NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

2003 NFLRC WORKSHOP:

CLAN for Conversation Analysis

March 31–April 4 & April 7–11, 2003

EVALUATION

©2003 Jim Yoshioka

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

CONTