adult ESL students developed as they conversed about *Harry Potter* in their target language.

**Background**

Before delving into a discussion of the current study, its rationale, and its research questions, I will provide additional background information in this section on certain key concepts that directly relate to the study. Elaboration on the social model of literacy, both in L1 and L2 classrooms, will help to explain the researcher’s perspective on what literacy development looks like in the ESL classroom. A brief history of book clubs in and out of the classroom provides context and a greater understanding of book club operation and the claims
about the impact that they have had on their participants over time. A more detailed description and history of CA will explain the process and methodology used in the current study to analyze student interactions, and an explanation of the “community of practice” model will shed light on the theory of learning that underpins the study.

**Social model of literacy.**

Because “literacy” is a word that has developed a wide range of meanings over time, I will first discuss some of the meanings of the term and ground the current study in a specific meaning of the word. The definition of literacy is central to a longstanding debate that drives educational policy, determines literary canon, and colors perceptions of what it means to be an educated person. Early traditional definitions of literacy explain it as the ability to master discrete skills that allow an individual to read and write, conjuring images of young children learning to decode their first words or of scholars locked away in private libraries reading (or writing) thick tomes. In *Academic Writing as Social Practice*, Linda Brodkey (1987) points out the historical tendency to envision writers as solitary – “alone in a cold garret, working into the small hours of the morning by thin candlelight” or “alone in a well-appointed study, seated at a desk, fingers poised over the keys of a typewriter“ (p. 54). Brodkey demonstrates how these images of writing as a solitary activity are reflected in Western artwork and literature; she contends that this cultural tendency to foreground the solitary activity of writing negates its social aspects. Brodkey argues that writing is a social practice not only because writers write for other people, but also because the social context determines what is written, what is published, what is read, and who is writing (Brodkey, 1987, p. vii). Inspired by Brodkey’s work, Elizabeth Long (2003) applies a similar lens to reading. Long explores depictions of readers in Western paintings, demonstrating how frequently readers are portrayed as “withdrawn from the world and
suspended from human community and human action” (p. 2). Long maintains that envisioning reading as an exclusively solitary activity disregards “two crucial aspects of its social nature” – (a) the social infrastructure that enables literacy and literacy development, and (b) the social framing and institutional processes that determine what is read, what becomes canon, and how reading is taught (pp. 8-11).

In the 1980s, several books and studies accounted for a major shift in how literacy is understood. Two foundational texts, Shirley Brice Heath’s *Ways with Words* (1983) and Brian Street’s *Literacy in Theory and Practice* (1984), argue that literacy is not a solitary skill, and neither is it a neutral or technical skill; rather, they assert that literacy is a contextualized practice enmeshed in cultural practices and power relations. Street contends that prior to the 1980s, many Western researchers embraced what he refers to as the “autonomous model” of literacy – a Western-centric model that overemphasizes written text and discounts oral communication and literacy within oral societies (1984, pp. 2-5). Arguing against literacy scholars such as Jack Goody (1968, 1977) and Walter Ong (1977), Street asserts that literacy is not merely a set of discrete skills learned regardless of the social context. Instead, Street offers what he calls an “ideological model” of literacy; this model recognizes the significance of the social aspects of reading and writing and the way these practices are culturally embedded. He writes that his ideological model “stresses the significance of the socialization process in the construction of the meaning of literacy for participants and is therefore concerned with the general social institutions through which this process takes place and not just the explicit ‘educational’ ones” (Street, 1984, p. 2). For Street, what it means to be literate varies from culture to culture; in a more recent article he defines literacy practices as “the broader cultural conception of particular ways of thinking about and doing reading and writing in cultural contexts” (Street, 2000, p. 20). Street’s
perspectives developed out of his anthropological fieldwork in the 1980s in Iranian villages – he was struck by the vast amount and variety of literacy activity going on in these villages. He observed a surprising amount of variation in literacy practices among the traditional Qur’anic schools, the new State schools, and the tradespeople negotiating fruit sales at urban markets (Street, 2009, p. 22). Despite the significant number of literacy practices that he could describe in these varying contexts, the inhabitants of the region were characterized as “illiterate” by outside agencies such as UNESCO, the state educational system, and literacy campaigns (p. 22). Street contends that literacy campaigns that attempt to bring traditional notions of literacy to the illiterate – “light into darkness campaigns,” as he refers to them – often fail because students either drop out or never sign up to begin with (p. 22). Street condemns such campaigns:

   Even though in the long-run many local people do want to change their literacy practices and take on some of those associated with Western or urban society, a crude imposition of the latter that marginalizes and denies local experience is likely to alienate even those who were initially motivated. (Street, 2009, p. 22)

Street’s experiences with the Iranian villages and with other subsequent populations that had been labeled as “illiterate” led to his development of the “ideological model” of literacy and contributed greatly to the current understanding of the social model of literacy.

Another foundational text in the social literacy movement, Heath’s *Ways with Words* (1983), argues for this social model of literacy and for shifting the emphasis of literacy research into contexts beyond the classroom. *Ways with Words* describes Heath’s nine-year ethnographic study comparing three communities in the Piedmont of the Carolinas. Heath observed the home lives of families in these communities and studied how the differences in language use and attitudes towards oral and written communication in children’s early years impacted the
children’s later classroom experiences. She argues that the context in which children are raised, and the rules about communication that they learn from their families and their communities, define a set of culturally-specific “social interactional rules which regulate the type and amount of talk about what is written, and define ways in which oral language reinforces, denies, extends, or sets aside the written material” (Heath, 1983, p. 386; see also Heath, 1982). Heath asserts that young children who, in their day-to-day interactions, learn interactional rules that align with the expectations of their educational systems exhibit greater success in later school and work experiences. In the epilogue of Ways with Words, Heath draws three general conclusions that demonstrate the importance of these social interactions on participants’ literacy:

First, patterns of language use in any community are in accord with and mutually reinforce other cultural patterns, such as space and time orderings, problem-solving techniques, group loyalties, and preferred patterns of recreation. In each of these communities, space and time usage and the role of the individual in the community condition the interactional rules for occasions of language use. The boundaries of the physical and social communities, and the extent and density of interactions within these influence such seemingly culturally remote language habits as the relative extent to which babies are talked to or about.

Second, factors involved in preparing children for school-oriented, mainstream success are deeper than differences in formal structures of language, amount of parent-child interaction, and the like. The language socialization process in all of its complexity is more powerful than such single-factor explanations in accounting for academic success.
Third, the patterns of interactions between oral and written uses of language are varied and complex, and the traditional oral-literate dichotomy does not capture the ways other cultural patterns in each community affect the uses of oral and written language. In the communities described here, occasions for writing and reading of extended prose occur far less frequently than occasions for extended oral discourse around written materials. (Heath, 1983, p. 344, italics in original)

Almost ten years after Heath’s publication of her groundbreaking study in *Ways with Words*, she partnered with classroom teacher Leslie Mangiola to write a monograph for the National Education Association describing how instructors in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms can draw upon their students’ diverse backgrounds to create a richer learning environment for everyone (Heath & Mangiola, 1991). Building on Heath’s earlier work on social literacy, the authors observe that an individual’s expectations about learning and cultural transmission may depend heavily upon that individual’s culture and upbringing (p. 15). Expectations may differ greatly about how knowledge is displayed, what basic background knowledge about the world is transmitted, and what patterns of student-teacher or student-student interaction are preferred. Heath and Mangiola caution against thinking of “students of diverse backgrounds as bringing ‘differences’ to school, but instead as offering classrooms ‘expansions’ of background knowledge and ways of using language” (1991, p. 17). They strongly encourage the foregrounding of collaborative work (over basic literacy skills laid out in “small bits of scope and in a specific sequence”) in classrooms to capitalize upon the individual students’ background knowledge (1991, pp. 17-18). They issue the following credo for educators:
Teachers, students, and researchers must be jointly active in the learning process. All must have chances to learn and to construct and revise theories about what and how they know. They must be free to use the language of give-and-take to negotiate ideas, to build knowledge, and to acquire new skills to prepare for lifelong learning. (Heath & Mangiola, 1991, p. 12-13)

Later in the monograph, Heath and Mangiola define academically literate behaviors as the following: (a) interpreting texts; (b) connecting texts to personal experience and other texts; (c) explaining and arguing with text passages; (d) making predictions about texts; (e) comparing and evaluating texts; and (f) talking about the aforementioned tasks (p. 41). They contend that collaborative student-student interaction in the classroom far surpasses the teaching of “minute skills” and “a dependency on scope-and-sequence learning tied to school textbooks and workbooks,” because the business and corporate worlds are looking for workers who can “solve problems, explicate them, and negotiate and collaborate with their colleagues” (p. 48). These descriptions of “academically literate behaviors,” in which the focus is on collaboration, negotiation, and conversation about texts, seems a perfect match for classroom book-club use. The following section will explore book clubs and their implementation in classrooms further.

**Book clubs.**

**History of book clubs.**

Although it is difficult to determine the dates of the earliest book clubs, people have discussed texts in groups at least since the invention of the printing press, and researcher Brian Stock (1983) describes “textual communities” in Europe as early as the twelfth century (pp. 90-91). Adult literature discussion groups in America are documented as dating back to 1634, when Puritan leader Anne Hutchinson began holding weekly meetings to discuss the Sunday sermon.
on the ship to the Massachusetts Bay Colony (Laskin & Hughes, 1995, p. 2). The all-female group continued meeting in Hutchinson’s Boston parlor, until Hutchinson was banished from the colony for “troubling the peace” during these heated discussions. Other less inflammatory colonial book clubs also met to talk about religious texts during this time period, and by 1800, documents exist from groups that were meeting to discuss non-religious texts as well. (The records from one all-female group indicate that they discussed *The History of Columbus*, George Frederic Watt’s *Treatise of the Mind*, and Benjamin Trumbull’s *Complete History of Connecticut*) (Laskin & Hughes, 1995, p. 3). In the 1830s, freed African-American women in eastern cities formed book discussion groups in order to educate themselves, and shortly afterwards women in the Midwest met for literary discussions in a similar bid for self-improvement (Laskin & Hughes, 1995, pp. 3-4). After the Civil War, book discussion groups burgeoned, and sociologist Elizabeth Long (2003) attributes this sharp increase in women’s literary clubs to their being “aflame with the then revolutionary desire for education and self-development” during a time period in which higher education was largely inaccessible to women (p. 38). According to Long (2003), by the end of the nineteenth century the focus of many of these discussion groups shifted to social reform (pp. 52-55). Some of the book clubs that originated in the late 1800s, however, still exist; the great- and great-great grandchildren of the founding members continue on the tradition (Laskin & Hughes, 1995, p. 9).

By World War I, another significant contributor to the book club movement in the United States was taking root. Professor John Erskine of Columbia University created a course in which he required the reading and discussion of the “great works” of western literature and philosophy. Laskin & Hughes (1995) point out that this curriculum was a “radical innovation” for the time, taking hold when Robert M. Hutchins and Mortimer J. Adler introduced the course at the
University of Chicago in 1929 (p. 10). Hutchins and Adler then took what became known as the Great Books idea to high schools and non-academic adult settings such as libraries, gymnasiums, and churches, maintaining that their “Great Books” were accessible to anyone willing to invest time in reading and discussing the works. By the 1950s, Hutchins and Adler’s Great Books Foundation officially registered 2700 groups and 50,000 participants in the United States (Laskin & Hughes, 1995, p. 11). A team of sociologists from the National Opinion Research Center conducted a survey of 1909 Great Books participants in 1957, determining that the average participants were “well-educated, high-status, socially active, youngish adults” who “were concerned about the intellectual narrowness of their lives and wanted not just knowledge of great authors but also contact with other group members who shared their intellectual orientations” (Laskin & Hughes, 1995, p. 12; National Opinion Research Center, 1960).

According to Long (2003), the Great Books movement has been declining since the 1960s, and there has been a shift away from its top-down, centrally organized structure in book clubs (p. 19). Long asserts that more grassroots-oriented book discussion groups have flourished since the decline of the Great Books movement. She particularly notes “an almost explosive growth” of female participants in informal reading groups since the 1980s (p. 19). Harvey Daniels (2002) provides statistics that support such a flourishing in adult book clubs in general: “In 1990, there were about 50,000 book clubs in the United States; by the turn of the millennium that number had just about doubled” (p. 3).

Daniels (2002) claims that concurrent with this explosion of adult book clubs in the general population was a marked increase of book clubs (also commonly referred to as literature circles, literature groups, and cooperative book discussion groups) in the classroom since the 1980s (p. 5). He has documented classroom book clubs in the United States, Australia, Asia, and
throughout Europe (Daniels, 2002, p. 2). He argues that teachers who were themselves involved in book clubs outside of the classroom began implementing them in the classroom with the goals of “transfer[ring] the energy, the depth of thought and emotion, the lifelong commitment to books and ideas” that they themselves experienced in book clubs (p. 3). The dramatic increase of book-club use by classroom instructors was further encouraged in 1996, when literature circles were officially endorsed by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the International Reading Association (IRA) in the national Standards for the English Language Arts (Daniels, 2002, p. 7). Daniels observes that many qualitative and quantitative research studies have been conducted since the 1990s demonstrating the benefits of using literature circles in the classroom. Many of these studies have focused on how book clubs can improve students’ scores on standardized tests (Daniels, 2002, pp. 7-8; and for examples of studies, see Avci & Yüksel, 2011; Klingner, Vaughn, & Schumm, 1998), while others have focused on interviews of instructors and participants to gauge student interest and motivation (for example, Dupuy, 1997; MacGillivray, Tse, & McQuillan, 1995).

Book club formats.

The long history of book discussion groups in a diversity of social contexts has given rise to a variety of book club formats. An assortment of “how-to” guides with suggestions for how to hold discussions, which styles of questions can be asked, what role discussion leaders might play, and what books should be read have inundated the market (see, for example, Laskin & Hughes, 1995; Long, 2003; Slezak, 2000). Similarly, a number of books on how to implement book clubs in the classroom are available (for example, Daniels, 2002; McMahon & Raphael, 1997; Vaille & QuinnWilliams, 2006). The most informal groups may meet irregularly, may not prepare questions beforehand, and may not choose to have a designated leader at meetings. Some
groups rotate leadership, and others have an assigned leader (or leaders) for a pre-specified number of meetings. If a group does choose to have leadership, the role of the leader may be relaxed; some leaders are responsible for preparing questions ahead of time and/or for keeping the conversation “on track,” whereas in other groups, it may be stipulated that leaders must facilitate the conversation but cannot answer the questions or weigh in on the discussion in any way.

The guides for putting book clubs into practice in the classroom also demonstrate an assortment of suggested formats. Harvey Daniels (2002) created one of the most popular standards for book groups in the classroom with his manual Literature Circles: Voice and Choice in Book Clubs and Reading Groups. In the 2002 edition of this guide, Daniels lays out “eleven key ingredients” for successful literature circles, including stipulations that the reading material is student-selected, groups meet on a regular schedule, students create the discussion topics, teachers serve as facilitators rather than as members or instructors, students make personal connections and digress with the goal of maintaining “open, natural conversations about books,” and “a spirit of playfulness and fun pervades the room” (p. 18, italics in original). A characteristic specific to Daniels’s literature circle paradigm is the use of “role sheets” to help scaffold students temporarily into the process of having a productive yet free-flowing small group discussion. Daniels is adamant that literature circles must give rise to what he refers to as natural free-flowing conversation – he instructs teachers to make it clear that students do not need to raise their hands to speak, that turn-taking does not progress around the circle with one speaker at a time, and that there is no requirement to cover all of the material on the role sheets (2002, p. 99). With that in mind, Daniels suggests that the teacher assign students rotating roles
with corresponding role sheets that students fill out prior to the discussion. The four basic roles that Daniels typically assigns, with descriptions in his own words, are as follows:

The *connector* role embodies what skillful readers most often do – they connect what they read to their own lives, their own feelings, their experiences, to the day’s headlines, to other books and authors.

The *questioner* is always wondering and analyzing: Where is this text going? Why do these characters act as they do? How did the author evoke this feeling? Is this a plausible outcome? Sometimes questioners seek to clarify or understand; at other moments, they may challenge or critique.

When we take the *literary luminary/passage master* role, we return to memorable, special, important sections of the text, to savor, reread, analyze, or share them aloud. The *illustrator* role reminds us that skillful reading requires visualizing, and it invites a graphic, nonlinguistic response to the text. (Daniels, 2002, p. 103)

Although a wide variety of models of book club use in the classroom exists, Daniels’s literature circle model is one of the most popular, sharing common traits with most other models: the desire to foster “natural” conversation, to include all of the student members in the discussion, and to encourage the students to make personal connections with the text in their discussions with their classmates. The book clubs analyzed in the current study were not as formally structured as Daniels’s literature circles in terms of student roles, but they were also not as informal as some groups. The structure of the book club group under discussion is briefly discussed later in this chapter and elaborated on more fully in Chapter 3.
Conversation analysis.

The analytical method used in this study for examining student book club discussions is conversation analysis (CA). Conversation analysts investigate naturally-occurring spoken interaction in a diversity of disciplines including applied linguistics, sociology, and anthropology. Prior to the 1960s, naturally-occurring language was considered too chaotic to study, but the collective work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson in the 1960s led to the development of a research methodology that could describe an “order of conversation” (ten Have, 2007, p. 5). Sacks and Schegloff, graduate students in Sociology at the University of California Berkeley, were influenced by the work of UC sociologist Erving Goffman. Goffman was interested in studying face-to-face interaction, often on the micro level; he investigated the organization of everyday human behavior, eventually labeling the phenomenon the “interaction order” (Goffman, 1983, 2). Drawing on Goffman’s work, but also influenced by anthropology, linguistics, and psychiatry, Sacks and Schegloff began to lay the groundwork for the research technique that was to develop into CA (ten Have, 2007, p. 5). Also in the 1960s, sociologist Harold Garfinkel (1967) was developing ethnomethodology, an approach that explores how humans construct order via social interaction in everyday activities. In *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Garfinkel describes ethnomethodology as a process of “paying to the most commonplace activities of daily life the attention usually accorded extraordinary events, seek[ing] to learn about them as phenomena in their own right” (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 1). This minute attention to everyday interactions meshed well with Sacks’s research, and provided further impetus for Sacks’s development of CA (ten Have, 2007, p. 6).

Paul ten Have’s *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide* (2007) is a well-regarded manual for researchers using CA as a data analysis method. Ten Have delineates four
significant characteristics of CA that distinguish it from other methodologies within sociology and the other social sciences. Briefly, these characteristics are as follows: (a) CA works on a micro scale by analyzing fine-grained details in conversation; (b) CA analyzes naturally occurring conversation; (c) CA understands conversation as emergent and collaboratively organized; and (d) CA studies oral language as actually used and therefore differs from "more traditional forms of linguistics [that] are mainly based on written language, strictly following normative rules of correct usage" (ten Have, 2007, pp. 9-10). Conversation analysts transcribe and examine details such as overlapped speech, timed pauses, and intonation. They then analyze phenomenon such as how the conversants establish patterns for turns at talk, how they organize sequences of turns, and how they repair "breakdowns" in understanding.

A researcher using a CA approach does not begin with a rigidly defined research question in the same way that a quantitative approach would require. Ten Have suggests a spiraling approach in which earlier stages of research are tentatively designed in anticipation of later work; the researcher, however, must be open to the actual data taking him or her in a different direction than is anticipated (2007, p. 68). Throughout the research collection and analysis, the research questions will relate generally to how talk-in-interaction is organized, though the researcher may have more specific questions in mind as well.

The researcher typically follows at least four steps when using CA: (a) collecting recordings of natural interaction, (b) transcribing the recordings, (c) analyzing segments of the transcript, and (d) reporting the research (ten Have, 2007, p. 68). The data collection begins with either recording natural interactions or obtaining previously-recorded examples of natural interactions. Harvey Sacks’s (1967) preliminary CA work used previously-recorded audio recordings of phone calls to a suicide prevention center. Some researchers prefer previously-
recorded data such as these phone calls because the conversations of the interactants are not influenced by the participants knowing that they are part of a study. Other researchers, however, argue that the interactants are only minimally influenced during CA data collection and that the ability to collect data in a location of the researcher’s choice outweighs the concerns of influence (ten Have, 2007, pp. 81-83).

In traditional CA, the recordings of naturally occurring interaction and the researcher’s transcripts of these recordings are the sole data used. According to ten Have:

CA’s insistence on the use of audio or video recordings of episodes of ‘naturally occurring’ interaction as their basic data is, indeed, quite unique in the social sciences and means that some of the most common data sources are not used, or at least not as ‘core data.’ (ten Have, 2007, p. 73)

Thus, interviews, researcher observations, and other common ethnographic data collection techniques are not allowable in pure CA. John Heritage and J. Maxwell Atkinson (1984) argue that data collection techniques such as interviews, observation notes, and “unaided intuitions” are too dependent on the researcher’s subjective choices; they state, “Data of this sort can always be viewed as the implausible products of selective processes involving recollection, attention, or imagination” (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984, p. 3). Any observations about speaker identity, setting, and institutional hierarchy (e.g., teacher/student or doctor/patient) can only emerge through the talk-in-interaction.

The effectiveness of the CA approach, with its focus on naturally-occurring conversation at a microanalytical level and its evolution from an interdisciplinary mix of multiple social sciences, is evidenced by its growth since the 1960s. Douglas Maynard (2013) claims that the growth “can only be charted in exponential terms and is a remarkable accomplishment” (p. 11),
and Tanya Stivers and Jack Sidnell (2013) state, “[Now] CA is the dominant approach to the study of human social interaction across the disciplines of Sociology, Linguistics, and Communication” (p. 1). CA analysis also has been used in a variety of settings; for example, Stivers and Sidnell discuss CA’s use in classrooms, courtrooms, news interviews, and medical facilities (2013, p. 7). Because CA is a well-recognized, rigorous approach to language interaction, it is an appropriate choice for the current study on naturally-occurring language use.

**Community of practice.**

This study is grounded in the learning theory known as community of practice (CoP), developed by anthropologists Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991). Lave and Wenger define a CoP as a group of individuals who are working together towards a common goal, such as learning a skill or taking part in a shared profession. Participants learn together in a socially collaborative endeavor over a period of time. They share strategies, insights, and innovations as part of the learning process. Etienne Wenger-Trayner and Beverly Wenger-Trayner (2016) provide the following examples:

Communities of practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavor: a tribe learning to survive, a band of artists seeking new forms of expression, a group of engineers working on similar problems, a clique of pupils defining their identity in the school, a network of surgeons exploring novel techniques, a gathering of first-time managers helping each other to cope.

In a nutshell: communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly. (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2016, para. 4-5)
E. Wenger-Trayner and B. Wenger-Trayner (2016) cite three aspects that must be present in a group in order for it to be defined as a CoP: (a) domain (a CoP has “an identity defined by a shared domain of interest”); (b) community (members share information and participate together in activities related to the domain); and (c) practice (members are practitioners who “develop a shared repertoire of resources”) (para. 7-9). A CoP can be situated either within or outside of a classroom context, as long as it fulfills these three criteria. In fact, the earliest CoP studies (Lave & Wenger, 1991) focused on learning that occurred outside of the classroom, emphasizing the socialization of members into their workplaces and community organizations (such as Alcoholics Anonymous) (Hellermann, 2008, p. 6).

Learners within a CoP have varying degrees of knowledge about the shared domain of interest. Lave and Wenger refer to newcomers and old-timers in the community, with the core of the group typically being composed of old-timers, and newcomers being peripheral members. As they participate more within the CoP and gain knowledge and resources from the old-timers, newcomers may develop a more central position in the core of the group in conjunction with learning more about the domain of interest. The availability of resources and the potential for learning for a particular member depends on that member’s position within the community.

John Hellermann, an applied linguist who has grounded much of his research in community of practice theory, contends that the use of CoP in classroom research has provided both researchers and instructors with a new perspective on classroom learning (2008, p. 2). Hellermann observes that when researchers and instructors examine interactional routines in the classroom over time, there is a tendency to shift from understanding learning as purely a process of transmittal of knowledge from teacher to student. He states that instead, “[t]his richer vision has allowed us to reconsider learning in the classroom as co-constructing knowledge through
interaction” (Hellermann, 2008, p. 2). When viewed through the CoP lens, group members demonstrate learning either in or out of the classroom by their changing patterns of participation. Old-timers model and mentor newcomers, participants collaborating on the processes for reaching the group’s goal; learning is “dynamic and shared” (Hellermann, 2008, p. 7). Thus, in the context of ESL students discussing a text in a book club, when students develop interactional routines to converse about a text in their target language, they are demonstrating learning and literacy development.

**Research Question**

The formal statement of this study’s research question is found in Chapter 4, but I will provide a brief overview of the question addressed by this study before turning to a literature review in Chapter 2. As discussed earlier, when taking a CA approach, analysts do not enter the study with a preconceived notion of what questions they will ask. Rather, analysts record conversations, meticulously transcribe those conversations, and then immerse themselves in the transcribed data to see what patterns or structures become apparent. In transcribing and reviewing the six book club sessions, two particularly interesting interactional phenomena appeared, both related to how the three students enacted transitions during their discussions.

Some background information on how the book clubs were structured is pertinent before I frame the research question. The book club group in this study included three adult ESL students who had chosen to read J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone*. Each week, one student was assigned to be the book club “leader,” meaning that s/he prepared four

---

4 In the current study, although all of the adult ESL students could be perceived as newcomers in the book club, one student had some background experience in small-group discussions in American university classes. The data and analysis in chapter 4 will demonstrate how she acted as an old-timer through her mentorship of the two other students in the development of one of their group routines.
written questions about that week’s reading. The student was asked to bring copies of those questions for each group member and to turn in a copy of the questions to the instructor for evaluation. During the 20-30 minute book club, the students were asked to discuss all four of the student-prepared questions. The leader role rotated each week, meaning that each of the three students served as leader twice during the six weeks. Prior to the start of the book club cycle, the instructor had modeled book club discussions through having the students read some short stories and then having the group brainstorm potential questions that could be asked about those stories. An emphasis was placed on creating and asking open-ended questions in order to facilitate discussion. Unlike the literature circle model espoused by Harvey Daniels and mentioned earlier in the background info, students were not assigned additional roles such as “connector,” “questioner,” or “illustrator”; the leader was the only assigned role, and this role did not explicitly entail any duties other than writing the four prepared open-ended questions and bringing copies of them to class.

When I sifted through the data, two particularly interesting phenomena emerged. Both relate to the interactional routines that the students developed to transition from one topic (one prepared discussion question) to the next. Transitions from one topic to another are an important focus of research within CA (for example, Beach, 1993; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The interactional routines that the students developed in order to enact their transitions in their discussions have interest both from a linguistic and a pedagogic point of view. Transitions from one question to the next could have been formally and explicitly accomplished by the assigned leader through an utterance such as: “Has everyone answered this question? (pause) Good! Let’s move on to the next question.” This formal transition style does not happen in the current data, however. Instead, all three students construct the transitions collaboratively as they close down
The study analyzes two distinct strategies that the students use—
one relating to the development of a routine for reading the prepared questions aloud, and one
relating to preferred transition markers—for successfully transitioning from topic to topic. The
research question, therefore, is what interactional routines these three students develop in order
to transition from one topic to the next during the six weeks of their book club discussions. When
students develop these interactional routines, they demonstrate literacy development in their
target language. By navigating this co-construction of conversation in the process of discussing
*Harry Potter*, students develop tactics essential in other English-language conversations—in
American academic settings, and, arguably, in non-academic settings as well.

**Summary and Organization**

The next chapter (Chapter 2) will provide a detailed literature review of L1 and L2 book
club research as well as research using CA in both L1 and L2 book clubs. Gaps in the extant
literature will also be presented. Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the research site,
participants, and methods for data collection. Chapter 4 includes the presentation and analysis of
data, the implications of the findings, general conclusions, and opportunities for future research.
The appendices include the transcripts of the six weeks of data collection, a key to the
transcription symbols, the student-generated questions from the book club discussions, the
equipment used for data collection, and the consent forms used to obtain student consent.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

This study describes how adult ESL students demonstrate literacy development as they establish interactional routines during weekly book club discussions of *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone*. This chapter provides a literature review of current research relating to (a) book club use in L1 and L2 classrooms, and (b) a broader survey of CA studies in L2 language classrooms. This literature review will provide necessary background information for the current study, and through the identification of gaps in the extant literature, the review will demonstrate how applying a CA approach to adult ESL book club discussions will yield fresh and meaningful insights to the literature on classroom book clubs.

Studies Investigating Book Club Use in L1 and L2 Classrooms

As mentioned in Chapter 1, classroom book club use saw a dramatic increase in the 1990s. In 1996, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the International Reading Association (IRA) officially endorsed literature circles for classroom use (Daniels, 2002, p. 7). With this rapid growth came a number of both quantitative and qualitative research studies aimed at demonstrating the benefits of literature circle use in the classroom.

Quantitative studies of classroom book club use typically look to measure whether student participation in book clubs raises their standardized test scores. For example, Janette Klingner, Sharon Vaughn, and Jeanne Schumm (1998) investigated the impact on students’ test scores when teachers included a specific cooperative learning approach to social studies reading in an elementary classroom. This cooperative learning approach incorporated several elements of book clubs – the discussion groups were composed of a small number of students and were student-led over the course of eleven days (Klingner et al., 1998, p.3). Student participants included both native English speakers and ELL students. Through a statistical analysis of test
scores, the researchers determined that students who took part in the discussion groups showed gains both in reading comprehension and content knowledge. A discourse analysis of the students’ discussions tallied the following breakdown of topics for student discourse: 65% was academic and content-related, 25% was procedural, 8% was feedback, and 2% was unrelated (p. 15). This study thus aimed at providing a quantitative justification for the incorporation of student-led textual discussions in the classroom.

A study conducted in Istanbul by Süleyman Avci and Arzu Yüksel (2011) combined quantitative and qualitative methods for exploring the impact of literature circle use in a fourth-grade class in a private elementary school. Seventy-two students were placed into traditional literature circles of eight students each, with each group meeting a total of seven times. Teachers assigned the students roles in the book clubs as suggested by Harvey Daniels’s (2002) literature circle approach; the eight roles were interrogator, mapper, word-hunter, plotter, connector, summarizer, analyzer, and observer (Avci & Yüksel, 2011, p. 1297). The researchers conducted pre-tests and post-tests on student reading comprehension, finding that reading comprehension increased after literature circle participation, with the greatest gains being found in students who had the lowest reading comprehension skills in the pre-test (p. 1297). The researchers also conducted five-question interviews with the students and instructors involved in the study. They found that both students and instructors reported that the literature circles were useful. Students felt that they had read the books more meticulously in preparation for literature circle discussions than if they had only been reading for individual use; they also had opportunities during group discussion to clarify any textual misunderstandings that had developed during their individual reading (pp. 1297-1298). Instructors and students both maintained that the students emerged from the book clubs with a better understanding of the text. Students contended that this greater
understanding stemmed from the combination of the group discussions, the discussion of minute
details, and the lengthy period of time spent reading the book. Students reported that the
literature circles helped them to develop better reading habits; one student who was new to the
school stated the benefits of social interaction with new classmates as a result of the literature
circles (p. 1298).

These two quantitative studies are representative of several other studies that compare
standardized test scores and survey results from students before and after they have participated
in book clubs. For other such studies, see Blum, Lipsett, and Yocum (2002), which focuses on
reading gains made by special needs students in inclusive classrooms using literature circles;
Mizerka (1999), which compares reading comprehension results from sixth-grade students
participating in student-directed and teacher-directed literature circles using the California
Achievement test; and Chiang and Huang (2005), which investigates student responses to pre-
and post-literature-circle surveys for freshman English as foreign language (EFL) students in a
university in Taiwan.

Qualitative studies often rely on interviews or reflections by instructors and students who
have taken part in book clubs in the classroom. Burda (2000), for example, writes of her own
experience implementing classroom literature circles for four years. She relates frustrations and
insights while discussing anecdotes about how literature circles encouraged students to develop
better reading habits. Pitton (2005) investigated literature circle use in a middle-school
classroom, exploring how participation in literature circles impacted the students’ interest in
reading as well as student collaboration and interaction. Pitton surveyed 66 students before and
after their participation in literature circles and found that while some students preferred small-
group literature circle discussions, others were partial to whole-class literature discussions led by
a classroom teacher (Pitton, 2005, pp. 91-93). Based upon these results, Pitton argues for a balance in curriculum design that takes into account individual student preferences and learning styles, stating that literature circles encourage students who are more comfortable in small-group settings and in actively collaborating with their peers, whereas whole-class discussions of texts cater to students who are uncomfortable in the small-group collaboration (Pitton, 2005, p. 93).

Several other qualitative studies investigate the usefulness of book clubs in non-traditional classroom environments or with non-mainstream student populations. For example, Hill and Van Horn (1995) studied book club meetings with at-risk youth at a juvenile detention center, using field notes, transcriptions of conversations, and student journals to determine that the book clubs promoted student cooperation during group discussions and also helped the students to gain a greater understanding of social justice (p. 187). A study led by Pardo (1992) explored book club use in a fifth-grade inner-city classroom, relying upon field notes from the teacher and university researchers, as well as audiotapes and videotapes of some of the student groups. The study showed that students who participated in book clubs showed improvement over time in their abilities to participate in whole-class discussions and write reflectively about texts. Rutherford et al. (2009) provide survey results from students, instructors, and parents at a reading summer camp in which literature circles were used. The surveys indicated that most students felt motivated and excited about reading in ways that they had not before the camp. The researchers attribute this engagement with the students’ having been able to select their own literature to read as well as to their participation in the group discussions at the camp. According to Rutherford et al. (2009), the summer camp succeeded in reaching its primary goal of promoting a long-term love of reading through the use of literature circles (2009, p. 47).
The studies presented in this section are a cross-section of the many quantitative and qualitative studies on book clubs that exist in the scholarly literature. As illustrated by the studies discussed here, the vast majority of extant literature related to book club use focuses on elementary or middle-school-aged students, either in the classroom or in non-traditional classroom environments. As indicated above, the quantitative studies chiefly focus on students’ improved test scores and reading comprehension after book club participation, and the qualitative studies primarily rely upon interviews, surveys, or journals to determine student and teacher attitudes towards the book club experience. Far fewer studies -- either quantitative or qualitative -- exist that investigate book club use in the L2 university classroom. Because that student population is the focus of the current study, the next section will summarize the current research relating to classroom book clubs with second-language university students.

Studies Investigating Literature Discussions with L2 University Students

Dupuy’s (1997) study surveyed 49 U.S. university students studying intermediate French. These students were given the opportunity to self-select French literature to read and discuss in a literature-circle format. The class format was similar in many ways to that of the current study: the class met twice a week for 90 minutes with their literature circles meeting weekly, students decided as a group how far to read each week, and the instructor gave fairly minimal direction as to how the students should frame their discussions (Dupuy, 1997, p. 14). Dupuy reports that at first the students were uncertain as to how to proceed in their textual discussions, but with some instructor intervention early on, they soon advanced to leading their own book clubs independently (p. 14). The post-literature-circle survey conducted by Dupuy resulted in three primary findings: (a) students reported that the literature circles helped to create what Dupuy refers to as a “social/intellectual forum,” with 97% of the students saying that the book club...
discussions enhanced their comprehension of the texts and 100% stating that their peers’ reflections offered insights about the texts that they had not thought of themselves; (b) 91% of students acknowledged that literature circles had increased their confidence when reading in their target language, because discussions with peers confirmed that they had gleaned the main ideas in their reading; and (c) 97% of students reported that literature circles increased their enjoyment of reading in their target language and the likelihood that they would continue to read in the target language once the class was completed (Dupuy, 1997, pp. 14-15). Dupuy’s study thus demonstrates specific benefits of literature circle use in a university population, but the research emphasis is quite different from the current study in that there is no form of analysis of the students’ textual discussions.

Myonghee Kim’s (2004) study also focused on L2 university students and investigated the discourse of adult ESL learners in literature circles with classroom discourse analysis. Kim studied the students’ discussions to explore (a) how much the students interacted with the text and with their peers; (b) what themes arose in the literature discussions; and (c) how the discussions impacted the students’ L2 development (Kim, 2004, p. 147). The nine participants in this study were advanced ESL students enrolled in a course that met for two hours a day with the goal of preparing students for undergraduate or graduate coursework in the United States (p. 148). Data collection included audiotapes with broad transcriptions (e.g. no timing of pauses or intonation), field notes, and interviews. Kim found that the students collaborated during literature circles to understand the plot of the novel that they were reading, that they drew personal connections to the story as they discussed it in their groups, and that they evaluated the text critically (Kim, 2004, pp. 150-159). In response to the third research question (how the discussions impacted the students’ L2 development), Kim found that student-initiated, open-
ended questions were routinely posed and then answered (p. 160). Kim argues that such interactions are “authentic”\textsuperscript{5} (as defined by Breen, 1985; Widdowson, 1990) and contends that the literature circle discussions thus engaged the students and allowed them to practice speaking in their target language in a meaningful way (Kim, 2004, p. 160). Through discourse analysis, Kim also claims that students showed high responsiveness as evidenced by a high level of student “uptake,” a phenomenon in which an utterance directly makes reference to or quotes a part of a previous utterance (as described by Cazden, 1988, p. 85; Collins, 1982) (Kim, 2004, p. 160). Kim asserts that because student discussions demonstrated both authenticity and responsiveness, their participation in literature circles provided the students with the opportunity to engage in more meaningful extended discourse in their target language than in more traditional, teacher-fronted classroom discussions (Kim, 2004, p. 161).

Another study that employs a form of discourse analysis was conducted by Boyd and Maloof (2000). These researchers analyzed whole-class literature discussions among undergraduate and graduate international ESL students at a southern U.S. university. Even though the students were not participating in small book club groups, the study is pertinent because the whole-class discussions of “Theme for English B” by Langston Hughes, “Aria” by Richard Rodriguez, and “How to Tame a Wild Tongue” by Gloria Anzaldua demonstrated an unusually high percentage of student talk (68% of lesson talk) (Boyd & Maloof, 2000, p. 171). This finding was especially striking because prior to the literature discussions, these students had not been expected to engage in classroom talk; instead, classroom participation had been solely

\textsuperscript{5} Breen (1985) writes that “perhaps the most authentic language learning tasks are those which require the learner to undertake communication and meta-communication. The assumption here is that genuine communication during learning and meta-communication about learning and about the language are likely to help the learner to learn” (p. 68). For a critical discussion and a different approach to the study of “authentic” language, see the description of Junko Mori’s (2002) study later in this chapter.
based upon homework completion and listening to lectures (p. 168). Boyd and Maloof used audiotapes and broad transcriptions to analyze how the teacher encouraged such a high degree of student talk. The teacher selectively acknowledged and included student-initiated vocabulary in her statements to the class (Boyd & Maloof, 2005, p. 178). The teacher was thus both modeling and extending student utterances, thereby creating a classroom environment conducive to a high level of student talk.

Other articles on literature circles and literature discussions in university-level L2 classrooms primarily offer suggestions for implementing classroom management strategies without providing a microanalysis of the efficacy of literature circles. Intended primarily for a teaching audience, these articles make claims of greater student engagement and increased chances for training up lifelong readers (see, for example, Hsu, 2004; Xiaoshi, 2005). The existence of these articles indicates that book clubs and literature circles have many advocates among university-level L2 instructors and curriculum designers.

**Studies Using Conversation Analysis to Analyze Book Club Discussions**

All of the studies described thus far have presented findings that support the use of book club and literature discussions in L1 and L2 classrooms. These studies have used, often in combination, statistical analyses and qualitative analyses of student surveys, teacher surveys, standardized scores, and interviews, as well as analyses of participants’ classroom talk. The researchers have reported higher test scores, greater student engagement, more authentic classroom conversation, and higher percentages of student talk during classroom lessons. The general consensus of these studies is that book clubs are a very effective teaching tool in both L1 and L2 classrooms.
Although Kim (2004) and Boyd and Maloof (2000) used broad transcriptions and discourse analysis to investigate student and teacher talk during literature discussions, no studies described thus far have used conversation analysis (CA) to provide a microanalysis of student interactions during book club discussions. In fact, only one study was found in which a researcher applied CA to book club discussions. Peplow (2011) uses CA and community of practice (CoP) theory to analyze adult L1 interaction in a non-classroom-based book club group. Specifically, Peplow investigates how the book club members presented their interpretations of the book club text as legitimate. He contends that over the course of several meetings, the group developed specific ways of talking about the books, including methods for offering their own interpretations of the reading to the group. He focuses on three features of the readers’ interactions: category entitlement, the oh preface, and X then Y structures (Peplow, 2011, p. 301). Because Peplow’s study is the sole study found to use CA with book clubs, I deem it worthwhile to provide an in-depth explanation of his methodology and the three interactional features that he describes.

The participants in the study were six L1-English speakers voluntarily taking part in a book club group that met every two months to discuss short stories or novels. Peplow recorded and transcribed their dialogue from a single meeting, in which they discussed “The Dead” by James Joyce and “Karain: A Memory” by Joseph Conrad, and he also conducted interviews with the participants. He found evidence in their conversations of the three features – category entitlement, the oh preface, and X then Y structures – when the members were offering literary interpretations. Category entitlement maintains that people with certain backgrounds, in the right situations, are automatically perceived as more knowledgeable and insightful in a discussion. Peplow provides the following examples:
Someone who has traveled on the Congo would be expected to bring a different perspective to a meeting on *Heart of Darkness*, while someone who has been married to an adulterous partner might be anticipated to illuminate a discussion of *Madame Bovary*.

(Peplow, 2011, p. 301)

Peplow references the work of Potter (1996), who found that during a conversation, category entitlement must continually be developed and displayed by the speakers (Potter, 1996, pp. 137-140). Even during a single book club meeting, the readers in Peplow’s study frequently drew upon aspects of their personal identities to add legitimacy to their textual interpretations. For example, while discussing Conrad’s “Karain,” a short story set in Malaysia, a book club member who had just returned from Malaysia rapidly established greater credibility when talking about certain parts of the story (Peplow, 2011, p. 302).

The second feature that Peplow investigates is the book club members’ use of the *oh* particle in establishing interpretive legitimacy. For instance, when the book club members debate about the character Gabriel from “The Dead,” the following sequence of utterances develops:

1. S6: = [but don’t] you think that the fact that his anger (0.5) and embarrassment over Michael Furey turns into an understanding
2. S5: = mmm
3. S3: → oh I think he has an understanding

(Peplow, 2011, p. 305)

Peplow analyzes the exchange between S6 and S3 as a debate with S6 acting as a questioner and S3 being in the role of answerer. Because S6 frames his turn in line 1 as a negative interrogative, S3’s preferred response in line 3 would be an agreement token such as “yes” if she were offering
absolute agreement. However, S3’s use of the *oh* particle allows her to offer partial agreement with S6 instead. Peplow writes:

The ‘oh’ allows S3 to acknowledge the correctness of the view embedded in S6’s question (thereby avoiding the potentially tricky business of articulating a ‘dispreferred’ disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984) and show that she had independently arrived at the view that Gabriel had an ‘understanding’ of his wife’s situation. S3’s turn, therefore . . . appeas[es] S6 by agreeing with him, whilst also showing that she is capable of reaching her own interpretation. (Peplow, 2011, p. 305)

Peplow offers several other examples of this *oh* particle being used by book club members while they debate over competitive interpretations of the text. He contends that it serves as an indication of a speaker’s claim to greater rights to interpret the text (p. 306).

Peplow claims that the third feature, which he refers to as the *X then Y* structure, is used by participants to make their textual interpretations seem disinterested and unprejudiced (p. 306). When offering an interpretation, Peplow’s book club members want that interpretation to be considered as well-reasoned and neutral, rather than “superficial and shallow” (p. 306). *X then Y* structures, which take the form “At first I thought *X*, then I realized *Y*” (p. 307), have been shown in previous studies to be used when speakers wish to appear dispassionate or even to establish normality; Wooffitt (1992, 2005), for example, established their use in conversations with people who were recounting experiences with the paranormal. In the single meeting that Peplow analyzed, he found eight instances of the *X then Y* structure (p. 307). The example given here developed during the group’s debate on “The Dead” and references S1’s interpretation of Gabriel’s mental state:
S1: X we – well when I first read it I thought he was very sad and very depressed (0.5) but having read it [since]

S6: [yeah]

S1: and and knowing er what you said about the er Irish soul enjoying melancholy [then]

S6: [mmm]

S1: Y I I think there’s hope there (0.5) and I think it’s because the snow is settling on everybody (0.5) everybody is going to live and then die

(Peplow, 2011, p. 308)

S1 refers to having read the story twice during her X statement. Peplow comments that several of the examples of the X then Y structure in the book club meeting employ this technique, with the participants claiming a change of opinion and thereby greater insight into the text with each additional reading (p. 308). In line 3, S1 adds an explanation as to what altered her change of understanding with the second reading (her learning that the Irish soul enjoys melancholy), and then in line 5 she offers her interpretation (that there is hope because of the settling snow) as the Y component of the X then Y structure. Rather than offering her interpretation about the snow signifying hope, S1 frames the interpretation in the more complex X then Y structure. Peplow argues that each time the speakers use this structure, they establish greater legitimacy for their textual interpretation, and, more generally, Peplow asserts that the group routinely draws upon the three features described here during the course of their book club meetings to “lend greater validity to their interpretations” (p. 309).
As can be seen by Peplow’s study, the application of a CA approach to a book club discussion – paying attention to the minute details of the spoken interaction – yields insights about how the participants co-construct the conversation that would be lost through other analytic methods. Peplow uses his findings about the linguistic patterns developed within the book club to conclude that interpretation within a reading group is a social act (Peplow, 2011, p. 310). He argues, “The shared repertoire established in a reading group over multiple meetings governs what is acceptable to say and how best to say it, thus greatly influencing (and perhaps even constituting) the content of the interpretations offered” (p. 310). Furthermore, the findings suggest that there is a pragmatic aspect of language use that develops within the context of a book club. Although Peplow’s study focuses on native English speakers discussing L1 texts in their native language, it could be argued that L2 students who develop their own linguistic patterns when discussing texts in a book club context are developing literacy and spoken-language skills that are a meaningful and necessary aspect of learning their target language. This current study investigates the development of these interactional skills for L2 students, and thus not only adds to the currently tiny corpus of CA data on book clubs, but also provides unique insights into how L2 students demonstrate literacy development through the development of their interactional routines in the book clubs.

Studies Using Conversation Analysis to Investigate Discussions in L2 Classrooms

Several studies use CA to investigate other forms of L2 classroom interaction, two of which are especially pertinent to this thesis: Junko Mori’s (2002) analysis of talk-in-interaction during a small-group activity in a Japanese L2 classroom and John Hellermann’s (2006) investigation of L2 literacy development in two adult L2 English students. Both of these studies will now be described to glean how the authors made use of CA to explore second-language
acquisition in their respective classrooms. Junko Mori (2002) observed the classroom conversations of university students studying Japanese as a foreign language. Mori used CA as a tool to gauge how “natural” and “authentic” the students’ interactions were during two classroom activities that had been designed specifically to give students the opportunity to engage in such natural, unstructured conversations. Students were tasked with preparing discussion questions about family life in Japan and then using those questions to lead a discussion with native Japanese speakers. Through the application of CA to the student talk, however, she found that the classroom activity did not yield the natural interactions that the teacher had intended.

Mori notes that a current trend in second-language classrooms is for teachers to design task-based lessons that provide students with the opportunity to engage in “real-life interaction.” Such lessons are commonly being privileged over the more traditional “teacher-fronted” activities (Mori, 2002, p. 323). However, Mori observes astutely that the definitions of “authentic” and “natural,” when applied to language, can be problematic. Drawing on the work of Cook (1997, 2000), Kramsch and Sullivan (1996), and Sullivan (2000), Mori points out that “authentic” and “natural” language is typically defined as that used by native speakers, and that it “raise[s] questions as to whose words, rules of interpretation, and discourse conventions comprise authentic language” (Mori, 2002, p. 325). In an attempt to address this issue, Mori draws upon conversation analysts’ descriptions of naturally-occurring mundane conversations and institutional talk, comparing these analyses with student conversations during their classroom task and their pre-task planning (p. 326).

In the comparison, Mori found that the students’ discussions took on a structure much more similar to an interview than a natural conversation. Although the teacher referred to the task-based activity as a zandankai, which implies a group discussion without the enforcement of
formal structures (p. 328), the majority of the interactions between the students and the native speakers followed a question-answer format that lacked the common structures of a mundane conversation illustrated here:

1st Pair Part A: ((Question))
2nd Pair Part B: ((Answer))
3rd Pair Part A: ((Acknowledgement or Evaluation of the Answer))

or

1st Pair Part A: ((Question))
2nd Pair Part B: ((Answer))
3rd Pair Part B: ((Returning the Same or a Similar Question\(^6\)))

or

1st Pair Part A: ((Question))
2nd Pair Part B: ((Answer))
3rd Pair Part B: ((Telling/Question on a shifted focus\(^7\)))

(Mori, 2002, p. 331)

During the \textit{zakankai}, the students asked the first-pair part, the native speaker answered in the second-pair part, and occasionally the students provided a minimal acknowledgement in the third-pair part (e.g., producing a reactive token such as \textit{hun} or nodding the head with no accompanying verbal utterance) (p. 331). The students then most frequently moved directly to their next pre-planned question, and as Mori notes, many of those questions did not tie into the

\(^6\) Mori provides the following example of this type of interchange: “How are you?” “Fine. And you?” (Mori, 2002, p. 331).

\(^7\) In this interaction, after the respondent provides an answer, he or she shifts the topic and either asks a new question based on the shifted topic or initiates what is referred to as a telling on the shifted topic (Mori, 2002, p. 331).
prior responses. The lack of more elaborate responses, or of demonstration of the other third-pair parts illustrated above, led Mori to conclude that the interactants did not treat the discussion as an ordinary conversation (p. 332). The application of CA to these conversations, then, shed light on the fact that the instructor’s goal of giving the students an opportunity to engage in natural conversation with native speakers did not succeed.

Mori also explored the students’ conversations during the pre-task planning that took place the week before the zadankai. She found that most students followed the linear order of the instructor’s requirements and created a series of questions or statements designed to convey the essential information. Most did not, however, consider how to encourage a naturally-flowing discussion during the event (Mori, 2002, p. 334). She concludes that the students thus oriented to the “information-transfer aspect of the task” (p. 339). Although the pre-planning time allowed them to develop more sophisticated ideas and forms for their questions, it did not enable them to develop strategies for fostering naturally-occurring conversations with the invited guests. Mori also notes that although in some respects the zadankai succeeded in exposing the students to “authentic” language in terms of pronunciation, intonation, syntax, and semantics, as well as in terms of obtaining meaningful information from the native speakers, it did not succeed in providing the students with exposure to the natural flow of conversation with native speakers. She concludes by stating:

while the critique of traditional teacher-fronted instruction has motivated the field to introduce tasks such as the one examined in this study into language classrooms, task-based instruction still may not guarantee its capability for simulating real-life, non-institutional interaction as described by CA. (Mori, 2002, p. 340)
Indeed, Mori observes that in her analyses, the students’ pre-planning session actually demonstrated more natural, coherent conversations in the L2 than were found during the zadankai (p. 341).

Mori’s study illustrates how the application of CA to L2 classroom interactions can generate insights about curriculum design and its impact on student literacy development that are not accessible with other research methodologies. It is probable that had Mori conducted a survey or interviews of the students, instructor, and classroom guests after the zadankai, they would have all reported favorably upon the classroom exercise. These hypothetical reports would have been accurate in many respects; as noted earlier, the students had the opportunity to communicate with native Japanese speakers and learn more about their culture, as well as experience exposure to native pronunciation, intonation, and syntax. However, the reports may not have revealed that one of the instructor’s explicit goals – that of engaging the students in a naturally-occurring “authentic” conversation with native Japanese speakers – was not met. Similar insights about classroom interactions can be anticipated with the application of CA to the book club discussions in the current study.

A second study of particular interest in light of its similarity to the current study is John Hellermann’s (2006) investigation that uses CA in combination with a CoP perspective to trace the literacy development of two adult beginning ESL students during their interactions in a modified Sustained Silent Reading (mSSR) program. Specifically, Hellermann’s study demonstrates how the two students from different cultural and educational backgrounds became socialized into three classroom literacy events during the mSSR program: book selection, opening post-reading retellings, and completing and filing reading logs (Hellermann, 2006, p. 377). Hellermann asserts that the students in his study – working adults interacting in an L2
classroom in a *lingua franca* who also needed to use English every day outside of the classroom – are underrepresented in applied linguistics research (p. 378). Significantly, Hellermann states:

[T]his study starts from the theoretical perspective that a primary goal of language learning is becoming competent interactionally, and that this competence is achieved through socialization into language. This theoretical perspective seems especially important for understanding working adult immigrant language learning as the learners on whom this study focuses need competence to engage in social practices both within and outside of the classroom in a variety of situations. (Hellermann, 2006, p. 378)

Hellermann’s theoretical perspective speaks directly to the current study. Although only one of the three students was working in the community at the time of the book club meetings, all of the students were immersed in day-to-day social interactions in a primarily English-speaking community both in and out of the classroom.

Hellermann audiotaped and videotaped the two adult ESL students in his study over the course of thirty weeks during their participation in the mSSR program, and then used CA to analyze both verbal and non-verbal interactions, emphasizing not only spoken utterances but also detailed descriptions of body posture, gesture, and gaze. During the classroom mSSR period, students were expected to self-select a book to read in English from the classroom book cart, read silently, tell a peer what they had read, fill in a reading log, and file that log alphabetically in a file box (Hellermann, 2006, pp. 382-392). Hellerman describes how, during the book selection process of the mSSR, one of the students progressed from merely grabbing a random book from the book cart and reading it for the full twenty minutes on the first day, to self-selecting an appropriate book from the cart by week four, to bringing his own reading material from home by the second and third terms of instruction (Hellermann, 2006, pp. 382-383).
Hellermann argues that the student’s progress with selecting appropriate reading material demonstrates literacy development; the ability to discriminate among several texts to find one that is at a reasonable reading level and that captures the student’s interest is an integral part of developing literacy in the target language. Furthermore, Hellermann explains that the student’s literacy development came about by his participation in the classroom’s community of practice (CoP). The teacher’s daily instructions and his classmates’ daily participation in the book selection process gave this student the opportunity “to move from having somewhat limited participation in the event in the beginning of the first term of the mSSR (selecting a book without looking at it) to more complete participation by the end of the term” (Hellermann, 2006, p. 383). To further illustrate the student’s progress, Hellermann describes how by the first day of the second term, the student helped the teacher set the books out during the book selection process. He also explained to a new student (in Spanish) how the book selection process and the mSSR activity as a whole worked (Hellermann, 2006, p. 383). From a CoP perspective, the student had successfully shifted from newcomer status to old-timer status, and Hellermann asserts that the student’s offer of support to a new student “shows the social nature of classroom literacy events” (p. 384). Hellermann’s article not only provides a model for how using CA within a CoP framework can yield new insights about L2 literacy development, but it also issues a call for future qualitative microanalytic work to add to the scarce literature on (a) adult L2 literacy development, (b) classroom discourse practices during classroom literacy events, and (c) how classroom interaction occurs between experienced and non-experienced learners. The current study answers the call on all three levels.

The final work to be included in this literature review is not a study but a textbook by Jean Wong and Hansun Zhang Waring (2010) entitled *Conversation Analysis and Second*
Language Pedagogy. This text is pertinent because it is written for second-language teachers and curriculum designers with the goal of increasing their knowledge about spoken interaction and encouraging them to incorporate the findings of CA into L2 classroom lessons. Wong and Waring observe that within second-language acquisition theory, interactional competence (IC) is a crucial but often overlooked aspect of communicative competence in a second language (Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 7). The authors define IC as “the ability to use the various interactional resources, such as doing turn-taking or dealing with problems of understanding” (p. 7); these interactional resources are made explicit through the findings of CA. The majority of the text then provides strategies and techniques for teaching interactional resources such as turn-taking, sequencing practices, conversation openings and closings, and repair practices; all of these strategies are based upon the findings of CA. The existence of this text, with its emphasis on incorporating direct instruction on interactional resources in the L2 classroom, indicates that the findings of CA in L2 classrooms and in terms of L2 literacy development are crucial and are in demand within the field of second-language acquisition.

Gaps in the Extant Literature

The literature review clearly indicates that a study using CA to investigate literacy development in adult L2 book clubs will provide unique insights and contributions to the fields of literacy studies and applied linguistics. Although book club use is growing in L2 classrooms, and although there are a number of quantitative and qualitative studies affirming that students benefit from participating in these book clubs, no studies were found that used a CA approach in the study of classroom book clubs. Other studies that have used CA in L2 classrooms (such as those described above: Mori, 2002; Hellermann, 2006) have demonstrated that fresh insights can arise when a microanalytic method is used to explore student interactions. These insights are not
obtainable through other methods such as quantitative studies of reading comprehension scores, surveys, interviews, or journals. Additionally, adult L2 literacy is still underrepresented in literacy studies in general. In *Literacy and Language Diversity in the United States*, Wiley (2005) observes that school-aged children and adolescents are easier to study because they attend school for longer and more continuous periods of time, and funding for studies on children is typically easier to obtain. Wiley argues that “while it is likely that many issues related to second language and literacy acquisition among children are of relevance to adults, much more research needs to be done with adults” (Wiley, 2005, p. 174). Finally, the current corpus on CA in book clubs in general is tiny – only a single article on this topic was found (Peplow, 2011). Much of the power of CA lies in building a corpus of work within a certain area, such as doctor-patient interactions or telephone call openings, so additional studies on how book club participants interact are relevant to applied linguistics and pure CA. The current study thus fills several niches at once within literacy studies and second-language acquisition research and should interest a variety of audiences.
Chapter 3 Research Site, Participants, and Methods for Data Collection

With the necessary background on book clubs, social literacy, conversation analysis, and current research now established in the previous chapters, Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the research site, participants, and methods for data collection.

Site and Participants

The data for this study were collected in Fall 2013, during the researcher’s English as a Second Language (ESL) reading course at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The instructor designed the course for English language learners with high-beginning to low-advanced reading proficiency; a minimum score of 50 on the TOEFL internet-based test (iBT) was a prerequisite. The primary course objective (as listed in the course description as well as the syllabus) was to help students develop their skills and strategies in reading for personal enjoyment, general information, and academic purposes. Though the class was labeled as a reading course, the curriculum incorporated an integrated-skills approach, emphasizing reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Students met twice a week in 90-minute classes for fifteen weeks.

The small class consisted of seven adult students whose L1 was Japanese. Six were exchange students attending the university for one or two semesters, and the seventh was a community member. Three students were the focal participants for this study: Hiroshi, a male exchange student; Mika, a female exchange student; and Yukiko, a female community member (all names are pseudonyms). These three students signed consent forms before participating (a copy of the form can be found in Appendix E). The three students reported that they had not taken part in book clubs before.
Book Club Format

Book clubs were a significant component of this course, both in terms of class time and in the percentage of the overall course grade. Students met in two- and three-person groups once a week for six weeks (weeks six through eleven of the fifteen-week semester) to discuss their texts. The students organized themselves into two- and three-person book clubs, remaining in the same groups for the duration of the semester. Once they had established their groups, the members worked together to select the text that they would read during the six weeks. Unlike classroom book clubs in which the instructor stipulates that students must select a book from a specified list, these students chose any text that they wanted to discuss, provided that they had not read the book before and the instructor rated the reading level as appropriate. The instructor encouraged students to consider young adult fiction and/or graphic novels because of their approachability and high-interest for many adult ESL university students (Chun, 2009; Mathews, 2014; Reid, 2002). The three students in this study chose to read J.K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone*, finishing the novel in the six-week time frame.

Every week one student in each group assumed the role of book club leader. This student prepared in writing four discussion questions about the week’s reading; he or she brought a copy of the questions for each group member as well as one to submit to the instructor for a grade. (The student-generated questions can be found in Appendix C.) Students took turns in this leadership position, with each student in the three-person group being assigned the role of leader twice during the six-week period.

In the weeks prior to the first book club meeting, the instructor provided whole-class modeling of literature discussions as well as guided practice with writing discussion questions. One day the class read Aesop’s (2010) fable “The Miser” aloud and worked in pairs to answer
written questions designed by the instructor. Afterwards students engaged in a classroom
discussion facilitated by the instructor about these questions. On another day the class read a
fairy tale adapted for ESL students (“The Good Peasant’s Son” in Burke, 2008) and then
participated in a whole-class discussion, again facilitated by the instructor. On a third day the
class read a short story adapted for ESL students entitled “Girl in White” (Schlosser, 2013) and
then practiced writing discussion questions together for the story. The instructor explained that
this in-class practice was to prepare the students for writing effective discussion questions when
they were book club leaders, and she emphasized that students should write open-ended
questions that fostered conversation. Students were encouraged not to write “yes/no” questions;
if they did write such a question, they were told to include “why or why not” in order to
encourage more thought-provoking discussions. Student- and teacher-generated examples of
both closed-ended and open-ended questions were written on the board and discussed with
respect to the effects that such questions might have on a conversation.

Other than providing this explicit lesson on question-writing and the more implicit
elements of literature discussions modeled earlier in the semester, the instructor did not train the
students on specific procedures involved in the facilitation of book clubs, nor did she assign any
roles other than that of book club leader for the six book club meetings. Students developed their
own methods and styles for leading discussions and asking the questions that the week’s book
club leader had prepared. The instructor also requested that each week the groups determine how
far they would read for the upcoming week, occasionally giving the students supplemental topics
to discuss (e.g., “Who do you think is the protagonist in your book? Why?”) after they had
covered the student-generated questions.
In addition to these six weeks of book club meetings, students were asked to engage with their books in other ways. Throughout the semester, students read an English text of their choice for thirty minutes a day, six days a week. They also wrote about this daily reading in journals that were turned into the teacher. During the six weeks of meetings, the instructor strongly suggested that the students focus their reading journal entries on their book club texts. Most students wrote about their book club books for these assignments, though some chose to discuss other pleasure reading in their journal entries. Students also gave a final presentation about their book clubs at the end of the six weeks in which they delivered information both about their books and reflected on the book club process. At the end of the semester, and as part of their final examination, the students participated in a “book club conference” with the instructor in which the entire book group prepared book club questions and discussed the book with her.

Data Collection

The researcher collected data for this study by videotaping and audiotaping the six weekly conversations of one three-person book club group. (See Appendix D for a list of the specific recording equipment used.) The three students sat in individual desks that were turned to face each other for the book club discussions (Fig. 1).
In order to capture the facial expressions of the three participants, the researcher used two video cameras. Because the other students in the class were also meeting in book clubs and generating background noise during the data collection, an audio recorder was placed on one of the student’s desks to capture better quality audio recordings than could be obtained by the video cameras alone. The instructor/researcher arranged the classroom by moving desks and setting up the recording equipment before class began. Typically, book clubs were held towards the beginning of the ninety-minute class, with the instructor starting the cameras and audio recorders once she and the class were ready for the day’s book club sessions. The recorders ran for the duration of the student discussions. During the book club conversations, the instructor would move from group to group, listening to the discussions and occasionally answering clarification questions or interjecting some comments or questions for the students in a group.

At the end of the semester, after all of the recordings were complete, the researcher transcribed student conversations using InqScribe transcribing software. Initial transcriptions
were made from the audio recordings because they were easier to decipher, as they had not registered as much background noise. The video footage was then referenced to make note of non-verbal gestures, gaze, and to clarify difficult-to-decipher utterances. The transcriptions of the six sessions are found in Appendix A.
As previously discussed, this thesis addresses the research question of how three adult ESL participants establish interactional routines that allow them to accomplish transitions from one topic to the next during their book club discussions. This chapter presents the data, the analyses, and the conclusions resulting from the analyses for the research question. A broader discussion of implications of this study and potential future research concludes the chapter.

On the first day of the book club discussions, an interaction took place that indicates the salience of these research questions to the participants themselves. The book club leader for the day, Yukiko, distributed her written discussion questions to Hiroshi and Mika, read her first question aloud, and within ninety seconds of beginning the discussion, the following interchange occurred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Y,M,H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Y:</td>
<td>So: the, (2.0) remember, the glass disappeared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>H:</td>
<td>Mm, yeah, yeah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Y:</td>
<td>Harry used the magic. (3.7) I don't know how to talk about together. How (.) like this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>Y,M,H:</td>
<td>(laughing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Y:</td>
<td>So-um, my answer is the glass at the front of the boa constrictor's tank?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to this interaction, there were initial interchanges in which Mika and Hiroshi offered brief responses to Yukiko’s first discussion question. Then, in line 048, Yukiko explicitly voiced some bewilderment as to how to encourage more fluid conversation: “I don’t know how to talk about together. How (.) like this.” Hiroshi and Mika’s affiliative laughter in line 050 indicated that they shared in Yukiko’s confusion. For these adult ESL students, then, leading a small-group discussion and co-constructing an ongoing conversation in a second language was not intuitive. Yukiko, Mika, and Hiroshi are not alone in finding these skills challenging. Wong and Waring

---

8 All transcription conventions are described in Appendix B.
(2010) report multiple anecdotes in which adult non-native speakers face confusion in the classroom. For example, one Japanese student working on her JD at Columbia Law experienced anxiety in seminar classes because even though she had a firm grasp of the content, she did not know how to break into the class discussions (p. 37). Another graduate student with high-level French skills reported difficulty in knowing how to shift topics in an ongoing French conversation and acknowledged that topic management was the final step towards her feeling like a fluent French speaker (p. 104). The current study, which examines how the participants work together to accomplish topic transitions, sheds light on how classroom book clubs provide opportunities for students to develop these valuable literacy and communication practices.

**Accomplishing Topic Transitions**

The primary goal of the book club discussion was to answer the four prepared questions; however, the instructor also made clear that an additional goal was to hold a conversation about the book. Students thus had to accomplish a variety of conversational tasks in order to meet these two goals. They had to open the conversation, negotiate turn-taking and determine who would speak when, ask each of the four prepared questions, answer each of the questions, navigate the appropriate moment to close down the discussion of one question and transition to the next, and make conversational repairs when there was a misunderstanding. All of this conversational work occurred in addition to using and understanding the vocabulary and syntax of a second language in written, oral, and aural forms, not to mention having had to read and understand several chapters of *Harry Potter* in preparation for the discussion each week.

In focusing on one piece of this puzzle – how the students accomplished transitions from one discussion question to the next – conversation analysis exposes two significant interactional strategies developed by the students during their six meetings: (a) a specific routine that the
students developed over time for reading their prepared book club questions aloud; and (b) the reliance on *okay* and *next* at pivotal points in the conversation to accomplish transitions between topics. The data and analysis for each of these interactional strategies is presented in the following sections.

**Reading questions aloud: data and analysis.**

For this analysis, the instructor had not given the students explicit instructions on how to ask their questions; she had merely required that the discussion leader produce written copies of all four prepared questions and distribute these copies to the other book club members. On day one, the leader Yukiko passed out her typewritten questions to the other students at the beginning of the discussion. She then read the first question aloud, and the students discussed their answers; she read the second question aloud, and a discussion ensued. This pattern was repeated until all four questions had been read aloud and discussed. Without detailing how she achieved the specific transitions from question to question (that discussion will follow in a later section of this chapter), it is evident from the transcripts that after Yukiko reads each question aloud, another student responds to the question either immediately or with a minimal pause in the conversation. For example, with Yukiko’s third discussion question, Mika provides an immediate (and even overlapped) response to the question in line 184:

[Day 1]
180 Y: Yeah, so yeah, I'm pretty sure. So, um, so, it's about chapter five? And my
181 question is, yeah, it's about a boy, too. Harry went to the Madame Malkin's store
182 to get his school uniform? And met a boy with a pale. The boy, mean boy. And
183 does Harry like or dislike the boy [and why?]
184 M: [Yeah::] I think Harry does- doesn't like.
185 Y: Mmhm. Why do you think so?

Question four requires a little more interactional work, but an answer is still rapid:

[Day 1]
274 Y: ((reading)) So which part of the story is your favorite so far. And why?
In this exchange, Yukiko reads the question and Hiroshi immediately utters a humlike *mmm* sound that acts as a nonlexical filler to indicate that he is thinking. Yukiko quickly rephrases the question by asking Hiroshi directly if he has a favorite part, and after a 2.9-second pause, Hiroshi offers a response. On day one, when the questions are read aloud, the students can thus quickly provide responses to the prepared discussion questions.

On day two, when Hiroshi is the designated leader, he passes out his prepared questions to the other students. After the students read the first question silently, Mika seeks clarification on a word that Hiroshi misspelled in his question (*herard* instead of *heard*); Yukiko also offers an unsolicited definition for the word *existence*. Then the following exchange occurs:

[Day 2]

032 M: Ah o[kay]
033 Y: *[platform] is (. ) exists
034 M: Ahh:
035 (10.7)
036 H: °All right.°
037 (7.5)
038 Y,M: ((quiet laughing))
039 (2.6)
040 H: Mkay. ((laughing))
041 (1.5)
042 Y: M:[kay]. ((laughing))
043 H: [So.]
044→ H: Mm. First I () My answer () about first question is () I could believe in the
045 existence? () because () ahh is to me it's nice:: () I- I wanna believe it.
046 (2.5)
047 Y: Cause it's nice.
In line 034, Mika acknowledges Yukiko’s explanation of what *exists* means, and then there is a very long (10.7 second) pause. Book club leader Hiroshi then offers a very quiet *all right* in an apparent attempt to transition to a new topic. There is another long (7.5 second) pause, some quiet laughing among the participants, two more apparent offers from Hiroshi to transition, and then finally, in line 044, Hiroshi himself answers the question. This interaction is not as streamlined as those in day one. Although the students do proceed to answering the question, the process is riddled with long pauses. Research in conversation analysis has shown that the preference in conversation is generally to minimize gaps and lapses between turns (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, p. 708), and the students’ laughter in lines 038, 040, and 042 indicates a sense of awkwardness among the participants with the long pauses found in this interaction (Glenn, 2003). Hiroshi’s eventual answering of his own question is also not the preferred response for question-answer pairs (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Sacks et al., 1974).

By question two, however, a different interactional pattern is suggested by Yukiko:

[Day 2]

096 (4.2) 
097 H:  "Ready?"
098→ Y:  "Kay. Shall we read a question? (. ) Each? Before we start [talking?]
099 H:  ["Yeah right." ]
100 (3.0) 
101 H:  Question?
102 Y:  Mm:hm. N[ext.]
103 H:  [One] or two?
104 Y:  Two.
105 M: [Two, yeah.]
106→ H:  [Question two. ] ((reading question)) What (. ) what is your favorite scene in
107 chapter six and nine. Se[ven.]
108 Y:  [and seven. ] Wait. ((laughing, flipping through book))
109 H:  ((laughing))
110 Y:  >Wait wait< ((laughing))
111 (5.9)
112→ M:  Ah::, my favorite scene, um, appeared, uh ghost appeared?
After everyone has answered question one, there is a 4.2-second pause at line 096. Hiroshi very quietly asks if the other students are “ready,” and Yukiko quietly agrees. Then she immediately asks if they should read each question aloud before talking, and Hiroshi agrees in line 099. After some additional clarification, Hiroshi reads question two aloud. Yukiko laughingly asks for Hiroshi to wait while she flips to the correct chapter, and after a 5.9-second pause in which the students search in the book, Mika provides a direct response. When the students have finished discussing question two, Hiroshi reads question three aloud with no prompting, and after Yukiko responds with a clarification question, the students quickly move to responding to the question.

The interactional pattern is still not firmly established, however, as evidenced by the following exchange for question four:

[Day 2]
241 (8.7)
242 H: ((looks at paper, looks up))
243 M: ((looking at K)) °Next°
244 H: Next ((laughing))
245 M: Next. Next. ((laughing harder))
246→ Y: °Ask question.° ((looking at clock)) We still have lots of time (though).
247 (5.0)
248 Y: °Mmkay.° Let's talk a lot in the last question. ((laughing))
249→ H: If [you ] ((reading from questions))
250 Y: [Although] we still have ((pointing to questions on board)) yeah.
251 M: >yeah yeah<
252 Y: °(Something to take.) Okay.° Sorry go ahead.
253→ H: ((reading)) If you have to if you <have to eat> chocolate frogs or pumpkin pasties,
254 which one do you eat?
255 Y: ((laughing))
256 M: Ahh[.....]
257 H: [>This one is<] not so nice question.
258→ M: Mmhm. I choose chocolate frog.

After the students have finished discussing question three, a long pause of 8.7 seconds elapses, and Mika quietly prompts Hiroshi with next. Hiroshi and Mika laughingly joke about transitioning to the next question with a series of nexts, and then Yukiko quietly prompts, “Ask
question” in line 246. By line 253 Hiroshi reads the question aloud, and Mika almost immediately utters *ah* – a change-of-state token indicating that she understands the question (Heritage, 1984; Aston, 1987) -- and shortly afterwards provides a direct response.

On day three, which is Mika’s first day as discussion leader, there is one more request for reading the prepared questions aloud. Mika passes out her written questions, and the discussion begins with the following:

[Day 3]
042→ Y:  Let’s start, let’s start with reading questions?
043→ M:  ((Reading)) Who do like, Who do you like ((laughing))
044 Y,M,H:((laughing))
045 M:  Who do you like the best so far in this book. And why. ((laughing)) I forgot you.
046 M,H: ((laughing))
047 H:  Huh.
048 Y:  We understand.
049 M:  ((laughing))
050 H:  ((reads question very quietly to himself))
051 Y:  Mm.
052 (10.6)
053→ Y:  I, I like Hagrid.

Yukiko explicitly asks Mika to read the questions aloud before any discussion of answers begins, and Mika responds by immediately reading the question. In reading the question, Mika enacts a self-repair on a word (*you*) that had been omitted from her written question. After the students all engage in affiliative laughter about the repair (Glenn, 2003), Yukiko quickly responds with “we understand” in line 048, indicating that she comprehends the question. Although there is a 10.6-second pause in line 052, the time is filled with the students considering their response to the question⁹ – the pause lacks any of the laughter and awkwardness of the question-answer responses from day two.

---

⁹ During this long pause, the students assume what in conversation analysis is referred to as a “thinking face” – a characteristic expression that is found across many cultures and that serves to
For the rest of day three, and for the remainder of the book club sessions, each discussion leader always reads the written questions aloud without the need for explicit requests. The group thus establishes the interactional routine of having the day’s book club leader read each question to the group in order to start the discussion on that particular question. Although the establishment of this routine may not be surprising, the reading aloud of the questions was not mandatory in this situation because the students already had the written questions to reference. As evidenced by the difficult and even awkward conversational interactions demonstrated on day two when Hiroshi did not read question one aloud\textsuperscript{10}, and the relatively smoother transitions that occurred when the students did read their prepared questions, the group settled upon a routine that facilitated smoother transitions, fewer pauses, and a more rapid path to the conversational work of answering the book club questions.

**Reading questions aloud: implications.**

By the third book club meeting, these adult ESL students developed an interactional routine for asking their prepared questions that allowed for them to move relatively smoothly from one question to the next. Because the work of the book club was to answer the questions brought in by the day’s leader and to hold a conversation about the book, the routine of reading each question aloud enabled the students to move more rapidly to their objective of answering questions. As evidenced by the one instance in which the question was not read aloud (on day two question one – Hiroshi’s first day as leader), long lapses in conversation prolonged the transition to answering the question and even resulted in laughter among the participants regarding the awkwardness of the discussion. This interaction also had the unusual trait of the

---

\textsuperscript{10} For an example of Hiroshi’s second day as leader in which the transition was smoother, see Appendix A, Book Club Meeting 5, lines 049 through 061.
questioner’s (Hiroshi) being the first to answer his own question, perhaps in a bid to move the conversation along when no one else was responding. Reading the questions aloud, however, allowed for all of the participants to know when it was appropriate to provide an answer. As discussed in the previous section, pauses were generally minimized and participants other than the questioner almost always were the first to answer the question.

Settling upon a routine in which the questions were read aloud yielded other benefits as well. Significantly, when discussion leaders were reading their questions, they often enacted self-repairs on errors in their written questions. One such example – Mika’s self-repair of the omitted you in question one of day three – was mentioned in the previous section. Reading drafts of papers aloud is a well-known proofreading strategy (e.g., Harris, 1987), and reading the question aloud provided Mika with the opportunity to catch her written error and correct it. Conversation analysis identifies four types of repair: (a) self-initiated self-repair; (b) self-initiated other-repair; (c) other-initiated self-repair; and (d) other-initiated other-repair; the preferred form is the self-initiated self-repair that was demonstrated by Mika (Wong & Waring, 2010, p. 217). In contrast, on day two question one, when Hiroshi did not read the question aloud and there was a misspelling in the word herard/heard, a fair amount of interactional work was needed to repair the error:

[Day 2]
009 (22.4) ((H organizes papers and then students all read questions silently))
010 M: I don't know this
011 H: hea[rd]
012 M: [word]
013 H: heard
014 M: This word hhh <I'm sorry.>
015 Y: Heard
016 H: Heard
017 H: A[h:]
018 Y: [Her]ard
019 H: Hear.
In line 010, Mika enacts an other-initiated repair on Hiroshi’s written work by indicating that she does not know the word *heard*. Hiroshi offers the repair of *heard* in lines 011, 013, and 016, but Mika does not demonstrate full understanding until line 020, when she expresses the change-of-state token *ah*. Similarly, Yukiko shows complete understanding in line 022, when she uses the change-of-state token *oh* and then says *hear* to express the bare infinitive form of the verb.

Comparing this exchange to that of Mika’s self-initiated self-repair of the omitted *you* illustrates how streamlined the repair can be when the questions are read aloud. If reading their own writing aloud increases the students’ chances for self-initiated self-repair, then this routine allows for smoother transitions between each book club question. Additionally, a specific type of self-initiated self-repair known as same-turn repair, such as that demonstrated by Mika when she corrected for the omission of *you* on day three, is a form of self-correction that can indicate oral language development (Gass & Selinker, 2008):

[Day 3]
043 M: ((Reading)) Who do like, Who do you like ((laughing))

Hiroshi also enacts a self-initiated same-turn repair when reading aloud question two on day two:

[Day 2]
106 H: [Question two.] ((reading question)) What () what is your favorite scene in
107→ chapter six and nine. Se[ven.]
108 Y: [and seven.] Wait. ((laughing, flipping through book))
109 H: ((laughing))
When reading the question, which he wrote as “What is your favorite scene in Chapter 6 and 7?,” Hiroshi mistakenly reads the 7 as a 9 and then immediately self-repairs. A third example of this style of repair occurs with Mika on day six with question two:

063 M: ((laughing)) Second question. ((reading)) Do you think uh the action same as her.  
064→ Her- is Hermione, Hermione. Or think the other way if you were Hermione when  
065 Neville said I will fight you. Why?

Mika originally wrote her question as, “Do you take the action same as her or think the other way, if you were Hermione when Neville said you “I’ll fight you!”? Why?” In line 064, Mika, realizing that the pronoun “her” is ambiguous because its postcedent (Hermione) is located later in the question, performs a same-turn repair to clarify to whom “her” refers.

Indeed, reading the questions aloud allows for the discussion leaders to add clarification and elaboration multiple times throughout the six book club meetings. For day one, Yukiko wrote question one as follows: “In chapter one, what happened to the boa constrictor’s tank when Harry was punched by Dudley and fell down at the zoo?” The interaction occurred as follows:

[Day 1]  
032 Y: ["kay°."] So um let's talk about questions? So I: brought four  
033 questions about Harry Potter from chapter one to five like (.) page eighty-seven.  
034 So first question is in about chapter one. Question is what happened to the boa  
035 the snake? constrictor tank? when Harry was punched by Dudley? (.) and fell  
036 down at the zoo. He punched ((signals punching)) [Harry.]  
037 M: [mmhm] ((nods))  
038 Y: and he fell down and what happened. (1.0) That's that's my first question.

In line 035, Yukiko inserts the snake as an appositive to the boa to provide clarification to her listeners, and in line 036 she inserts the sentence He punched Harry while pantomiming a punching motion. This elaboration and clarification allows Yukiko to increase the chance that the other book club members understand her during her initial question turn and decreases the necessity for other-initiated repair. This style of self-initiated insertion and clarification occurs...
multiple times throughout the six sessions and is demonstrated by all three leaders while reading their questions aloud.

Finally, the routine of reading the questions aloud provides the discussion leader with the opportunity to practice pronunciation and experience immediate feedback from peers when pronunciation is either not understood or not perceived as accurate. Because the prepared questions were written and distributed, all participants had access to the question in both written and verbal form; there were several occasions in which they helped each other with English pronunciation. For example, on day three question four, Mika reads her question and has difficulty with the pronunciation of *criticize*:

[Day 3]

290  M: ((reading)) Snape criti (.) ciz?
291  Y: criticize?
292  H: [criticize]
293  M: [criticize] ((reading)) almost everyone except Malfoy.
294  H: Hm.
295  M: ((reading)) Why do you think that he does it?

She reads the word as *krite-sës* (“criti-sees”) with a questioning inflection in line 290, and Yukiko offers *criticize* as a repair. Hiroshi and Mika both repeat the correct pronunciation, and then Mika continues with her reading of the question. Such pronunciation repairs are frequent throughout the six book club meetings, with Mika in particular receiving other-initiated repair or feedback, as she often would pause or add an upward inflection when reading a word of which she was unsure.

Developing the routine of reading the questions aloud thus solves several conversational trouble-sources and enables the students to progress more rapidly to the work of answering the questions. The manner in which this interactional routine evolved can be explained by a community of practice (CoP) perspective. Recalling from chapter one that “communities of
practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2016, para. 5), this book club fulfills Wenger-Trayners’ criteria for a CoP: (a) the book club group has an identity defined by the shared \textit{domain} of a desire to learn to read and communicate more fluently in English; (b) the book club group is a \textit{community} in which the students share ideas, information, and participate together in an activity related to the domain; and (c) the book club members are \textit{practitioners} who “develop a shared repertoire of resources” within their domain (para. 7-9).

On the first day, the discussion leader was Yukiko – a community member who had entered the class with the most advanced English skills and who had also taken other American college classes before. She asked all four questions that day by reading her prepared questions aloud. During the second meeting in which Hiroshi was leader, he began question one by having the students read his question silently. After a series of long pauses and attempts by Hiroshi to open the floor for responses to his question, he finally answered the question himself. When it was time to transition to Hiroshi’s second question, Yukiko suggested that they read the questions aloud before discussing them. With question three, Hiroshi read aloud without prompting, but in question four, after a series of pauses followed by verbal prompts from Mika (repeated \textit{nexts} in lines 243 and 245), Yukiko again urged Hiroshi to “ask question” in line 246. On the third day, when Mika led the group for the first time, Yukiko suggested on line 042 that they “start with reading questions,” and Mika complied by immediately reading question one. After that, the reading of questions aloud had become a routine, and all of the students did so without prompting for the duration of the meetings.
Yukiko, then, acts as the CoP old-timer in this situation, suggesting to the other students that they adopt the practice of reading questions and prompting them to do so when necessary. Yukiko had never participated in a book club before in English or in her native Japanese, and the source of her initial inspiration to read the questions aloud is not clear. Perhaps she drew on personal experience in other classroom situations, or perhaps she happened upon the practice during her first day as leader and then felt confident in suggesting the routine to the other students when it seemed to streamline transitions. She served to mentor Hiroshi and Mika into one effective strategy for conveying the prepared questions and enabling the group to proceed to the discussion section of each meeting. As a result, all three students demonstrated literacy development through their establishment of this routine – a routine that they could potentially carry forward into other book discussion groups or other small group discussions in American universities.

Using “okay” and “next” in topic transitions: data and analysis.

We now turn to a second aspect of interactional strategies used by the students for accomplishing transitions – their reliance on okay and next at pivotal points in their discussions. In every book club meeting, the participants had at least five topic transitions that they needed to negotiate: four transitions as they shifted to discussing each of the four prepared questions and a final transition as they shifted from the leader’s prepared questions to the teacher’s assigned final activities (such as deciding how far to read before the next meeting, selecting vocabulary words from their reading, and answering book-related questions that the teacher had written on the blackboard). In order to accomplish these transitions, Yukiko and Hiroshi routinely used okay or some closely-related variant (e.g., mmkay or ‘kay) at a pivotal point in the transition. In fact, of the twenty opportunities that those two students had for accomplishing transitions during the
course of the book club meetings, they used *okay* or a variant on fifteen different occasions. Mika never used *okay* to accomplish a transition, developing instead a pattern of using *next* or *next question* in topic transitions; she used *next* to transition between her prepared questions five times, and she also used *next* when Hiroshi was a discussion leader to prompt his transition to the following question.

*“Okay” usage in transitions.*

Wayne Beach (1990, 1993) has explored how speakers use *okay* in several different pivotal points of conversations. *Okay* can stand alone and act as a free-standing receipt marker, such as in the following example from Beach (1993):

Sha: Your mother wants you!

Flo: Okay. (p. 329)

However, Beach argues that *okay* is often:

employed *pivotally*, in the midst of yet at precise moments of *transition*, by recipients and current speakers alike, across a variety of speech exchange systems (both casual and institutional), not just in any sequential environment but where what is ‘at stake’ involves movements from prior to nextpositioned matter(s).” (Beach, 1993, p. 326, italics in original)

Through his analyses of many *okay* usages in naturally-occurring conversation, Beach concludes:

“*Okay*” [can] be understood as indicating that its producer agrees with, affirms, and/or understands what was projected prior – and perhaps even treats that talk as significant. *But once one has accomplished these objectives via “Okay,” the way is now open to what is deemed relevant through additional turn components... signaling a ‘state of readiness’ for moving to next-positioned matters.* (Beach, 1993, pp. 338-339, italics in original)
Yukiko and Hiroshi’s use of *okay* at transitionally pivotal points in their book club discussions allows them to affirm and attach significance to the immediately prior talk while also signaling their readiness to move forward to the next discussion question.

Yukiko and Hiroshi’s use of *okay* occurs so frequently throughout the data that just a few representative examples will be presented here. On day one, Yukiko uttered *okay* at the initial transition into asking her first question, twice in conjunction with transitioning to question three, as well as in the transition between question four and the final teacher-assigned activities. On her second day as leader (day four), she used *okay* in transitioning to question three, question four, and in transitioning to the final activities. The exchange for day four question three is as follows:

[Day 4]
134 Y: So I think I was, I, I, so I'm still rem-, um having dream of being artist. I'm not trying, but um, I, I think I keep having the dream. So I think I will see it in the mirror. With my family, from Japan. So I, I don't know where it will be. But me, my husband, and my family?
138 M: Mmmhm.
139 Y: And me being famous artist. ((laughing))
140 M: Ah.
141 H: Ahhh.
142 Y: That's my desire. Yeah (.) °So:° Having fun. Ha- have fun. It's interesting to you. Listening your dreams. °Okay.° So: next question. ((reading)) Do you think the mirror is good or evil.
145 M: Ahh.
146 Y: Why.
147 (3.1)
148 H: Good.

---

11 There were many other times when Yukiko and Hiroshi used *okay* in transitionally pivotal spots in their discussions, such as when transitioning from an assessment of the previous speaker’s answer to an offer of their own answer. Transitions between the main discussion questions are clearly delineated sections of the conversation and thus are useful excerpts to focus on for the current study; however, it should not be assumed that these are the only transitions occurring in the students’ quite complex conversation sequences.
In this excerpt, the group is transitioning from discussing their answers to what they think they might see in *Harry Potter’s* Mirror of Erised (a magical mirror that displays the viewer’s deepest desire) to question three (whether they believe that this mirror is good or evil). Yukiko is the last book club member to answer the question—earlier, Hiroshi has indicated that he would see a beautiful ocean, and Mika says that she would be in a rocket in space. In lines 134 to 137, Yukiko describes the mirror as reflecting her being a famous artist. She concludes line 137 by elaborating that her family will also be in the picture, and ends with an upward inflection that Mika acknowledges as understanding in line 138 with the continuer *mmhm*. Yukiko then reiterates that she would be a famous artist in the mirror, and Mika and Hiroshi both follow with the change-of-state token *ah* to indicate that they understand her reiteration. Then, in lines 142 and 143, Yukiko restates her desire and then summarizes the other students’ desires: having fun and listening to their dreams. In line 143, she uses a quiet *okay* and then announces that she will be reading the next question. She is clearly transitioning between the previous topic and moving to the next question, and she does so with minimal pauses. The other students take up the discussion of the next question immediately, with Mika using a change-of-state token in 145 that acknowledges her understanding of the question, and Hiroshi answering the question in line 148. By her use of *okay*, Yukiko closes down one topic, explicitly affirms the significance of the other students’ responses by summarizing them, and then moves immediately into asking the next question.

Yukiko enacts a similar transition using *okay* when shifting from the discussion of question three to question four on day four. This excerpt follows:

[Day 4]

186 Y: [It wi]ll be good. But if you (drown) in the mirror (.) if the mirror have
187 the possibility to make you (drown) in there, so. I think it's a dangerous thing.
188 Y,M,H:((laughing))
189 Y: Yeah. What did I write? ((laugh)) ((reads paper)) Yeah, like that, yeah. That's wh-
190 → like what I said. Okay. So, last question. ((reading)) Why do you think
191 Dumbledore told Harry to put the magic cloak back and go back to his bed gently
192 ins- ((looks up)) um, when you, um, Dumbledore found Harry in the, in front of
193 the mirror at night, r[ight?]
194 M: [Mmhm.]
195 Y: And it's, it's not a good thing that he's breaking the rule c[ause]
196 M: [Ahh ]
197 Y: student can't wander around the cla- classrooms at night. So, but he didn't you're
198 H: Mm.
199 Y: go away from the school. You, he didn't say, told Harry to quit the school. He just
200 said gently, go back t- to your bed.
201 H: Yeah.

Before this interaction, Hiroshi and Mika have already given their answers to whether they think
the Mirror of Erised is good or evil. In lines 186-187, Yukiko offers her answer, and then the
students join her in affiliative laughter in line 188. In line 189 she confirms that the answer that
she gave agrees with her pre-written notes on her answer; then she immediately uses okay as a
pivot point to transition to the last question. She states okay with a downward inflection, and then
offers a pre-expansion that does not require a response – So, last question – and moves directly
to reading question four. With the use of okay, Yukiko thus once again transitions directly from
the closing of the previous topic to the opening of the new topic, all within the same turn. The
other students clearly align with this transition, offering continuers and affirmative answers to
Yukiko’s statement of the new question.

Hiroshi’s use of okay as a transition marker develops during the course of the book clubs.

On his first day as leader (day 2), when he begins the book club discussion without reading his
first question aloud, the exchange progresses as follows:

[Day 2]
031 Y: So plat- platform is here.
032 M: Ah o[kay]
033 Y: [platform] is (. ) exists
In line 031, Yukiko is completing her explanation about the meaning of *existence*, and in 032 Mika uses the change-of-state token *ah* followed by *okay* as a free-standing receipt marker, acknowledging that she understands Yukiko’s explanation. After a significant pause, Hiroshi quietly utters *all right*, which serves as his first offer to transition to the discussion of the questions. After more pauses and laughing, Hiroshi offers *mkay* to try to shift the conversation, but none of the other members transitions to discussing their answers. Yukiko follows in line 042 with a slightly drawn out *mkay* overlapped by Hiroshi’s *so*, and then Hiroshi finally answers his own question. At this point, the other students align to the topic shift, with Yukiko offering a restatement of Hiroshi’s answer. Hiroshi’s use of *okay* as a pivot in this portion is not as seamless as those demonstrated by Yukiko on day four. Because he offers a transition between the individual, silent reading of the question and the verbal answering of the question, it takes longer for the other students to align with the transition.

By question three of the same day, Hiroshi’s use of *okay* works to transition to the next question more efficiently:

[Day 2]

162 Y: I finally thought the magical part started (.) finally. ((laughing))
163  M: Ah:
164  Y: Finished slow part.
165  Y,M,H:((laughing))
166  Y: Without magic.
167  (7.1)
168→ H: Kay. (2.0) *Eh*. If you, if you were given the invitation of Hogwarts, would
169  you accept the invitation.
170  Y: Can I ask you question?
171  H: Yes.
172  Y: Invitation is: (.) to come to the (.) to
173  H: to the invite

In lines 162-166, the students are closing down their discussion of question two. A fairly long
pause follows (7.1 seconds), but then Hiroshi uses ‘kay as a pivot point and transitions to reading
question three aloud after a much shorter (2.0 second) pause. Yukiko rapidly aligns to this
transition in line 170 by asking a clarification question about the new discussion topic. Hiroshi’s
use of okay as a transitional pivot succeeds in several other transitions while he is book club
leader – one final example is given here to demonstrate how efficiently it works by day five,
question two:

[Day 5]
088  Y: You wanna see it again.
089  H: Yeah.
090  Y,M,H:((laughing))
091  H: I disobey.
092  Y: Yeah.
093  (1.8)
094→ H: °°Kay. °° Second. ((reading)) If you were a one=
095  M: =Ah= 
096  H: =of Quidditch players, which position would you want? 
097  M: Mmm.

In lines 088 through 092, the participants are discussing Hiroshi’s answer to question one
(whether he would disobey Dumbledore by visiting the Mirror of Erised again), and Hiroshi
offers a summary of his answer in line 091, followed by an affirmation by Yukiko in line 092.
All three students have discussed their answers to the question at this point. After a brief pause of only 1.8 seconds, Hiroshi quietly says ‘kay and then begins reading the second question. Mika utters the change-of-state token ah partway through Hiroshi’s reading and thus demonstrates a rapid alignment with the topic shift. Hiroshi’s use of okay during this transition effectively closes down the previous topic, implicitly affirms the significance of the others’ responses, and then rapidly transitions to the second question all in one turn and enables the group to continue discussing their thoughts about the next question.

**Mika’s use of “next” in transitions.**

Although Yukiko and Hiroshi develop a routine of using okay to transition between discussion questions, Mika exclusively uses okay as a free-standing receipt marker during these conversations. Mika relies instead on the word(s) next or next question to accomplish transitions, using them five out of ten times when she is the book club leader, and also using them once to prompt Hiroshi to enact a transition when he is the leader. On Mika’s first day as leader (day three), Yukiko prompts Mika for the first transition by explicitly asking if they can start by reading the questions aloud, and Mika immediately follows by reading the question. No use of next, or any other transition marker for that matter, is required. The transition to the second question is as follows:

[Day 3]

145  Y:  But, yeah (.) they definitely need her. (laughing)) She has a good heart I think so too.
146  M:  Ah.
147  H:  °Let’s see.°
148  (4.3)
149  150→ M:  Next [question?]
151  Y:  [>Next question?><]  
152  M:  ((reading)) Do you go to get Neville's Remem- Remem-ball. Remem-

12 The majority of Mika’s other transitions involve a relatively long pause followed by her reading the question without the use of a transition marker.
In lines 145-146, Yukiko finishes discussing the character Hermione; Mika acknowledges Yukiko’s assessment with *ah*. In line 148, Hiroshi quietly utters *let’s see*, a hesitation marker typically used by a speaker to hold the floor while thinking, but which has also been used during topic transitions (Nguyen, 2012, p. 130). After a 4.3-second pause, Mika asks *Next question?* in line 150, and her utterance is partially overlapped by Yukiko asking the same question, which then results in Mika reading the question. This transition is thus explicitly collaborative, with Hiroshi first offering his readiness to shift topics with *let’s see*, Mika’s directly querying the other students if they are ready to transition, and Yukiko’s almost simultaneously asking the same question.

Mika also uses *next* in the following transition, but the structure of interaction differs somewhat:

[Day 3]

220  Y: I ((laughing)) I can’t guess what, what I will feel there. Just scared, or mad enough to do it, or.
221  H: Aghh: Mad enough, yeah.
222  H: °Let’s see.°
223  Y: You’re brave. ((laughing)) V[ery brave.]
224  H: [No, no brave. ]
225  Y,M,H:((laughing))
226  (7.1)
227  M: °Next.° ((reading)) How do you do when you meet a (.) monstrous dog
228  H: [hh]
229  M: [that] has three head.

In lines 220 to 222, Yukiko and Hiroshi finish discussing an answer to question two, and then there is a 4.8-second pause. Once again, Hiroshi indicates a readiness to transition with a quiet *let’s see*, but in line 225 Yukiko expands upon Hiroshi’s answer to the previous question with an
assessment, and Hiroshi follows in line 226 by politely declining her assessment/compliment.

After a longer pause of 7.1 seconds, Mika quietly announces \textit{next} not as a question, but as a transition marker, and then directly moves to reading her prepared question aloud. Although this interaction shares some similarities with the previous transition, this time Mika accomplishes the actual transition using \textit{next} in a single turn.

The other instances of Mika using \textit{next} in transitions when she is the leader are similar to the first example given here. She adds an upward inflection to the word or phrase including \textit{next} and thereby gathers confirmation from the other participants that they are ready to shift to the new question. This question-answer adjacency pair typically results in a quick transition to Mika’s reading once she initiates the question involving \textit{next}.

Mika also uses \textit{next} once in an interaction in which Hiroshi is leader on day two, transitioning between questions three and four:

[Day 2]
\begin{verbatim}
240  Y:  (What is saying) my cat
241  H:  (8.7)
242  H:  ((looks at paper, looks up))
243  M:  ((looking at H)) °Next°
244  H:  Next ((laughing))
245  M:  Next. Next. ((laughing harder))
246  Y:  °Ask question.° ((looking at clock)) We still have lots of time (though).
247  (5.0)
248  Y:  °Mmkay.° Let's talk a lot in the last question. ((laughing))
249  H:  If [you ] ((reading from questions))
250  Y:  [Although] we still have ((pointing to questions on board)) yeah.
251  M:  >yeah yeah<
252  Y:  °(Something to take.) Okay.° Sorry go ahead.
253  H:  ((reading)) If you have to if you <have to eat> chocolate frogs or pumpkin pasties,
254  Y:  which one do you eat?
255  M:  Ahh[:::]...
\end{verbatim}
In this interaction, Yukiko completes a statement in line 240 in answer to a previous question, and then a long (8.7-second) pause follows. All three students have already provided answers to the discussion question, so it is a possible transition point. After the pause, Hiroshi looks down at his prepared questions and looks at the other students, apparently to gauge their readiness for the next question. Mika returns Hiroshi’s gaze and quietly prompts him with next. Hiroshi laughingly repeats next, and then Mika laughs even more and jokingly repeats next, next. Yukiko prompts Hiroshi to ask question in line 246, but without pausing for him to begin, she enacts an insertion sequence about the amount of time remaining for the discussion. After a 5.0-second pause, Yukiko offers mkay as a transitional marker and continues her turn with a joking admonition to talk a lot when discussing the final question. Hiroshi begins reading in line 249, Yukiko briefly overlaps his speech to insert another side sequence about other questions that will need to be answered, and then by line 253 Hiroshi completes the transition to reading his question. Although next is uttered four times by Mika and Hiroshi, it is lines 248 and 252 that immediately precede Hiroshi’s reading of the question, and both of these lines consist of a form of okay and then an explicit statement to read the question.

Although next becomes an integral part of Mika’s transitions, it functions differently from the pivotal okay described by Beach (1993). Okay serves to acknowledge and affirm the prior talk while also shifting the discussion to a new topic. Yukiko and Hiroshi often enacted a transition within a single turn when they were discussion leaders. Mika’s routine of using next – although equally as effective at enacting the transition – required more interactional work among the students. Often next was uttered as a question, requiring an affirmation from the other participants before Mika continued with the reading of the next question. When Mika and
Hiroshi both used *next* to indicate readiness for a transition on day two, the transition was not successfully achieved until *okay* was employed.

**Using “okay” and “next” in topic transitions: implications.**

The data demonstrate that not only did the students develop the interactional routine of reading questions aloud in order to enact transitions, but they also developed routines of preferred transition markers for shifting between discussion questions. The routines differ, however, in that the entire group adopted the routine of reading questions aloud, whereas Mika’s most frequently-used transition marker (*next*) differed from that of Yukiko and Hiroshi (*okay*). Mika’s use of *next* typically required more turns at talk to accomplish the transition than Yukiko and Hiroshi’s usage of *okay*.

In these transitions, *okay* accomplished several tasks as described by Beach (1993). Because *okay* can both acknowledge and affirm the previous speakers’ answers to the discussion questions and also act to open a new topic, it is a concise and powerful transition marker for rapidly shifting from one discussion topic to the next. *Next* as a transition marker, however, lacks the acknowledgment/affirmation ability of *okay*. When Mika uses *next* in transition, she most typically uses it with an upward inflection or even phrases it as an explicit question (*Next question?*) in order to express her readiness to shift topics and to confirm that the other students have completed their discussion of the previous topic. In the one case in which Mika accomplishes a transition with *next* in a single turn, Hiroshi has already demonstrated readiness to shift with a quiet *let’s see* after a 4.8-second pause, and another 7.1-second pause has also elapsed:

[Day 3]
223 (4.8)
224 H: °Let’s see.°
225 Y: You're brave. ((laughing)) Very brave.]
It is fair to say that the long pause indicates that no other speakers want to claim the floor for additional discussion, but Mika’s next does not accomplish the action of affirming the previous speakers’ answers.

It cannot be determined from this data why Mika uses next rather than okay – perhaps she does not understand the pragmatic subtlety of using one transition marker instead of the other in this instance, or perhaps she chooses to use next for another reason. What is interesting, however, is that as a group, the students develop routines that allow for transitions between discussion topics and that allow them to accomplish the interactional work of a three-person book club meeting. In the development of one routine – that of reading the questions aloud – Yukiko mentors the other students in the establishment of the routine. In the development of the second routine, however, Mika does not adopt Yukiko’s method of transition, and there is not enough evidence to determine whether Hiroshi’s use of okay develops from Yukiko’s modeling on the first day or if it was an interactional strategy that he already had in his repertoire. What the data does reveal is that all three students routinely use transition markers, and that each student develops a preference for a certain marker, with the group collaboratively enacting strategies to make each of those transitions successful.

Conclusions and Future Research

The primary purpose of this study was to explore whether the application of CA to adult ESL classroom book club discussions provided insights to literacy development in the students’ discussions. As described in Chapter 2, previous studies on L2 classroom book clubs have
focused on such criteria as improved test scores or student and teacher interviews and surveys to provide validation for the use of book club activities. Applying the fine-grained analytical approach of CA to the interactions of the three-person book club discussion in this study enables us to see the benefits of classroom book clubs from a different angle. The CA approach shed light on the routines and literacy practices that the students developed over time in their book club meetings. This study focused on one specific aspect of the students’ conversations – how they enacted transitions from one discussion question to the next – and even within this particular conversational feature, the data demonstrate that the students clearly developed routines that allowed for them to navigate transitions and topic shifts successfully. With these results in mind, the rest of this chapter will focus on general conclusions and implications for future research that have developed from the study results.

**Benefits of book clubs for adult ESL literacy development.**

Because every conversation is dependent upon its individual context, the conclusions drawn here with respect to the use of book clubs on a broad scale are necessarily limited. However, within the context of this book club discussion, the students developed interactional routines that demonstrate literacy development during the course of their six weeks of discussions. When we define literacy as a social practice, the students’ development of interactional competence as demonstrated in their growing ability to come together as a group and discuss a text that they have read is significant. The strategies and routines that they developed together in their book clubs are strategies and routines that they can carry with them into other small-group discussions both in and out of the classroom. Yukiko’s admission on the first day that “I don’t know how to talk about together. How (.) like this,” mirrors findings in other studies that adult ESL students often lack the strategies or confidence to take part fully in
group discussions in their L2. Yukiko, Mika, and Hiroshi developed both strategies and
certainty over the six weeks that enabled them to discuss *Harry Potter*, to hear each other’s
opinions and views about the text, and to grow in their understanding of the story through their
successful navigation of a three-person conversation. Much as Hellermann’s (2006) study
demonstrated literacy development in two adult ESL students through their development of
interactional strategies for opening dyadic story retellings and for learning the routines for book
selection during sustained silent reading, the students in this current study broadened their skills
in the conversational interactions necessary for discussing literacy texts in a classroom
environment.

Because of the scope of this study, CA was only used to analyze the students’ literacy
development in terms of enacting transitions between discussion questions. Because all six
weeks of the book club discussions have been transcribed, the potential exists for an analysis of a
myriad of other conversational strategies and routines that relate to literacy development. For
example, turn allocation and speaker nomination are two key areas of study within CA that often
provide difficulties for adult ESL students and that could be analyzed with the data available in
the transcripts. Conversational repair was briefly touched upon in the current analysis, but an in­
depth study focusing exclusively on the students’ repair tactics could provide valuable insights
for L2 teachers and applied linguists alike. Additionally, with the data available in the
transcripts, a study of the actual content of the students’ discussions could yield greater
understanding as to the topics of the student conversations – for example, whether they were
discussing intertextuality, character development, author intent, vocabulary, etc. The fine-grained
transcriptions that resulted from this study and that are found in Appendix A provide a wealth of
data that could furnish valuable insights into adult ESL book club discussions.

In addition to the current study’s findings about L2 literacy development in book clubs, the analyses also indicate that book clubs are a viable option for instructors who want to provide their ESL students with the opportunity to practice conversational skills. Although the findings of this study should not be too broadly generalized, there is value in noting that the conversations demonstrated by the students in this study show that the participants evolved in their abilities to navigate transitions and topic shifts – an area of conversation that is often perceived as difficult by ESL students (Wong & Waring, 2010). In fact, these book club meetings gave the students practice with a variety of conversational strategies – openings, closings, transitions, turn allocation, nomination of speakers, repairs – that are not easy to practice in traditional teacher-fronted activities.

The interactions that took place in these six book club meetings also demonstrated that students with differing abilities in English all benefited from their book club discussions. For example Mika, who lacked confidence in her pronunciation of many English words, received peer feedback on her pronunciation in the midst of reading and discussing the book club questions and answers aloud. Both Mika and Hiroshi completed their book club experience with the strategy for reading questions aloud when facilitating small-group discussions. Yukiko mentored the other two students in the strategy of reading the prepared questions aloud. All three students gained experience in clarifying, expanding, and repairing the written questions that they prepared when they were the designated book club leader.

In reflecting back on the Mori (2002) article discussed in Chapter 2, in which the task-based activity involving Japanese language students conversing with native language speakers yielded an unexpected and undesirable interview-style conversation, it is evident that this
particular book club group succeeded in enacting discussions that Mori would refer to as more representative of mundane, naturally-occurring conversation. Even with a brief inspection of the question-answer pairs in the transcripts, evidence exists that the students frequently followed up on each other’s questions and responses, providing elaborations, assessments, side sequences, and other insertions. One possible reason why the book club discussions were more effective at yielding these conversational structures may relate to the definition of task itself. Work examining the definitions of task and the applications of tasks in the classroom (e.g., Ellis, 2003, 2009; Long, 2015; Willis and Willis, 2007) conducted after Mori’s (2002) study may shed some insight as to why certain activities are more effective in Task-Based Language Teaching. (Future research could analyze and code this study’s transcripts in depth to deliver a more detailed analysis of the sequential structures of the students’ interactions.) Again, it is essential to recognize that although this particular book club group did not exhibit an interview-style structure in their discussions, another group might. What is significant is that book clubs have the potential to provide ESL students with the opportunity to enact complex conversational strategies and develop communicative skills that are of use in naturally-occurring conversations.

A corpus of CA book club data.

In addition to the teaching implications relating to literacy development and in-class conversation practice discussed in the last two sections, the findings of this study also contribute to the currently tiny corpus of CA book club data. One of the goals of conversation analysts is to build a significant corpus of data in various conversational contexts, such as classroom talk, courtroom talk, doctor-patient talk, and telephone conversations (ten Have, 2007, pp. 35-37). As discussed in Chapter 2, Peplow’s (2011) study on L1 book clubs appears to be the only extant study to use a CA approach to analyze book club discussions. Future investigations into the
strategies used by book club members to discuss their texts and facilitate their discussions in a variety of contexts (e.g., in or out of classrooms, or in the participants’ L1 or L2) would contribute to the field of conversation analysis specifically and to applied linguistics in general.

**Some final thoughts.**

In conducting this investigation, I hoped that CA would yield findings that demonstrated literacy development in my students. As the instructor for an adult ESL reading class, I have seen my students’ enthusiasm for book clubs repeated semester after semester. Almost every student lists the book clubs as their favorite activity on their end-of-course evaluations, and the students typically speak of the power of discussing a text with other students to glean new perspectives and greater understandings of the book. As a graduate student in a master’s program in literature, I have been involved in small literature discussion groups for years and have experienced firsthand how the discussion of a text with peers deepens my own understanding and appreciation of what I have read. I found it quite validating, therefore, when CA provided definite evidence of literacy development in the students’ book club interactions.

The results of the investigation have also caused me to reflect on some of my classroom practices. For example, because this particular group of students derived such benefits from establishing the routine of reading questions aloud (thereby creating easier transitions, enabling them to practice pronunciation and enact repairs), I now wonder if I should adjust my teaching practice to instruct all of my students to read the questions aloud as book club facilitators. I am considering whether students would derive more value from this explicit requirement, or if there is a greater benefit in allowing them to develop their own group routines. Similarly, I am pondering if there is merit in teaching them about transitional markers and conveying how *okay* can be used both to project back to prior talk and to pave the way for a topic shift. My answers to
these questions will probably depend on specific classroom contexts, but I believe that it is advantageous for instructors to conduct this style of research in our own classrooms, because it heightens our awareness about how our instructional design affects our students’ experiences. The fine-grained analysis of CA in particular allows us to explore what our students are doing – and to develop a greater appreciation for what they are achieving – on a daily basis in their classroom interactions.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Transcripts

Book Club Meeting 1
Y = Yukiko, H = Hiroshi, M = Mika, T = Teacher
Y is leader
Movie File 134
Audio file 131010_001

001 Y: So should we start talking?
002 T: If you don't mind waiting just a moment.
003 Y: Okay
004 T: >Hopefully< I'm sorry. Usually I'll have this set up ahead of time? I thought I'd
005 set up during the quiz, but then I didn't want to make a lot of noise.
006 All: ((laughing))
007 (4.5)
008 T: Sorry.
009 Y: °No problem°
010 (5.0)
011 T: Almost there.
012 (3.0)
013 Y, M: ((laughing))
014 Y: Do you make sense? ((looking at written questions))
015 M: ((nods))
016 M,Y: ((laughing))
017 (32.0) ((teacher sets up camera and students look at written questions))
019 Y: My book is kinda ((laughing)) squashed.
020 Y,M,H:((laughing))
021 Y: I treat things really bad[ly.]
022 H: [Ah.]
023 Y: Roughly.
024 Y,H: ((laughing))
025 Y: So, yeah, nobody don't wanna lend some things.
026 Y,H: ((laughing))
027 Y: So I don't like to use the library.
028 Y,H: ((laughing))
029 T: °°Okay.°° Thank you.
030 Y: Is it is it all right to start now?
031 T: Yeah. Thank [you].
032 Y: [°Kay°] So um let's talk about questions? So I: brought four
033 questions about Harry Potter from chapter one to five like (.) page eighty-seven.
034 So first question is in about chapter one. Question is what happened to the boa
035 the snake? constrictor tank? when Harry was punched by Dudley? (.) and fell
036 down at the zoo. He punched ((signals punching)) [Harry.]
M: [mmhm] ((nods))

Y: and he fell down and what happened. (1.0) That's that's my first question.

M: Sna snake is (.) uh ((hand signals)) <hh>

H: Snake is ((hand signals))

Y: Snake moved.

H: Snake (.) went out.

Y: Yeah, went away. It went to Brazil.

Y, M: ((laughing))

M: Yeah.

Y: So: the, (2.0) remember, the glass disappeared.

H: Mm, yeah, yeah

Y: Harry used the magic. (3.7) I don't know how to talk about together. How (.) like

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

Y: So-um, my answer is the glass at the front of the boa constrictor's tank?

M: Mmhm

Y: had vanished and a snake left for a new world. Brazil. So, same an[swer]

M: [Yeah]

Y: This, this question has to be the one (.) answer, right? So number two it will be

more, um, variety.

M: Mm.

Y: >So< why do you think number one event snake went away happened?

H: Be (.) cause, uh, talent?

Y: Mmhm?

H: from (.) his (.) parents.

M: He has much a power.

Y: Yeah, and he use magic and vanished. Wh- why can he use the magic (.) so

suddenly. What do you think?

H: Maybe (.) he doesn't (.) he didn't notice?

Y: Mmhm

H: his power.

Y: Is, do you think it, it's his anger? Made that? He was punched and [like]=

M: [Yeah]

Y: =shocking, and anger make it, made it happen? ((laughs)) <And um> I wanna ask

one more thing. It's, I'm sorry, I (.) how I wrote is kind of too, too:: <°I forgot the

word.°> Not clearly so, um, why do you think the author wrote about the event.

H: Ahh: (3.9)

H, Y: ((laughing))

H: Ah.

Y: You know what I mean?

M: Yeah:

H: Cause, cause ah, wanna show it? Mm:: (Because what) Harry Potter is.

Y: Oh, to show his magic power.

M: Mmhm.
083 Y: He can use magic. I guess. (2.7) Yeah.
084 ((9.2))
085 Y: °His talent (1.4) for magic (1.0) yeah.° That's part of the reason I think. What do
you think (.°°Mika.°° ((looking at M))
086 M: Um, almost the same.
088 Y: (Oh) the same?
089 M: Yeah.
090 (3.2)
091 Y: I, thought about um, like, plot? settings? Um, the, my answer is um should I just
read uh what [((laughing))]\]
093 M: [Yeah]
094 Y: So (. my answer is Harry was um shut in the in this small cup-board? under the,
in the house? For a long time like the snake. He- he was in stuck in a small place?
like the snake, the tank, in little tank, the snake in little tank. So the situation is
kinda similar. [Yeah]
098 H: [Ah:]\]
099 Y: And the snake is kinda Harry? She-she meant, the author meant the snake is
Harry and
100 H: Ah.
102 Y: Um ( . and Harry met Hagrid? And knew about magic world
103 M: Mmm
104 Y: and he left for magic world to learn magic. Leaving from the little, little cup­
board room. So, um, the situation is very similar to snake, so I thought it's kinda
106 (3.6) the introduction of Harry's happening. What- what will happen next. Like
107 introduction.
108 M: Mm:: ((nodding))\]
109 Y: >For the event.< And I- I think it was also, um, letting Harry know what would
110 happen soon.
111 M: Mm:
112 Y: That's my answer.
113 Y,H: ((laughing))\]
114 Y: Yeah but I think (. of course to show Harry's magic. Harry's talent for magic, too.
115 H: °Yeah, I agree with you.°
116 Y: Do y- do you have something else ((looking at M while M looks at paper))
117 (13.2)
118 Y: Did you understand what my opinion?
119 M: ((nods))\]
120 Y: Do you have something else on your mind.
121 (11.1)
122 Y: Or questions or anything?
123 Y,M,H:((laughing, with M, H looking down))\]
124 (18.6)
125 Y: So, sh:ould we move onto question three?
126 M: Yeah.
127 Y: (Are we) good? Really?
128 Y,M: ((laughing))
Ok. ((laughing)) Ok. So, number three, um, it's about chapter five. It's about um, chapter five is about shopping and magic town, right? to get equipment for his magic school. So it's kinda ( ) part.

M: Um, in the movie,

Y: Mmmhm.

M: the (boy) is not not not (don't talk here)

Y: The (.) hm?

M: (don't talk here)

Y: Can you say that again?

M: This this boy ((pointing to paper))

Y: Oh yeah, they cut the scene!

M: Yeah.

Y: ((laughing)) Yeah, they cut, but I think they're talking to Malfoy, right? This is Malfoy I think.

H: Yeah.

M: °°Oh. Ah°°

Y: I think this, this part, they, it didn't say [the name]

M: [yeah, yeah]

Y: but I think it's Malfoy. Yeah, do you remem-, do you know him?

H: Yeah, I know.

Y: The blonde=

H: =Yeah.=

Y: =the mean boy?

Y,H: ((laughing))

Y: I think [this ] is introduction for him, I think.

H: [yeah?] [Yeah]

M: Y[eah.]

H: [Yeah]

Y: ((laughing)) But, they cut the, cut it. Cut this scene in movie, yeah.

M: Ah:: he, he said (certainly)

Y: Yeah

M: (loudly)

Y: And he's kinda mean.

Y,M: ((laughing))

Y: Like, he was fooling oh Hagrid and=

M: =yeah=

Y: =do you know him?

M: Ah yeah.

Y: Yeah, I think, I'm pretty sure it's Malfoy.

M: °Mm° (nodding)

Y: He, I think he will come back (.) in pretty soon. Like in school.

M: Mmhm.

Y: And he was also mention about the, the, I forgot the name of the game, the flying game with=

M: =Uh=

Y: =magic. The quid=
M: Quiddit.
Y: Quidditch?
M: Quidditch.
Y: Quidditch?
M: Quidditch.
Y: H- he also plays it, right?
M: Yeah.
Y: Yeah, so yeah, I'm pretty sure. So, um, so, it's about chapter five? And my
question is, yeah, it's about a boy, too. Harry went to the Madame Malkin's store
to get his school uniform? And met a boy with a pale. The boy, mean boy. And
does Harry like or dislike the boy [and why?]
M: [Yeah::] I think Harry does- doesn't like.
Y: Mmhm. Why do you think so?
M: Mm: (1.4) Mm: (2.5) The bo[y is]
Y: [Mmhm]
M: um () too ((hand signals))
Y: chatty? ((hand signals))
M: Yeah yeah yeah.
Y: ((laughing))
M: °Very chatty°
(10.9)
Y: Oh, it's about um pa:ge ((flipping through book))
M: Maybe, um, the boy doesn't like Hagrid. °°Hagrid?°°
Y: What, can you say that again?
M: Uh, the boy.
Y: Oh, the boy didn't like Hagrid because, yeah. °Yeah.° (3.6) And he says
something bad to him.
M: ((laughing))
Y: And Harry (2.0) really like Hagrid.
H: °°Yeah°°
(7.0)
T: Did you: um find Hagrid hard to understand? Was it hard to read () and
understand what Hagrid was saying? [Or was it okay?]
Y: [It was fun to ] guessing=
T: =Okay=
Y: =what he's saying like ya, ya is you, right? ((laughing))
T: Right, right. He's very Scottish, I think.
(2.2)
Y: Yeah, sometimes I () don't understand what he's saying?
T: Mmmh
Y: But () in that case I just skip and guess a saying
T: That makes [sense.]
Y: [From] the context.
That makes sense. If you're ever totally lost, you know, let me know. Write it down, write down the page number, and I can try and help. But, yeah, skipping it and trying to guess is the best way. Good. ((teacher leaves group))

So: sss- do you know what page is it? °I'm lost.° It's about ss- page eig- eighty, or some- eighty-something I think.

Ah, seventy-eigh[t°?]

[Seventy?]

Seventy::

Yeah, seventy-eight.° Seventy::

Eight?

Seventy-eight.

Seventy-eight.

Oh yeah! ((laughing)) Seventy-eight. Do you remember the scene?

They, Harry and Hagrid went into the, the store (. ) which sells clothes like to get school uniform. And they measure their their clothes (. ) and while the clerk is measuring the robes they (. ) the boy was getting really chatty and he just keep talking [to Har]ry

[Yeah] ((laughing))

And Harry was an- annoyed.

((laughing))

So, what do you think Hiroshi? I think, he, you, also think the boy (. ) Harry didn't like the boy? Or (. )

Harry didn't like. ((nods))

You think

Yeah.

Why do you think so?

Cause I saw the movie.

Yeah!

Yeah, it's very obvious. Yeah, sorry, this question is very obvious. ((laughing)) I don't know why I asked this. ((laughing)) So, my question is, No, my answer is, Harry dislike the boy because the boy says nasty things about people. I think Harry felt sick of him from his lack of respect to other [people=]

[Ah]

= and his behavior reminded Harry of Dudley, which made Harry feel even sick more. Like (. )

Ah

the boy and Dudley were sim[ilar.]

[>similar<]

((laughing))

So=

=Ah=

=and Harry really hate- hated Dudley, so I think the behavior of Malfoy, the boy
reminded him of the life in the cupboard, like old life (.) he hated, so

H: So

Y: Yeah I think [so]

H: [Dud]ley (.) is kind of reminder

Y: Remind- the, the boy reminded Harry of the Dudley and (.) um unhappy life he had.

Y,M: ((laughing))

Y: So (.) shall we move on to question four?

H: Yeah.

Y: ((reading)) So which part of the story is your favorite so far. And why?

Y: Do you have some favorite part?

H: Mm:

Y: ((laughing)) Just funny. Can you explain how funny it is?

H: Ah:::

Y: Why you think it's funny?

H: Yeah, cause, Mm: (2.3)

Y: The situation is funny? or

H: Situation is also funny. Yeah.

Y: Oh, I can imagine where the snake go? ((laughing)) Snake adventure?

H: Ah snake adventure

Y: Do you think the snake make, make his way to Brazil? And you think he

H: Ah:::

Y: And you think he finished, he, he, he made it?

H: Mm:

Y: Or he's still on the way or captured by someone?

H: Yeah, captured or

Y: Captured! ((laughing))

H: Yeah.

Y: I hope the snake is okay

H: Yeah

Y,M: ((laughing))

Y: Went to Brazil safely

H: But too hard

Y: ((laughing)) Yeah, it's very hard. °Yeah.°

Y: Has to swim or ((laughs)) catch an airplane or something

Y,M,H: ((laughing))
Y: Maybe sneak into some ship

Y,M,H: ((laughing))

H: Yeah. Ship is easiest.

Y: Yeah. ((laughing)) Always longer though. So, what do, what about you, Mika=

M: =I cannot decide.

Y: Because of too many=

M: =Yeah=

Y: =too many fun part? 

Y: So, you can say, as many as you want. ((laughing))

H: Ah.

Y: ((laughing)) You don't have to pick one.

M: Pick one?

Y: You- you don't have to pick one. Just tell us everything. ((laughing))


Y: Oh, bank, yeah. ((laughing)) That's one of my fa[vorite.]

M: 

Y: Yeah that was, they're (. ) kind of funny.

Y,M: ((laughing))

Y: No one can steal.

M: (It seems too fast?)

Y: Yeah.

(16.0)

M: °And, chapter one?°

T: Are you trying to figure out how far to read?

Y: Oh, we're still talking about number four question=

T: =Oh, good, no that's good. I just thought you were trying to figure out

((laughing))

Y, H, M: ((laughing))


Y: But chapter one=

M: =Chapter one

Y: Is it about snake or=

M: =No, uh, Mrs. McGonagall

Y: Mmhm

H: Ah:: c[at]

M: [and] cat?

Y: Oh being cat

H: [Ahh:::]

M: (First) and Dudley Dudley um (2.3) Harry

(audio too poor to transcribe for 1.5 seconds)

Y: She, she, she stayed there for ever.

(2.0)

Y: I forgot her name. What, what did you say

H: Dud- Dudley

Y: The name of the lady, I forgot name.
Y: Oh, oh, the guy is Dumbledore.
M: Ah yeah yeah
Y: ((writing)) Can't spell.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
M: Um: ((handing book to Y))
Y: It's okay.
(20.1) ((group writes on question page))
Y: °Chapter one°
(5.7)
Y: Do you have something else?
M: Ah:
(13.4) ((all three students flip through books))
M: The scene of the uh Hagrid appear
Y: ((Nodding)). Oh what what was it like? (3.8) Oh he the in the hut in the hut.
And and Duh- Dursley?
M: Mmhm
Y: try to escape=
M: =>Ah yeah yeah yeah yeah<=
Y: from the weather and went to the (.) hut. And they stayed there and Hagrid
appeared? but was it the first time for him to appear? Or he appeared before?
Y: I forgot.
M: Ahh:::
Y: Is it before he was there?
(5.1) ((all three students flip through books))
Y: Which which scene are you talking about?
M: °Mmm.:° (6.3) He was (happy birthday cake?) °Happy birthday° ((singsong
voice))
Y: Ohh: the the trash can lids. ((laughing))
H: Ahh:
Y: Oh, so it was in the the hut, right?
M: ((nods))
Y: The hut.
M: Ah, hut cabin.
Y: Cabin yeah. Oh yeah. Yeah, that was funny. (3.2) I wondered how how much the
cake was squashed. Was it just the box or even cake was squashed °too°? Like,
messy cake or just box was messy. He was sitting on it.
M: ((nods)) Yeah.
Y: ((laughing)) It's kinda gross.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: Yah.
(3.6)
Y: I also have a favorite. So do you guys like how the author write the sentences? Do
you like her sentences? (.) Like, how how she describe things. Do you like her
way to describe things? Like ex- ex- explain? What's [going] on?
388 M: In the sentences. Do you like her way to do it?
389 Y: Mm.
390 H: Mm.
391 M: Like many authors have different ways to express the things, right?
392 H: °Yeah.°
393 Y: So you read the (2.8) Hemingway.
394 M: Yeah.
395 Y: Are they very different from (.) their the writing style?
396 M: Yeah
397 Y: They're different?
398 M: Bu[t um]
399 Y: [Which] one do you like better?
400 M: Um Hemingway's book is (easy)? ((pantomimes short book))
401 Y: Mmm. How how are his sentences? Because I-I haven't read him, so I'm interested in it.
402 M: (Mm)
403 Y: Are they the sentences are pretty shorter than this? Or
404 M: Ah ((nodding))
405 Y: Yeah? More simple?
406 Y: Which one do you think more difficult to read?
407 M: ((signals to Harry Potter book))
408 Y: This one's more difficult than Hemingway book?
409 M: Yeah, but Hemingway (. ) there are (. ) different sentences.
410 Y: Si[mple, but ]difficult?
411 M: [Hard words]
412 M: Yeah
413 Y: Sounds more frustrating. So many words. So I marked the words I didn't know.
414 M: Yeah
415 Y: And like so, so like,
416 M: So I am
417 Y: like run here is fine, but (. ) like (. ) some part they're like so many words I don't know? and ( .) like if I have too many words I don't know I can't guess.
418 M: Ahh:
419 Y: What the meaning is, so if it's not too much I kinda can guess what the meaning is? But if (. ) if too many words are stuck together?
420 M: Yeah
421 Y: °It's so bad.°
422 (4.0)
423 Y: Do you use dictionary while you reading?
424 M: Mm yeah.
425 (1.9)
426 Y: Okay, so um, my favorite part is um (2.6) Harry and Hagrid shopping. The shopping scene.
M: Ahh:
Y: To buy magical equipments for school. Because it's very interesting and a little
strange I mean to read about buying magical things. As if they are buying
ordinary things. Like, like, they like (.) they, it, she wrote like if as if they're
buying some normal clothes, normal shoes
M: Mmhm
Y: and some vegetables like from normal stores? But they're actually getting magical
things like wands
M: ((laughs))
Y: and robes. Isn't it funny? ((laughing))
M: ((laughing))
Y: So that, that's my favorite part because it's funny.
Y,M: ((laughing))
(4.1)
Y: Mmkay. (3.9) So we talked about (.) all the questions. Do you have any questions
or
M: °No°
Y: Are we good? Let's see, let's talk about. Oh vocabulary.
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Note: Book club leader’s first prepared question – “If you had heard platform nine and three-quarters at eleven o’clock, could you believe the existence?”

001 T: And you can go ahead and start whenever you’re ready.
002 T: ((Students moving to desks, sitting down, and chatting in Japanese.))
003 Y: Do you have enough room? (.) with this here?
004 Y: Oh if you wanna put something (.) I have more space.
005 T: Yeah, you can do that if you want.
006 T: ((H searches for book club questions he created))
007 M: (Thank)
008 Y: Thank you
009 M: (22.4) ((H organizes papers and then students all read questions silently))
010 M: I don't know this
011 H: heard
012 M: [word]
013 H: heard
014 M: This word hhh <I'm sorry.>
015 Y: Heard
016 H: Heard
017 H: [h:]
018 Y: [Her]ard
019 H: Hear.
020 M: Ah. ((laughing))
021 H: Yeah.
022 Y: Oh, hear.
023 M: Hear.
024 Y: Heard.
025 H: Yeah, just I missed.
026 (1.9)
027 Y: And existence is exist-es. I'm exi- I exist here.
028 M: °Yes.°
029 Y: Exist. I'm, I'm here. I ex[ist].
030 M: °[Ahh:]
031 Y: So plat- platform is here.
032 M: Ah o[kay]
033 Y: [platform] is (.) exists
034 M: Ahh:
035 (10.7)
036 H: °All right.°
037 (7.5)
038 Y,M: ((quiet laughing))

039 (2.6)

040 H: Mkay. ((laughing))

041 (1.5)

042 Y: M::[kay]. ((laughing))

043 H: [So.]

044 H: Mm. First I (.) My answer (.) about first question is (.) I could believe in the existence? (.) because (.) ahh is to me it's nice:: (.) I- I wanna believe it.

046 (2.5)

047 Y: Cause it's nice.

048 Y,M,H:((laughing))

049 H: ( )

050 Y: [Fun]

051 H: [It's not.]

052 (3.2)

053 H: But I don't wanna believe (.) the ghost.

054 Y: Ah because you don't like it.=

055 H: =Yeah.

056 Y: So you wanna believe something you like.

057 H: Ah, yeah, [that]'s right.

058 Y: [((laughing))]((laughing))

059 Y: And it's we need lots of courage to run into the wall.

060 M,Y: ((laughing))

061 Y: of bricks. I heard there is a platform in Britain?

062 H: Ah >yeah, yeah, yeah.<

063 Y: The fake one but=

064 H: =yeah

065 Y: They actually made it, right? ((laughing))

066 M: ((laughing))

067 H: “yeah I know”

068 Y: Mm. I (.) yeah. I think I (.) I (.) wanna believe. ((laughing))

069 H: Mm::

070 Y: Cause it's, it's fun and if I was, was Harry (.) I'd, his life sucks ((laughing)) so if he, if I can do something to change my life, I would just try it.

072 H: Ah[:]

073 M: [Mm]:

074 Y: Even if it's a crazy idea. I [just] try it.

075 H: [Ahh]

076 M: Ahh.

077 Y: It's better than doing anything [in] the life.

078 H: [Mm::]


080 M: I think I also believe.

081 Y: Mmhm.

082 M: Um but I'm sort (troubled)
So um feeling clumsy or Yeah.
M: ((laughing))
I don't know what I should do.
((laughing))
Wh- why do you think you can believe it?
M: Umm (5.9) Mmm. (7) I, I wanna wizard. I wanna become wizard.
Ah so you, that's why you wanted to do.
Yeah. I, I wanna back? I wanna go back to Dursley's house.
You don't wanna, yeah. Hafta try something. ((laughing))
((laughing))
°Yeah°
°°Ready°°
Kay.° Shall we read a question? (. ) Each? Before we start [talking?]°
°Yeah right.°
Question?
Mm:hm. N[ext.]
[One] or two?
Two.
[Two, yeah.]
[Question two.] ((reading question)) What (. ) what is your favorite scene in
chapter six and nine. Se[ven.]
[Yeah (my favorite) scene]
In, in, the movie, I had no idea that he's angry.
Ah::, my favorite scene, um, appeared, uh ghost appeared?
[Ah]
[He was] angry. Because of the rude students.
Mmhm ((laughing))
That's why he did it but I, I just thought he just liked doing it.
((laughing))
So it was a new discovery.
°Yeah°
(19.1)
M: Nearly headless Nick.
Y: Mmhm.

(4.6)

M: Headless.

(4.9)

H: Mm. My favorite scene is also platform.

M: A

H: Mm. If I had seen the people (balancing) (hand motion) in the (hand motion) ahh: (hand motion)

M: °wall°

(2.9)

Y: the

H: pers

Y: wall?

M: wall

H: wall, yeah. (I very break out)

Y: (break?)

Y: I think my favorite (. ) I think we all have different

M: Ah:

Y: favorite parts this time

Y,M: ((laughing))

Y: I like (. ) when they first arrive at the Hogwarts?

H: Mm:

Y: I like the description of um dancing candles and

H: Ahh::

Y: (fallen) tables and

M: Ahh:

Y: like entrance with marbles? I, I like that part because it sounded like very magic

M: (some tour)

Y: Mmmh.

Y: °Yeah°

M: °Mm°

Y: I finally thought the magical part started (. ) finally. ((laughing))

M: Ah:

Y: Finished slow part.

Y,M,H: ((laughing))

Y: Without magic.

(7.1)

H: Kay. (2.0) *Eh*. If you, if you were given the invitation of Hogwarts, would

you accept the invitation.

Y: Can I ask you question?

H: Yes.

Y: Invitation is: (. ) to come to the (. ) to

H: to the invite

Y: Oh to be a student. T[o]=
H: [Ah::]
Y: =To go to the magical school? Or to go to the party?:
H: Ah::
Y: Cause I, I found party two parties? Right? (at least)
H: °two° Uhhh:: So. I meant (.) I meant
Y: °School?°
H: Yeah
Y: The school. To be a student.
H: Yeah
M: Ah::
Y: Okay.
M: Of course!
Y: Of course.
M: Yeah.
Y: Okay.
M: Of course!
Y: Of course.
M: Yeah.
Y, M, H: ((laughing))
Y: I can be: a witch.
M: Yeah.
Y: Mm (.) Yeah how how they talk about magic is very very fun like
M: Yeah
H: A[h: yeah]
Y: [They sound like we can actually try it.
M: Ye[ah, yeah, yeah]
Y: [((laughing)) ]
M: °°Mhmhm°
H: Wanna be wizard.
Y: Wizard.
H: Yeah
Y: Yeah
H: It's cool.
Y: °It's cool.°
M: Um, ordinary life was boring.
Y: Mmhm
H: Oh yeah
Y: Yeah (. ) Yeah, if if they say they can teach magic to me (.) I just go.
M: Yeah! ((laughing))
H: Yeah.
Y: A little scary though if [it's]
H: [Yeah]
Y: a real life. ((laughing))
H: Yeah. (1.5)
Y: What?
Y, M: ((laughing))
H: But if I, if I were a only person who can ah use magic it would be very bad.
((laughing)) Yeah, yeah. I think so too.

H: Cause I (.) maybe (.) if it's close to (.) I (.) don't have to uh feel scared (.) about

ting. I became more brave.

Y: If we can use magic, what what do you want to try first? With the magic.

H: Fly.

Y: Fly.

M: Mm[hm]

H: [Fly.]

Y: °Fly.°

(5.2)

H: Go to the forest.

Y: Mmm.

M: ((laughing)) °forest°

H: °Yeah°

Y: I wanna make animals speak.

M: Ah[:;]

H: [Ah::]

Y: ((laughing))

M & H ((nodding))

Y: (What is saying) my cat

(8.7)

H: ((looking at paper, looks up))

M: ((looking at H)) °Next°

H: Next ((laughing))

M: Next. Next. ((laughing harder))

Y: °Ask question.° ((looking at clock)) We still have lots of time (though).

(5.0)

Y: °Mmkay.° Let's talk a lot in the last question. ((laughing))

H: If [you ] ((reading from questions))

Y: [Although] we still have ((pointing to questions on board)) yeah.

M: >yeah yeah<

Y: °(Something to take.) Okay.° Sorry go ahead.

H: ((reading)) If you have to if you <have to eat> chocolate frogs or pumpkin pasties,

which one do you eat?

Y: ((laughing))

M: Ahh[::::::]

H: [>This one is<] not so nice question.

M: Mmhm. I choose chocolate frog.

H: Mm.

M: So, um (;) I wanna witch card! ((laughing))

Y, M: ((laughing))

H: Mm.

M: °Witch card (yeah)°.

Y: Do you know what pasty is? Is it=

M: =Pas- ty is

H: Like [um]
M: [Um] 
H: Mix 
M: Ss, ss, sluh, ss 
H: (Mm) 
Y: Not pastry. I thought they're pastries and I kept reading pastries. 
M: ((laugh)) 
Y: But it's pasties. 
M: Pa[sty.] 
Y: [Like] pie? 
H: Mm. 
M: Maybe. Yeah.= 
H: =Mm. 
T: Are you asking about pasties? 
Y: ((nods)) 
T: I think they are pies. I think they might be little (. ) They might be something that's 
folded in half? 
Y: Like a Danish? 
T: <Maybe.> Well: like something is inside, like the pumpkin is inside, and then 
there's crus:t ( ) like a pie crust but it's folded all the way around it? I think. I think 
it's a British word, but I'm not sure. 
M: °°British word°° 
T: Yeah. Um, when my phone is not being used I could look it up. ((laughing)) 
Y,M,H:(laughing) 
T: and see. I'll try to remember to do that. So. Yeah. It's a good question. (1.0) Does 
the food, do you li-, does the food sound good to you or does the food sound 
awful. 
H: Sound good. 
T: Yeah. 
H: Yeah. Chocolate frog. 
T: Chocolate frogs, yeah. ((laughing)) 
Y: ((laughing)) 
H: But not the frog, so. Just, I want card 
T: Right. 
Y: Wizard card ((laughing)) 
T: Th[e cards] 
Y: [Yeah. ] 
T: The cards are great. Who would you want on your card? 
H: Hmm. Dumbledore. 
T: Ye:ah. How about you Mika? Who would you want on your card? 
M: Mmm. (. ) Professor Quirrell ((laughing)) 
T: ((laughing)) Th[at's funny.] 
Y: [Is that?] Quirrell. 
T: Qui[rell.] 
M: [Profes]sor Quirrell. 
T: Professor Quirrell[ell.] 
M: [Quir]rell.
Who's that?
Um, turban?
Right. The funny teacher. Who would you want on your card ((pointing to Yukiko))
The ((3.9)) uh Mac MacGonagall?
Ah[
[Oh]: ye[s. I] like her.
[So she] might turn into a cat sometime.
Yeah] ((laughing))
(I would enjoy it.)

Ah::

Ahh.

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.

Yeah. But I think I'd, I think I'm with you. I think I'd want Dumbledore.

Yeah)

Yeah.
Y: Moving and melting.
M: Ah!
Y: Or maybe we don't have to (bake) with our tongues to be to melt it because it just move around and
M: [Eee] (laughing)
Y: melt =
M: Ah
Y: = naturally. (laughing)
Y,H: (laughing)
Y: (That's) creepy.
M: Pumpkin (patties) is better. (laughing) I think.
Y,M: (laughing)
M: Ah.
Y: We can get card from someone.
Y,M,H: (laughing)
M: Card, card.
H: (°Card°)
Y: Or just so that the chocolate go somewhere (outside).
M: Yeah (laughing) Card (grabbing motion)
Y: (Desperate) and bye. From the window. It just jumps and go away.
M: Yeah. (laughing)
H: °°Right.°°
Y: So:
H: Kay. Done.
M: [Mhm.]
Y: So let's move to: number two? Identify the protagonist and antagonist.
M: Ah.
H: Protagonist.
M: [Protagonist] is Harry?=
Y: =Harry.
H: Harry.
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001 T: Oh, um, "here." I can show you what you do just so you know.
002 Y: Yes, I can remember.
003 T: Yeah, so this button, this is the main power? And so you slide it over and
004 [you ha]ve to hold it for just a moment.
005 Y: [Okay.]
006 T: Till [the screen] lights up and then this you just push and then it starts recording.
007 Y: [Oh hold it.]
008 T: And R-E-C means that it's recording so
009 Y: Okay.
010 T: Great.
011 Y: All: the time like this.
012 T: Yeah, yeah. It just keeps going. Yep.
013 ((Hiroshi enters))
014 T: Thanks Hiroshi. (1.9) And I'm just going to do this as an extra "camera."
015 ((M whispers to Y))
016 Y: After the booking club.
017 M: Okay.
018 Y: (((laughing)) Book-ing club?
019 M: (((laughing)) Book club.
020 Y, M: (((laughing))
021 Y: So we can leave, as soon as we finish the test individually.
022 T: Yeah. I just figured, I know it's nice to get the test over and done with, but it's also
023 nice to be able to leave when you're done. So
024 Y: More time to forget things
025 All: (((laughing))
026 T: So you may start whenever you are ready. And, um, actually let me talk-
027 Hey, entire class, just for a moment. You may start. I'm not going to give you
028 anything extra to talk about today, so that you can finish your book clubs and then
029 take your midterm? But I do want you to make sure that you know um how far
030 you're going to read for next week. So after you discuss your questions, make sure
031 you know how far you'll read for next Thursday, and then that's all for book clubs
032 today. Does that make sense?
033 ((class assents))
035 (4.1)
036 M: Please fold.
037 H: Ah. Kay. (((laughing))
038 Y: Or you're cheating. (((wagging finger))
039 M: (((laughing))
040 H: I'm I'm not (.) a cheater.
Y, M, K: ((laughing))

041  

Y:  Let's start, let's start with reading questions?

042  

M:  ((Reading)) Who do like, Who do you like ((laughing))

043  

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

044  

M:  Who do you like the best so far in this book. And why. ((laughing)) I forgot you.

045  

M, H: ((laughing))

046  

H:  Huh.

047  

Y:  We understand.

048  

M:  ((laughing))

049  

H:  ((reads question very quietly to himself))

050  

Y:  Mm.

051  

(10.6)

052  

Y:  I, I like Hagrid.

053  

M:  Ahhh:

054  

Y:  Because he is really warm and () really cozy person to hang out with. He's nice.

055  

And he's gentle.

056  

M:  Mm. Ahh.

057  

Y:  And he's he's kinda cute. Like a big bear.

058  

M:  ((laughing))

059  

Y:  I like big bear guys, so (I like him first).

060  

M:  ((laughing))

061  

H:  Ahh I like ( ) Harry.

062  

Y:  °Harry.°

063  

H:  °Main character.°

064  

Y:  He has a sense of justice. So

065  

M:  Strong (person)

066  

H:  Yeah (.) He's nice person.

067  

Y:  Can you give me some examples?

068  

H:  Ah[h:]

069  

Y:  [To] show his justice.

070  

H:  He (.) fought against with Voldemort after ((laughing))

071  

Y:  ((laughing)) Okay.

072  

H:  Okay.

073  

Y:  After story.

074  

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

075  

H:  Yeah.

076  

M:  ((laughing)) °After story.°

077  

Y:  Okay. He's getting really stronger.

078  

M:  Mm.

079  

Y:  Because after (.) before he went to the school he was kinda wim- not [wimpy]

080  

H:  [Ahh]

081  

Y:  but kind of weak?

082  

H:  Yeah, yeah, yeah.

083  

Y:  Always get hits from Dud[ley]

084  

H:  [Ah Dudley] yeah
Y: And his friends. And he didn't fight against
H: Ahhh:: but
Y: But he's, I think he's getting stronger and stronger.
H: Ah with being wizard?
Y: Yeah. And finally he gets strong enough to fight with against Voldemort.
H,M: ((laughing))
H: (°I see°)
M: So: I, I like Hermione Granger. Because () um, she can correctly judge ()
Y: [That's] kind of similar reason as Hiroshi?
M: [Ahh]
H: [Mm yeah]
Y: [Like] sense of justice? [Or]
M: [Mmhm]
M: And trying to be calm, calm and
Y: Calm?
H: Calm. Calm[.] Calm[.]
M: [Calm.]
H: Calm.
M: Calm. ((shows Yukiko word on paper))
Y: Oh, cahm.
M: Carm.
Y: Cahm.
H: Cahm.
Y: Cahm down. Like slow down.
M: Cahm down?
Y: Cahm is kind of slow and
H: Cahm down.
M: Oh, I thought calm.
Y: I dunno. It depends on the person,
H: Ah yeah
Y: So: I'm not sure. (6.1) You should ask your boyfriend.
M,H: ((laughing))
M: ((reading)) Collected actions. Collected actions. I think that her ex- ((laugh))
exist-ence existence
H: Existence
M: Mmhm.
Y: Existence?
M: [Existence]
Y: [Exist], being here
M: ((reading)) is important because Harry and Ron are always depicted
Y: They're kinda ((hand motions and [wild sounds])), [wild sounds] ((laughing))
M: and she [is]
H: [Ah]
Y: Mhm
M: correct [them]
H: [Ah::]
Y: Make them calm, calm down. Oh I see.
H: °I see.°
Y: Yeah we, I think, they need her too. ((laughing))
H: Ahhh:
Y: She seem to be kinda annoying, because always trying to (.) °Hey. You shouldn't
do that.° Like textbook. Walking textbook.
T: Are you talking about Hermione? A walking textbook?
All: ((laughing))
Y: But, yeah (.) they definitely need her. ((laughing)) She has a good heart I think so
too.
M: Ah.
H: °Let's see.°
T: Are you talking about Hermione? A walking textbook?
All: ((laughing))
Y: [Remem]brall. Yes, that's [a hard]
M: °Remembrall°
T: That's a word the author made up. A Remembrall? I think she combined
remember
Y: [°and ball°]
T: [and then ] Ball. Yeah. So she [blend]ed
H: [Ahh]
T: them together and made Remembrall.
M: Mm.
T: It's kind of a fun word.
H: Created?
T: Yes, J.K. Rowling, the author, [made that] word up.
H: [Ah, created]
M: Ahh:
T: So it's not a word that existed before. She made it up. Yeah.
H: Mm.
M: °Remembrall° ((reading)) back from Malfoy, if you were Harry?
H: Ahh.
M: ((reading)) Why. ((laughing))
H: °Ah yeah.° Maybe I (.) would (_) do as I would (_) do uhh as Harry do. Harry did.
Cause
Y: You're gonna do it?
H: Yeah.
Y: Brave boy.
M: Yeah.

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

(3.2)

H: Yeah.

Y: Why?

H: Mmm. Malfoy, I don't like Malfoy.

H, M, Y: ((laughing))

Y: °I see° ((laughing)) Yes, this is this is kind of chance to beat him also. I'm not sure I, I might not be able to do it.

H: Ahh.

Y: Because teacher told me not to, so

H: Ahh.

Y: I might think teacher's order is the highest, in my brain, like a dog.

H: Ahh. ((laughing))

Y: And I, I might not be brave enough to do it. To (.) break, break her order, so

H: Ahh.

Y: I'm not sure if I can do it. I, I know I should, but

H: Yeah

Y: it's kind of struggling. I

H: Ahh.

Y: I'm not sure

H: you can do it

Y: if, what I do. I, if I was (.) if, if I was there, I will do something, [but I'm] [Ahhh.]

Y: not sure what.

H: Something else, or

Y: I can't think now. If, yeah, I'm not sure.

(9.0)

M: ((reading)) I'm (.) Actually, I don't, I don't want to go, go for Malfoy, because I don't don't want to have anything to do with him. °So.°

Y: Oh, you trying to keep a distance?

M: Yeah

Y: From him? Like ignoring him?

M: Mmhm.

Y: Until he get, he lost interest. Yeah. That's a clever way.

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

M: But (.) But if I um:, if I um: main character like Harry? I have to go:

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

Y: Yeah. If I'm really mad, angry (.) at that time, I might do it. ((laughing))

H: Ah[hhh.]

M: [Ahhh.] ((laughs))

Y: I ((laughing)) I can't guess what, what I will feel there. Just scared, or mad enough
to do it, or.

H: Aghh: Mad enough, yeah.

(4.8)

H: °Let's see.°
Y: You're brave. ((laughing)) Very brave.
H: [No, no brave.]
Y,M,H:((laughing))

(7.1)
M: °Next.° ((reading)) How do you do when you meet a (. ) monstrous dog
H: A[hh]
M: [that] has three head.
H: A[hh]
M: [°dog°]
Y: Mm[hm.]
M: Three heads dog?
H: °dog°
M: Fluf- Fluffy. Hm?
Y: Mm. Cer-a-berus like a (. ) three heads?
Y: [Three] heads dog?
H: Mm[hm.]
Y: I will throw: everything.
M: °Name.° Yeah.
Y: Tables and chairs.
M: ((laughing)) Yeah.
Y: Because I can't use magics. I can't use practical magic yet. I have to learn [to].
Y: I will throw: everything.
H: Ah.
Y: So, I think I will do some violent stuff.
H,M,Y:((laughing))
Y: (Rather) use magic.
Y: Escape.
H: ((laughing)) Yeah.
H,M: ((laughing))
Y: And close the door.
Y: (°You think you will use°) the magic? (. ) You will try to use magic?
H: Yeah. Abra-dabra-dabra. ((pretending to wave wand))
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: I think I'm, I will be: panic too much. I think I forget that I can use magic.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
M: Ah. I am amazed, amazed, and my voice don't come out. ((pantomimes amazement))
H,M: ((laughing))
Y: Freeze?
M: Yeah. (2.0) And escape.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
H: (Harry.)
((12.6))
Y: Or maybe, throw food, and throw some food? to the dog? And the dog will eat it.
And so I will escape.
M,H: ((laughing))
H: Or set on fire.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
Y: Fire. Against animals. The best way.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
M: I think I cannot find trapdoor?
Y: Oh, no, no way. (I, I) I see nothing. Yeah. So Hermione is really brave.
M: [Yeah.]
H: Mmm.
Y,M,H: ((nods))
M: °Next question.°
Y: ((waving arms)) ((laughing)) Many Snapes
H: Yeah, weird.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
M: ((reading)) Snape's Snape [critic- critii]
H: [((laughs))]
Y: ((waving arms)) ((laughing)) Many Snapes
H: Hm.
M: ((reading)) Why do you think that he does it?
H: ((laughing)) Yeah (?) Maybe Snake favor (?)
M: Favor Malfoy?
H: Favors Malfoy.
M: Mmhm.
Y: Maybe Malfoy has some similar atmosphere as Snape?
H: Ah.
Y: So he (?) kinda thought Malfoy is his fellow?
M: Ah[h.]
Y: [I] don't know.
M: ((laughing))
Y: No idea.
T: Are you talking about number four?
H: Yeah.
T: Oh yeah. That's a good question. Very good question. So (?) have you all talked
about it yet? Number four? Have you said why you think?
H: Mmm. Yeah. Snape favored Malfoy.
T: Okay. So, have you ever heard the term teacher's pet? Have you heard that? It's a,
it's a idiom, but it means the teacher's favorite student. And so maybe Malfoy is
Snape's teacher's pet? Maybe.
H: [°°teacher's pet°°
T: It's a, you know a pet, is like a little animal, um, like a cat or a dog. But, yeah, a
teacher's pet is somebody who the teacher likes best. I don't know. Maybe Snape
doesn't have a teacher's pet either. Snape's kind of (.) severe ((laughing)) strict. So
I don't know. Actually, I do know, but I don't want to spoil the story.

All: ((laughing))
T: It's a very good question.
Y: Snape is the most mysterious.
M: Yeah.
Y: I have no idea what he's thinking. (6.9) What do you think?
M: It is just my, my image.
Y: Mmmh.
M: So, I think Malfoy's parents pay [mon]ey to Snape.
H: [Ah.]
Y: Oh, to Snape.
Y: Yeah, they might have connection with his parents.
H: Ah.
Y: Because, yeah, I- in the book it was talking about some- Malfoy's parents?
M: Ah.
Y: Was it? I (kinda) remember. His parents.
H: Mm.
Y: Or just ( .) I might just be making up. I don't know. ((laughing))
(7.7)
Y: I think we will figure out. Later. We might not be able to figure out only with this
book. We might have to read everything in the series to figure out.
Y,M,H:((laugh))
Y: (what to think.)
(6.5 )
Y: °Long story.°
(17.5)
T: Are you still talking about the questions? Or are you done?
M: °No. We're (stop).
T: You're- I'm sorry?
M: °Done.°
T: You're done? Okay. Do you know how far you want to read for next time?
H: [hh ]
M: [No.]
All: ((laughing))
T: It's always the question, huh? ((laughing))
H: ((laughing))
T: And once you decide, just let me know? And then we'll, um, we'll stop and we can
do the midterm. ( .) So. So maybe you will never stop and you'll say "ha" no
midterm today. ((laughing))
All: ((laughing))
Y: So, finish one-hundred sixty-two
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001 Y: Sorry, but my questions is kinda gathered to chapter twelve? Mostly? But I thought chapter twelve is the (.) most interesting part
002 [to me ]
003 M: [Mmhm, ahh]
004 Y: So. Sorry if question is, are kinda gathered to the same chapter.
005 Y,M: ((laughing))
006 Y,M: Ok.
007 Y: So:: should we get started?
008 M: Mmhm.
009 Y: So, number one question is ((reading)) Who do you think gave Harry the magic cloak?
010 M: [Mmm:: ]
011 Y: Do you remember magic cloak?
012 M: Y[eah::]
013 Y: Yeah::
014 H: [Yeah.]
015 H: Yeah.
016 H: Yeah.
017 Y: Yeah. Who do you think?
018 H: Ah, maybe Harry's parents' friend.
019 Y: Harry's parents' friend.
020 H: °Ye[ah, °]
021 M: [Ah ] yeah.
022 H: °Friend.°
023 Y: I see.
024 Y,H: ((laughing))
025 Y: I [see.]
026 M: [Not ] specific. ((laughing))
027 Y: You have any guess? (.) Like connection [to them]?
028 H: [Sirius] Black.
029 Y: [Ahhh:::::]
030 M: [Ahhh::::::]
031 Y,M,H:((laughing))
032 M: Ahh.
033 Y: Ah, I didn't thought about it. But yeah. Probably=
034 H: =Probably=
035 Y: =Probably=
036 H: =Probably.
037 Y: ((laughing)) How bout you?
038 M: Same=
039 Y: =Same?
040 M: Yeah.
Y: Hm, so I wrote something different. ((laughing)) So, I wrote
H: Ah!
Y: I, I thought (.) Professor Dumbledore? gave the cloak to Harry.
M: Mmhm.
Y: I have a reason. Because um Dumbledore was watching Harry (.) go into the
mirror room and
M: Mmhm.
Y: [>many] times?< And he was watching
M: Aah.
Y: And, like, he (.) as if he already know what's happened? What Harry, Harry does?
So, because he give the cloak to him, to Harry so he knows Harry will wander
around the school? at night? So, he was kinda preparing for it. S[o:]
M: [I see.]
Y: He found. That's my [guess.]
H: [Ah] yeah, [yeah.]
Y: [But] probably Sirius Black.
H: Mm, yeah.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: So let's move on to second question. ((reading)) Um, it is a very personal
question.
M: Mmhm.
Y: ((reading)) As to the magic mirror? Harry found, if you found and looked at the
mirror what do you think you would see. (Through) the mirror. ((laughing)) Very
personal.
Y,M: ((laughing))
H: So, idea?
Y: Mmhm.
H: Idea. Yeah. (.) Mmm.
Y: You can explain about ideas. Also you can talk about yourself.
H: Mmhm. Maybe (view) scene.
Y: Of what.
H: Yeah. Beautiful scene.
Y: Beautiful scene.
H: Beautiful view.
Y: Can you explain why?
H: Ah. Because (.) I (.) interested in world
Y: Hm?
H: World?
Y: Mmhm.
H: So, beautiful view.
Y: Beautiful view.
H: Beautiful view.
Y: [Can you, ] can you give us some examples? Like, moun[tains] or lake or
H: [Uhh:]
H: So far I like ocean.
087  Y:  Ocean. Huh, nice. (.) °Ocean.° (1.8) Okay, what about you, Mika?
088  M:  Uhh, I think maybe um I will see: space.
089  Y:  Spa[ce.]
090  M:  [Space] Yeah, I wanna go to space. So, um, I wear spacesuit maybe.
091          (laughing))
092  Y:  Mmmm. Ah, so you will see yourself.
093  M:  Mmhm.
094  Y:  So Hiroshi, do you see yourself in the view? Or just the view?
095  H:  Ju[st view].
096  M:  [Just?] 
097  Y:  Just view, not y[ou?]
098  M:  [Not you?]
099  Y,M:  ((long laughing))
100 Y:  You, you're not existing?
101 Y,M,H:((laughing))
102 M:  Like TV.
103 Y:  Hm?
104 M:  Li[ke TV.] 
105 Y:  [Like TV.]
106 Y,M,H:((laughing))
107 Y:  I, the mirror (.) in the book Dumbledore said the mirror reflects what you really
108     want. What you desire, right? So it's gonna be your dreams?
109 H:  Ah[hh].
110 Y:  [I guess.] So your dream is beautiful ocean, sea. So you're not you? in the
111     ocean? playing?
112 H:  Ahhh.
113 Y:  Just ocean? ((laughing))
114 H:  Ocean, yeah, ocean.
115 Y:  Ahh. That's interesting.
116 M:  ((laughing)) °Just ocean.° 
117 Y:  And, you're moving around in space.
118 M:  Yeah.
119 Y:  In a rocket? Or just yourself in space.
120 M:  Um: Rocket? and me.
121 Y:  Uh, on the rocket?
122 M:  ((nodding))
123 H:  Ahhh.
124 Y:  That's cool. ((laughing)) Like Gravity.
125 M:  Yeah.
126 Y:  Did you see it?
127 M:  No.
128 Y:  Oh, no? Oh, you should see it. °Is it still in theater?° If it's on, y-you should see it.
129 M:  Ok, so, my: dream ((laughing)) I will see I'm being really famous artist.
130 M:  Mmhm.
131 Y:  ((laughing)) Drawing, because I love art? But I wasn't brave enough to try art. So
132     I kinda give up being artist (.) before I try. ((laughing))
So I think I was, I, I, so I'm still rem-, um having dream of being artist. I'm not trying, but um, I, I think I keep having the dream. So I think I will see it in the mirror. With my family, from Japan. So I, I don't know where it will be. But me, my husband, and my family?

M: Mmmh.

Y: And me being famous artist. ((laughing))

M: Ah.

H: Ahhh.

Y: That's my desire. Yeah (.) °So:° Having fun. Ha- have fun. It's interesting to you. Listening your dreams. °Okay.° So: next question. ((reading)) Do you think the mirror is good or evil.

M: Ahh.

Y: Why.

(3.1)

H: Good.

Y: (Do) you think it's good?

H: ((nodding))

Y: It's good mirror?

H: Yeah.

Y: Can you explain why?

H: Cause, ah ((laughing at something off-screen))

H: Cause, ah

Y, M, H: ((all laughing at something off-screen))

H: Yeah. It was me happy

Y: Oh you, the mirror give you happy. Happiness. So you can always be happy when you look at it. So it's a good thing.

H: Yeah.


H: True. ((laughing))

Y: True. What do you think.

M: Yeah:. I al-so, it makes me happy. But maybe um mm I: I forgot to live

H: Ahh.

Y: Oh, yeah, oh yeah. (To) the real world. And you don't want to come back.

M: Yeah. (.) ((laughing))

Y: Yeah. (.) Yeah. (.) That's, that's, do you think that's why Dumbledore

H: Ah[h.]

Y: [took] the mirror from Harry?

M: Mmmhm.

Y: Because Harry just stay there

M: Ah[h.]

Y: [and] he won't come back? ((pause)) My, my thoughts are similar to Mika. But I don't think the mirror is evil. I, I think it the mirror is also good.

M: Mmmhm.

Y: But, um, not good always? But, it's not evil? It's kinda like drug? Like drug. It gives you dreams and you will feel pretty good but it's too good, so you don't
want to come back. And it might stop making, making courage?
M: Mmhm.
Y: Making working? For your real life to make it good. Make it better. So you might stop encouraging your, your real life, so: it's pretty dangerous.
M: Mmm.
Y: If you watch only sometimes it will good.
H: Ahh, ye[ah.]
Y: [It will] be good. But if you (drown) in the mirror (.) if the mirror have the possibility to make you (drown) in there, so. I think it's a dangerous thing.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: Yeah. What did I write? ((laugh)) ((reads paper)) Yeah, like that, yeah. That's wh- like what I said. Okay. So, last question. ((reading)) Why do you think Dumbledore told Harry to put the magic cloak back and go back to his bed gently ins- ((looks up)) um, when you, um, Dumbledore found Harry in the, in front of the mirror at night, r[ight?]?
M: Mmhm.
Y: And it's, it's not a good thing that he's breaking the rule c[ause]
M: [Ahh ]
Y: student can't wander around the cla- classrooms at night. So, but he didn't you're H: Mm.
Y: go away from the school. You, he didn't say, told Harry to quit the school. He just said gently, go back t- to your bed.
H: Yeah.
Y: Even he said, um, put back the cloak. That means he's kind of, Dumbledore's protecting Harry. He can be invisible. So, and go back without wi- keeping secret. So he's kinda being nice to him.
H: °Yeah.°
Y: And, do you uh, what do you think? Why do you think
H: Ah[hh]
Y: [Dum]bledore did that to Harry.
H: Ahhh. Because, Dumbledore is always good?
Y: Uh huh.
H: With Harry, right?
Y: Yah, yah. Do- Do you know, why do you think so? Why do you, does he, is he nice to him.
H: Yeah.
Y: Always.
H: Maybe
T °Good question.°
H: Harry's parents
Y: Uh huh
H: are also good to Dumbledore.
Y: Mmmhm. Oh, they have connection, (or)
H: Yeah, that's right. Yeah, and uh, Dumbledore knows
Y: Mmmhm.
H: Harry doesn't have parents?
Y: Yeah, yeah.
H: Yeah, so he is gentle to Harry.
Y: He, he kinda feels sorry for Harry.
H: ((nods))
Y: And he returning the gent- the kindness to Harry's parents.
H: ((nods))
Y: I see.
H: ((laughing))
Y: Yeah, I think so, too. I di- I didn't think about parents too but yeah probably, yeah.
H: Yeah.
Y: What do you think, Mika.
M: ((reading question)) Mm. Sorry, I'm still (.) thinking. ((laughing))
Y: ((laughing)) You're still thinking. Okay.
Y: (16.1) ((M and H read question, them M turns to book))
Y: Oh, yeah, we didn't use the book at all. We should
Y,M: ((laughing))
Y: Sorry. I didn't.
(6.9) ((H, M, Y all look through book))
Y: Can you believe it? Read this much. ((showing thickness of book))
M: Yeah.
Y,M: ((laughing))
T: You should feel very proud. That's really, really cool. And so you read about, um, the Mirror of Erised?
Y: Mmhm.
T: That's one of my favorite parts. Did you like it Hiroshi?
H: Mm. ((nods, thumbs up))
T: Yeah?
Y: That was also my favorite, so.
T: Was [it?]
Y: [The] questions are all about it.
T: Yeah. Well that's good. I think it was interesting. Did you like that part, Mika, with the mirror?
M: Mmhm.
T: Yeah. That's, that's one of my favorite parts. I think it's, it's beautiful, and it's also sad
Y: Mmhm.
T: It makes us think. ((laughing)) Yeah. Well good.
M: Actually, I, I watched the TV last night. ((laughing))
Y: Oh you did? ((laughing)) Part one?
M: Yeah ((laughing))
Y: So, you understood better?
M: Yeah
Y: Much better than before reading the book.
M: Mmhm.
Y: Cool. I should watch it, too. I watched before I started this reading this book. So, in English? without any Japanese subtitles, so I, ((laughing)) I had no idea what
they're, what's going on.

((laughing))

And, I think yeah now I can understand better. I should watch it too. ((laughing))

So, you, yours image is very clear for the mirror.

((laughing))

((M looking at question))

I don't know why.

You don't know why.

(Yeah what)

in the story?

What I agree with.

Hiroshi. Yeah. Yeah I agree him too. (.) I, my answer is um because Dumbledore is sorry? for leaving Harry. He, he left Harry in front of Dursley's [house], right?

M:

[Mmhm]

And left. So um, when he was a (. So he, didn't have any choice? um to make Harry happier? Instead of leaving Harry at the Durs- Dursley's?

M:

Mmm.

house. And (. I think he, they're the Dursley's are Muggles, right?

M:

Yeah.

They're all Muggles. And, so, I think he knows how hard the, Harry's life will be. And he felt sorry for him? And, also he knows Harry misses his family so much. And he's also lonely? Because the Dursley's are, they're not nice.

((laughing))

So, he understand his (loneness) too so I think he (can't) blame him [about]

being lonely a lot. Being, seeing his family a lot. It's kinda (.) sad.

°Ahh.°

So yeah, similar opinion to Hiroshi.

(12.8)

Did you get some, something else? Idea? (Funny?)

M:

Mmm. (. ((shakes head)) (5.0) (Every?))

((laughing))

(Every?) ((laughing)) Or a similar thing. So anything.

Ahh. (4.2) ((laughing)) Both.

It (. you got everythi[ng?]]

[Yeah.]


Yeah.

Okay. So shall we talk about words then? Vocabularies?

(16.1) ((shuffling papers))

So, Mika, did you choose some same words as ours?

No=

They're, we're all different? We, we all have different words?

Mmm.

So maybe, um, we should choose one of them like last time we did?
M: Oh, okay.
T: So sit wherever you like, and then I will arrange the cameras around you.

((laughing))

... ((incidental conversation between teacher and teachers-in-training))

T: Okay, sorry guys: °Let's get you°

Y: °Question. For punishment? Why Ron wasn't there with them?°

(M and H look at book.)

M: Punishment.

Y: The, in woods? (2.2) They went to woods at night? as punishment.

Y: The last scene we read? Last?

H: Ah, ah.

Y: (Here) they saw him unicorn (centaurs) the magic forest? Why was- wasn't Ron there? He wasn't punished? I didn't [un]derstand what's going on.

H: [Ah.]

M: Ahh.

Y: Where did Ron go? They just sent Harry, Hermione, and Malfoy, and Neville.

M: Mmmh.

Y: Right?

M: Yeah. Mmmh?

H: Ron.

((laughing))

Y: ( He still wander )

H: °Ron.°

Y: It just

M: Oh.

(3.1)

Y: It's not important.

((laughing))

Y: I just didn't understand. So, I thought you guys knew.

(8.8)

T: Okay, so I'm going to step down to the other room.

H: Ahh.

T: But then I'll come back. So go ahead and, and

Y: Oh.

T: talk about your questions your, you should be good to go.

Y: So, there's no recorder?

T: That's wh-, I forgot those today.

Y: Ohh, I see.

T: So that's why I sent everybody [out]

Y: [Oh] that's why you sent (everybody out.)
T: I'll be right back.
(9.7)
Y: Oh sorry you don't have, you don't have, guys, have to look for it. I just, I was just wondering. So let's get started.
H: °Okay.°
(20.1) ((H passes out questions)) ((H and M laugh and wave to someone outside classroom))
H: All right. So. I will start.
Y: Okay.
H: ((reading)) If you were Harry Potter, would you go to the Mirror of Erised again even (.) Dumbledore said I do not want you to go there. (1.1) So.
Y: Okay.
H: Ee, I mean (.) would you (.) ahh accept (.) the order? [Or]
Y: [Yah] yah.
H: Yeah. Or, against.
Y: Still look for the mir[ror.]
H: [Yeah] yeah.
Y: Yeah.
((2.2))
Y: Hmmm. That's difficult question.
H: ((laughing))
M: Umm, If I were Harry Potter, I don't?
Y: You don't?
M: Yeah. Because (.) I'm (.) honest?
M,Y: ((laughing))
Y: Honest.
H: So. ((looks to Y))
Y: I, I might look for it again.
H: [Mmhm.]
M: [ Ahh.]
Y: Because (.) I can see what I really wanna see?
H: Mmm.
Y: That's a really, really good deal. ((laughing))
H: Yeah. ((laughing))
Y: And (.) for Harry (.) he missed his family.
H: Mm.
Y: A lot. He's lonely? So if I were him, I don't think I can stand (.)
H: Mmhm.
Y: Um (.) keep, keeping distance from the mirror? Whatever
H: Ahh.
Y: So, I, I wanna, I think I look for it again. ((laughing))
H: Mmmmm. (.) Maybe (.) I don't obey (the) I don't obey Dumbledore because it's (.) mysterious. Mirror is mysterious.
Y: Mmhm.
H: And (.) so to me it's all a good thing. Totally good thing.
Y: (Where) you can see good thing.
H: Mmmh.
Y: You wanna see it again.
H: Yeah.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
H: I disobey.
Y: Yeah.
H: °°Kay.°° Second. ((reading)) If you were a one-
M: =Ah=
H: =of Quidditch players, which position would you want?
M: Mmm.
H: ((hand motion)) Kun-
M: Um ( )
Y: Is there a bludger? (. ) Or is that one of the (. ) I can't remember. Seeker >what did
you say< Seeker:
Y: Se[eker]
H: [Seeker]
T: Keeper
Y: Keeper
M: Beater
T: Beater. Maybe I'm thinking Beater and Bludger.
All: ((laughing))
Y: Beater is dangerous one?
M: Yeah
H: Mm.
Y: Has to fight with the, with big, not big, with
M: Small=
Y: =against ball=
M: =Small [to]
Y: [pret]ty violent ball. Oh I don't wanna do that.
All: ((laughing))
Y: Maybe the, the one we can't remember. I think, because it sounds safest.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
H: °°So. °° (. ) I would, I, maybe I would be Seeker.
Y: See[ker.]
M: [Mm.]
H: It's the coolest.
Y: Coolest.
H: Yeah.
Y: In the book it says Seeker one is not always danger, dangerous? But when players
get hurt, it, the hurt will be really serious.
H: Ah: yeah.
Y: So it's kinda scary. ((laughing))
H: Yeah.
M: Seeker is [(expect)]
Y: [With really high speed, right?]
M: (expect, expected)
H: Ah[h.]
M: [By] people. (. ) ((laughing))
H: expe-
Y: Oh, interrupted=
H: =Ahh. Ah.
Y: Once the Seeker find the little ball
H: Mmkay. ((hand motion))
Y: Yeah, but the other players=
H: =Yeah=
Y: =Will look for it and
M: Your eye is good?
H: Mm.
M: ((laughing))
H: My eye is good.
M: ((laughing))
Y: The seeker is, I think it's really cool position=
H: °Yeah.°
(5.1)
H: I don't like Keeper.
Y: Me either. That's just scary. ((laughing))
Y: I don't wanna just take the ball.)
Y,M: ((laughing))
Y: What about you?
M: I want (one more) position.
H: Mm.
Y: Oh, the same position I was talking? about?
M: Um. (3.3) Mm. Keeper, Seeker, Beater, one more.
Y: And one more. I
H: Mm.
Y: I wanna be the last one. And we can't remember because it sounds safest.
M: [yeah]
M: Same, same.
Y: Same.
M: Mm:
Y: We are not brave.
Y, M, H: ((laughing))
M: ((laughing)) not brave.
(2.8)
M: Mmm. Because because mm. I understand mm. dangerous?
Y: Mmhm.
M: So:
Y: So dangerous.
M: But, I try quaffle, quaffle ball
Y: Mm[hm.]
H: [Ahh.]
M: To ring.
H: Ah, throw. Throw.
Y: Yeah.
H: °Yeah.°
Y: Do you wanna play? If you can fly?
H: Hai.
Y: You do?
M: Yeah.
H: I just want to fly with ((pantomimes broom))
M: Broomstick.
H: Yeah.
M: °Broomstick.° Broomstick?
Y: Hm? Broom?
H: Mmhm.
Y, M: ((laughing))
Y: I would just enjoy flying
H: Yeah, [yeah]
Y: [Not] fighting [the game]
H: [Yeah, yeah.]
M: Yeah.
H: °Just fly.°
(2.9)
Y: Flying for fun.
H: °°Yeah.°°
(3.2)
H: Ehh-at. So next is ((reading)) If you can get a baby of dragon, would you want one? (. And, tell me the reason.
(4.8)
H: I want. ((laugh))
Y: Yeah, me too, I, I want it. It's really cool.
H: Yeah=
Y: =It, but it bites a lot too. So it's, sometimes it burns houses, too, right?
H: M[m:]
Y: With fire. [((laughing))]
H: [Mm:]
Y: So it's hard to keep.
M: Umm, I don't think so. ((laughing))
Y: You don't, you don't want to keep.
M: Uhh, dragon is maybe become, become too big?
H: Mmm.
M: It's too dangerous. (.) Um, If I were=
H: =Mm.=
M: =Hagrid
H: Mm
M: Maybe I want (.) dragon
Y: Yeah, because you're strong enough=
H: =Ah
Y: If the dragon thinks (.) I'm the dragon's mother? That will be awesome.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: It's like little pretty pet? Obedient? Really strong?
M: If dragon is pet
H: Mm.
M: It is cool.
Y: [Yeah.]
H: [Yeah.]
M: Unique.
Y,M: ((laughing))
Y: We can rule the world.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
(2.1)
H: And, uh, I wanna fly with ri[ding] dragon.
Y: [Ah.]
M: Ah.
Y: Sounds cool. Do you know the movie, uh, How to Train a Dragon? (.) I think it's a
Pixar movie.
H: °I'm not sure°
Y: It's, yeah, 3-D movie?
H: Mmhm.
Y: And it's about village. Dragon village.
H: Ahh.
Y: A boy capture a dra[gon]
H: °drag]on°
Y: and train
H: Ahh.
Y: I think you like it.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
Y: How to Train a Dragon.
H: Ohh.
H,Y: ((laughing))
H: °It's cool.°
(9.0) ((Hiroshi searches for question to read))
H: °Okay.° So: Last (.) question. ((reading)) If somebody had gave you a
mysterious egg, would you receive it? And tell me the reason.
(1.9)
Y: So mysterious egg mea[ns]
H: [Yeah]
Y: the=
M: =dragon's e[gg]
Y: [we] we never know what=
H: =Yeah=
Y: what's in[side?] [Yeah] yeah, yeah=
Y: =Even, we don't know if it's dragon or [anything]
H: =[yeah, yeah]=
M: =Ohh.
Y: We don't anything about. Hm.
M: I see.
Y,H: ((laughing))
Y: So it could be (.) really (.) disgusting=
H: =Mm=
Y: =insect ((laughing))
H: Yeah=
Y: =egg.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
H: Yeah
Y: Or, really really cute horse [egg.]
M: [Mmm.]
Y: ((laughing))
H: Yeah.
H: °So.°
Y: Hm.
H: ((laughing))
(7.8)
M: It's difficult.
H: ((laughing))
Y: Hmmm. (.) I don't think I, I can, I take it.
H: M[m].
Y: [It's] like (.) s- (.) someone gives us
H: Hm.
>gives me< food? And I, if I eat it or not, I kinda doubt if it's poison

Ah[hh.]

poisonous or. I think it's, I think about this as kinda same idea? It's not

poison, but we don't know what's inside.

Ah yeah.

Someone might be t- trying to trick me? ((laughing)) So I don't wanna take it. I

don't wanna take the risk.

(4.5)

°Is a° (2.7)

M: Maybe I, I wills take it.

You will take it?

Yeah.

Um, because (. ) um I, I'm simply in- interesting in=

=what's inside?

Yeah. (. ) What is)?

M: Yeah. (.) What (is)?

M, Y, H; ((laughing))

°Yeah.°

°Maybe,° I think egg is (. ) not insect, so (. ) I must take this must be curious.

Yeah.

So I receive it, I receive. And (. ) if it's dangerous one, maybe I=

=remove it?

H, Y, M; ((laughing))

Yeah, you can do that.

[(yeah just)]

If I can do] that, I will take it.

H: Yeah.

(6.8)

°So ° Yeah.

Y, H, M; ((laughing)) ((students open Harry Potter books))

We have (. ) (it's) two?

M: Mmhmm. We [we can] finish

[two weeks?]

Do we have (one more) two more weeks? Two more book c- clubs or=

=Oh, really?

This one is will be the last one? I'm not sure.

(7.7) ((all thumbing through books))

We can go to like (4.6) Maybe we can ask when Sha[r]on comes back.

[yeah]

And think about how much we read.

Two, two-hundred nine?

Uh, if we have two weeks, maybe we don't have to.

Yeah, if we have two weeks

Oh.

Are you almost done?

Yeah. ((raises hand))
Yeah. Good. Do you have a question?

Uh. How many book clubs do we have?

Oh. Good question. This is number five.
T: I'm gonna actually (.) Can I organize you? Just a little bit Yukiko? ((laughing))
I'm sorry. Can I ask you to turn just a little bit so that I can see your face more. So
if you can turn
Y: So [so]
T: [That] way
Y: This way
T: Yes:. Sorry to (.). move you. °Let's see.° (.). It's like being in the movies.
Y: °Oh my goodness.° ((laughing))
T: Oh this is doing something weird. Everything (.). Come look at it. This is really
strange.
All: ((laughing))
T: It's like black and white. And everybody’s outlined in yellow.
M: Yellow ((laughing))
T: °That’s really strange.°
All: ((laughing))
T: I don’t know why it’s doing that. It’s never done that before.
Y: It’s like we’re ((laughing)) zombies.
T: ((laughing)) Yeah exactly. Very strange.
H: ((laughing))
T: Oh there we go. Ha! That was weird.
All: ((laughing))
T: That would’ve been good for Halloween.
All: ((laughing))
T: Umm: An:pd. There we go. You're good. Thank you.
M: First question. ((reading)) Which do you think about Snape. Is a good man or a
M,H,Y: ((laughing))
Y: He, (eh you) put space
Y,M,H: ((laughing and undecipherable comments about how the question is written))
M: ((finishing reading)) For Harry.
Y,M,H: ((laughing))
Y: You put space ((laughing))
M: Why.
Y: That's different thing.
Y,M: ((laughing))
H: He's bad man.
M: Bad man for Harry.
H: No. Good man.
M: Good man.
H: He saved Harry (.) At Quidditch.
Y: Yeah. Kinda mean, though. I, I wonder how he has to be that mean.
Y,M,H,(laughing)
Y: Well, maybe he's trying to (.) hide himself from be pr- protecting Harry? Because bad guys so knew Snape is trying to protect Harry? They might do something to Snape.
M: Ah[h.]
Y: [So] he can't protect him anymore. That's why he's being mean? Or his personality. ((laughing))
M: But Harry think that Snape, Snape is like (.) star?
H: Ah.
Y: Mmhm.
Y,M,H,(laughing)
M: Um, but (.) I also think ((laugh)) Snape is good man.
Y: Good man?
M: Yeah. After read, reading.
Y,M,H,(laughing)
M: Can I move
Y: Mmhm
M: next question?
M: ((laughing)) Second question. ((reading)) Do you think uh the action same as her. Her- is Hermione, Hermione. Or think the other way if you were Hermione when Neville said I will fight you. Why?
H: Mm. Fight. I would fight because we have to. Have to s- do that. Mm. (first).
M: Fight, fight ((punching motions))
H: Mm.
M,H,Y,(laughing)
H: Yeah. (2.8) I watched movie, and I thought I had to (. ) fight against with Neville.
If I were Hermione.
Y: Fight against Neville.
H: Hm. It's the only way to protect stone.
H,M,Y,(laughing)
Y: (Quite) remember. (laughing))
((11.3)
M: Mm. If I were Hermione I think I also take the action "same as her." Mm. Because Neville don't agree with us? So, I, we have to (. ) mm: ((laughing)) ((Japanese phrase and acting out covering up mouth))
Y: Make him shut up?
M: Ahh. Make him shut up. ((laughing)) (5.9) Yeah.
Y: You think we can just ignore him?
Y,M,H,(laughing)
Y: Instead of fighting?
H: But, maybe Neville take (just) action with, to to teacher?
Y: Mmhm.
H: And the teacher can stops, they stop Hermione and Harry. So (. make (4.2) fight.
H: Have to fight.
Y: Mmkay
M,Y,H:((laughing))
(10.0)
M,Y,H:((laughing))
M: (Next, next)?
Y: Ah:
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: ((nods to M))
M: ((reading)) If you were Harry you know what we are not al- allowed allowed
to use magic at home. Will you use mya- magic at home during summer?
Y: ((laughing))
M: ((laughing))
Y: ((nods to M))
M: (Next, next)?
Y: Ah: It's, it will be cool if I can show magic to people who can't use.
Y, M: ((laughing))
Y: But I think I will, try not to. And, if I really really want to do, I will do it in the
bathroom.
Y, M, H: ((laughing))
T: ((laughing)) That's a good answer.
Y: Bathroom wall or
All: ((laughing))
M: How bout you, Hiroshi?
H: I would use. It's convenient. So, I would use anytime.
Y: ((laughing)) In front of people, too?
H: Ah, may[be I]
Y: [Or secretly?]?
H: Secretly.
Y, M, H: ((laughing))
M: Yeah.
(3.0)
M: Last question. ((reading)) Do you want to enter a witch and wizard's school like
Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and W- Wizardry after reading it? Why?
H: M[mm.]
Y: [(>I want in.<)]
M, Y: ((laughing))
Y: >I want in.<
M: Me too.
Y: But I'm not sure if I can graduate.
133 M,Y: (laughing)
134 Y: Because stairs just keep moving and I don't think I can make to class (on)time.
135 H,M,Y: (laughing)
136 Y: And I can't get (the) credits.
137 M: Mm.
138 Y,M,H: (laughing)
139 (2.9)
140 Y: But I wanna try. °Sounds cool.°
141 M: Mm. (nodding)
142 M: I wanna (.) I wanna wear the robe. (laughing)
143 Y: Yeah=
144 M: =Cause it's cool=
145 Y: =Me too.
146 M: And, uh, I, I (.) I wear sort- sort of hat?=  
147 H: =Ahh=
148 Y: =Mmmhm. The pointed one?=  
149 M: =Mmmhm.
150 Y: Yeah.
151 M: Yeah.
152 Y: There's a comic shop? in Fairbanks? And they actually sell the robe and hat  
153 Y,M,H: (laughing)
154 M: Okay. Ah, oh okay. (laughing)
155 Y,M,H: (laughing)
156 Y: I saw the robe for the first time. The real one. On the, on the wall. I don't know if  
157 they're selling but it's there.
158 Y, M: (laughing)
159 H: I wanna learn magic so (.) I wish I could ((laughs)). I wanna learn. Yes.
160 Y: Seems to be very hard work though. Like lots of studying and taking many  
161 classes.
162 (3.3)
163 H: °Mmkay.°
164 (9.0)
165 Y: And, we have to live in school. For like four years? Or six years? Live in the  
166 school?
167 M: Ahh=
168 Y: =With classmates? Do you think you, you will like that? If, if it's one or two  
169 years, will be okay, but if it's six years?  
169 Y,M,H: (laughing)
170 Y: For, with classmates
171 M: Six years, uhhh
172 Y: Seems to be really [long.]
173 M: [too long]
174 (3.5)
175 Y: Might get tired of them.
176 M: Yeah.
177 Y: I want my free time like. ((laughing)) I want my private.
Y: But yeah (Think, think, learn magic) I can
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: I wanna go.
M: °Finish°, finish.
Y,M,H:((very quiet laughing))
M: °Finish°, finish.
Y: Who do you like the best in the book?
M: Mmm.
Y: Think I like Hagrid the best.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: He's cute.
H: Yeah. () Nice person.
Y: And he likes dragons. I like [dragons too.]
M: [Ay, yeah, yeah]. Oh really?
Y: And he's sweet.
H: Aah. ((laughing))
M: Hmm.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: We're laughing more than talking.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
M: Ah. I oh I don't know um () bottle?
Y: Hm?
H: Hm?
M: Um, page twenty, two-hundred eighty-five? () Sevens bottle. I don't (understand)
this scene. Potion.
H: Ah[h.]
M: [Three] potions, two wines.
H: Eh.
M: °I don't know.°
H: ((students reading silently from book))
M: Mm.
H: (4.0)
T: Are you still talking about your questions? Or are you talking about your favorite
part?
Y: Oh we're talking, Oh.
Y,M,H:((laughing and look to board))
T: That's okay.
Y: I forgot [about]
T: [That's okay.]
Tchr: Did you, did you ge-
Y: That's what we're talking about right now?
T: Well, did you do all your leader questions? Did you do all of Mika's [ques]tions?
M: [Yeah]
T: Ok. Good. Yeah, so you should talk about your favorite part of the book.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: I completely forgot. ((laughing))
Tchr: ((laughing)) That's okay.
Y: That's why we're talking about your favorite part is?
M: No:
Y: Oh no.
All: ((laughing))
T: That's funny.
M: °Favorite part.°
Y: I have, um, my favorite sentence. It's very (.) funny. °Where is that.° Oh. (.)
T: ((students flipping through book))
M: °Favorite part.°
Y: I have, um, my favorite sentence. It's very (.) funny. °Where is that.° Oh. (.)
T: ((reading from book)) Snape made them all nervous? Oh, it's um on two-hundred
sixty-two? (3.9) At the bottom? (5.3) Snape made them all nervous? Breathing
down their necks while they tried to remember how to make a forget-
forgetfulness po[tion.]
M: 
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: It's kinda funny. They're trying to remember and to make forgetful potion.
M: Ahh.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
Y: ((laughing)) This is just funny. ((laughs)) It's why I like it.
M: My favorite part is um Harry and uh Malfoy encounter first time.
H: Oh.
M: I, um
Y: What, [what is your]
M: [at Diagon] Alley.
Y: family name? Uh
M: Ye:ah. What's [your]
Y: [Oh, I] forget the word.
M: S-name, your s- s- surname?
Y: Oh, surname.=
M: =Surname.
M: Anyway.
Y,M,H:((laughing))
H: Ahh.
(5.8)
H: °Like first part.° So this, I watched the movie, too? So. So Letters from No One is
interesting.
Letters from no one.
Yeah. So many.
Ohh. [That part.]
[Yeah Dudley] Tried to erase? But (.) come more and more.
They describe it really well in movie.
Yeah. °Describe it so well.°
(1.6)
Why do you like the, the Malfoy part?
((laughing))
Um, this book and, (.) book and movie and (.) the most different.
Yeah, >oh yeah< yeah.
Scene=
=Yeah. In, in movie we can see it's Malfoy. But in the book it's kinda se[cret.]
[Ahh.]
Yeah ((laughing))
°Yeah.° Yeah, I think book is more fun. For the part.
Mmhm.
My favorite part is the mirror part?
[Ahh.]
With his family and (.) I think for me this part is more, the most nnnn ((hand signal indicating high point)) part.
Ahh.
Like ((hand signal)) nnnnn.
((laughing)) Yeah.
Yeah
Most up ((laughing))
((laughing))
For me.
(2.6)
The, that part made me think the most.
Yeah. ((pointing to back cover of book)) I like (this) sentence= =Oh: I did[n't]
[Unh?]
Um, Dumbledore.
((students look at back cover))
Oh this is, this is the mirror. I
Yeah
I hadn't thought about it. Oh.
((laughing))
Yeah.
((reading from back cover)) It does not do [to]
[°dwell°]
dwell on dreams and forget to live (.) Remember that. (.) Remember that.
Y, M, H: ((laughing))

(29.9) ((students reading various parts of book silently))

Y: Kinda interesting. It's like (.) really dream, ev- even if in real world? We don't have this mirror. But we have dreams.

M: Mm[hm.]

H: [Ahh]

Y: And, like, we have really favorite thing to do? Like for me to draw picture like drawing? or making crafts. And sometimes wh- when I'm doing it I feel really good, so I think maybe I can make money from it and to make living from doing it? But it's kinda mirror. They (.) it's (.) Those things make me feel good. But if I keep doing it, just doing only doing it (.) I'm not actually making money or anything? So my life is not getting better. But I feel better.

M, H: ((laughing))

Y: But I shouldn't keep it. Like, all the time. So, those, my favorite things to do is kinda working as mirror in this book? It's kinda funny. ((laughing)) I should keep this (.) word ((pointing to back cover)).

M: >Mmhm< °Yeah.°

Y: Not to get off.

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

(10.0) ((students looking through book))

M: It is good to, good word. This [sen]tence.

Y: [Yeah.]

(8.8) ((students continuing to look through book))

Y: ((laughing)) At first I (.) I didn't notice this is th- the mirror. Until now.

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

Y: I kinda ( ) looking. But I, I'm also looking the front side.

M: Mmhm.

Y: And I really like the feather part.

Y, M: ((laughing))

Y: The feather? ((laughing)) And (.) at first I couldn't see it (.) um, when I got this book. And I thought this is Hermione.

((laughing))

M: No way.

T: So how are you doing. Are you done?

M: Yeah.

T: Did everybody get to talk about their favorite part?

((all nod))

T: Oh good. Awesome. What were you saying you thought was Hermione?

Y: Oh ((laughing))

Y, M, H: ((laughing))

M: She, she, she sees Harry, Hermione, Ron ((pointing to back cover)).

T: Oh::, Oh:: I see. ((laughing))

Y: Mika, Mika told me this is the mirror and=

T: =Mmhm=

Y: =And I said my favorite part is the mirror part?= 

T: =Right=
Y: And Mika told me this is the mirror, and Huh. ((laughing))

All: ((laughing))

Y: When I bought this book at the book store, I kinda s- saw and I wasn't thinking about it's a mirror or anything and, huh this is Hermione, and Ron, and ((laughing))

All: ((laughing))

T: That's funny. Did you see: in this. ((writing)) So it's the Mirror of Erised, right? Is it okay I borrow this? I'm sorry, I just took it. ((laughing))

T: Thank you. So, Erised. E R I S E D. Do you know why it's named that?

Y: Oh, you told me at the my, to my book journal. and Tchr: Okay. ((to other students)) Do you know why?

M: °I don't know.°

H: ((shaking head no))

T: No? It is ((writing))

Y: °°It's very interesting.°°

T: Des[ire]

H: [Ah]h.

T: backwards. ((shows them paper))

M: Ah!

T: So like in a mirror, things are backwards? So it's the Mirror of Erised. It's the Mirror of Desire.

Y: I didn't notice at all.

T: Yeah, she's fun with her, her names of people, like Malfoy? ((writing)) Malfoy can mean like bad fairy.

M: Oh really?

Tchr: Yeah, like mal and foy. It's kinda French. So Malfoy, bad fairy.

T: A lot of the [names] are um=

Y: [Huh]

Y: =So, Hermione too?

Tchr: I don't know what that means.

Y: Hermione seem to be very weird name.

T: It is. It's very old-fashioned, I think. When I first read it, I though it was Her-my-

Y: own. ((laughing))

All: ((laughing))

T: For awhi-, I was an adult and I still read it wrong. Um (.) >I'm trying to thi-< oh, Snape. To snape at someone is to like pick at 'em and to annoy them and pester them. To snape.

H: Ehh

T: Or to complain about something. So

Y: So, it doesn't have any connection to snake? Or (.)

T: Well, not directly. But it does look like it, doesn't it?

Y: Hm.

T: And I think J.K. Rowling probably realized that it looks a lot like snake, and so we might make that connection in our mind. And his first name is Severus ((writing)), right? So it's like severe? Um, to be severe is to be very (.) mmm, kind
of angry and not forgiving. Not kind. Very difficult. So, yeah, that, um,

H: ((laughing))

T: she's very interesting with the names. And the names of her spells, too are in Latin
and they usually mean something in Latin. Yeah, it's very fun. All right. Well

good job guys, I'm very impressed that you made it all the way through Harry
Potter in six weeks. That's really, really cool. Um, so I'm going to stop recording
and bring everybody else in and we can talk about conferences, so (.) well done.
Appendix B: Transcription Conventions

The transcription symbols used throughout this document are standardized symbols used by many conversation analysts. This list is based upon a list included in Paul ten Have’s *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide* (2007, pp. 215-216). Ten Have acknowledges Gail Jefferson as being the originator of most if not all of these symbols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>Numbers in parentheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( . )</td>
<td>Dot in parentheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>Single left bracket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>Single right bracket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equals sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>Underscoring of word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Colons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Dash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. , ?</td>
<td>Punctuation marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Comma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Question mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No final marker</td>
<td>An indeterminate contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>Uppercase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°word°</td>
<td>Degree signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; word&gt;</td>
<td>Right/left carets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhh</td>
<td>Row of <em>hs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w(h)ord</td>
<td>Parenthesized <em>h</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Empty parentheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(word)</td>
<td>Parenthesized utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Double parentheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively quieter sounds compared to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A rapidly spoken utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An outbreath/exhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breathiness within a word (as with laughter,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crying, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcriber’s inability to hear what was said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcriber is not confident about utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transcribed within the parentheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcriber’s descriptions, such as ((nodding))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or ((opening book))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Student-generated Questions from Book Club Discussions

Although the researcher has the original documents turned in by the students, the questions have been retyped in order to preserve anonymity of the students. The questions are typed as submitted by the students (including variations in spelling and punctuation).

Book Club Questions – Day 1, Yukiko leader

1. In chapter one, what happened to the boa constrictor’s tank when Harry was punched by Dudley and fell down at the zoo?
2. Why do you think no.1 event happened?
3. In chapter five, Harry went to at the Madam Malkin’s store to get his school uniform and met a boy with a pale. Does Harry like or dislike the boy and why?
4. Which part of the story is your favorite so far? Why?

Book Club Questions – Day 2, Hiroshi leader

If you had heard platform nine and three-quarters at eleven o’clock, could you believe the existence?
What is your favorite scene in Chapter 6 and 7?
If you were given the invitation of Hogwarts, would you accept the invitation?
If you have to eat Chocolate Frogs or Pumpkin Pasties, which one do you eat?

Book Club Questions – Day 3, Mika leader

1) Who do you like the best so far in this book? Why?
2) Do you go to get Neville’s Remembrall back from Malfoy, if you were Harry? Why?
3) How do you do when you meet a monstrous dog that has three heads?
4) Snape criticizes almost everyone except Malfoy. Why do you think that he does it?

My answers
1) My favorite character is Hermione Granger because she can correctly judge things and take calm and collected actions. I think that her existence is important because Harry and Ron are always depicted as a high roller.
2) Actually, I don’t want to go because I don’t want to have anything to do with him. However, if I am the main character like Harry, I have to go to get it back.
3) Surely, I’m astonished, and my voice doesn’t come out. I may faint. I think I cannot find a trapdoor.
4) I think Malfoy’s parents pay Snape money secretly.
Book Club Questions – Day 4, Yukiko leader

1. Who do you think gave Harry the magic cloak?
2. It is a very personal question… as to the magic mirror Harry found, if you found and looked at the mirror, what do you think you would see?
3. Do you think the mirror is good or evil? Why?
4. Why do you think Dumbledore told Harry to put the magic cloak back on and go back to his bed gently instead of being mad at him about wandering around at night?

(Yukiko’s answers are on the back of her page.)

Book Club Questions – Day 5, Hiroshi leader

If you were Harry Potter, would you go to the Mirror of Erised again even Dumbledore said, “I do not want you to go there. And tell me the reason.

If you were a one of Quidditch players, which position would you want? And tell me the reason.

If you can get a baby of dragon, would you want one? And tell me the reason.

If somebody have gave you a mysterious egg, would you receive it? And tell me the reason.

Book Club Questions – Day 6, Mika leader

1. Which do you think about Snape is a good man or a bad man for Harry? Why?
2. Do you take the action same as her or think the other way, if you were Hermione when Neville said you “I'll fight you”? Why?
3. If you were Harry, you know what we’re not allowed to use magic at home. Will you use magic at home during summer??
4. Do you want to enter a witch and wizard school like Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry after reading it? Why?
Appendix D: Equipment Used for Data Collection and Transcription

**Video-recording Equipment**

- Canon XA10
- Panasonic HDC-HS60
- Tripods

**Audio-recording Equipment**

- Sony digital voice recorder (ICD-PX312)

**Transcribing Software**

- InqScribe (Version 2.2.3.258)
Appendix E: Student Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Book Clubs in the L2 Classroom: A Microinteractional Analysis of L2 Literacy Development and Student Enactment of Leadership Roles

IRB # 498979-1
Date Approved: 9/16/2013

Description of the Study:
You are being asked to take part in a research study about how English language learners use language in book clubs. The goal of this study is to learn how language learners use English when they are talking about books in small groups. You are being asked to take part in this study because you are taking the ESL reading class at UAF. Please read this form carefully. You can ask any questions you may have now or at any time during your participation.

If you decide to take part, you will be videotaped and audiotaped in class during your book club discussions each week. The study will last for 6 weeks. You will be videotaped for one 30-minute session each week while you talk to other students about your class reading. Any notes that you take during the book club discussions will also be collected and photocopied and then returned to you.

The research will be conducted only during book clubs. No other classroom activities, homework, or tests will be part of the research.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study
The risks to you if you take part in this study are minimal (very small). You might feel a little uncomfortable with being recorded at the beginning, but that should quickly pass.

One benefit to you for being in this study is that you will learn how linguistic research can be conducted.

Confidentiality:
- Any information with your name attached will not be shared with anyone outside the research team.
- We will properly dispose paperwork and store research records in locked cabinets.
- The data and videotapes from this study may be used in reports, presentations at UAF, presentations at conferences, and publications, but we will not share your name.
- Your voice and face will be able to be seen and heard in the audio and video recordings.

Your decision to take part in the study is voluntary. You are free to choose whether or not to take part in the study. If you decide to take part in the study you can stop at any time or change your mind and ask to be removed from the study. Whether or not you choose to participate, it will not affect your grade in the class.

Please indicate if you would like to participate in this study by putting an “x” next to the statement(s) that you agree with:

____ Yes, I agree to take part in the study. I am 18 years old or older.
____ No, I do NOT want to take part in the study.

If you DO agree to take part in this study, please put an “x” next to the statement(s) that you agree with:

____ I agree to share my audio (voice) recordings for research, presentations, and publications.
____ I do NOT agree to share my audio (voice) recordings for research, presentations, and publications.
____ I agree to share my video recordings for research, presentations, and publications.
____ I do NOT agree to share my video recordings for research, presentations, and publications.
____ I agree to share my written notes from book club discussions for research, presentations, and publications.
____ I do NOT agree to share my written notes from book club discussions for research, presentations, and publications.
Contacts and Questions:
If you have questions now, feel free to ask me now. If you have questions later, you may contact:
Sharon Johnson at sejohnson7@alaska.edu or 907-xxxx-xxxx, or
Dr. Duff Johnston at djohnston2@alaska.edu or 907-xxxx-xxxx

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the UAF Office of Research Integrity at 474-7800 (Fairbanks area) or 1-866-876-7800 (toll-free outside the Fairbanks area) or fyirb@uaf.edu.

Statement of Consent:
I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I have indicated my choices for participation. I have been provided a copy of this form.

Signature of Student ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent ___________________________ Date ___________________________
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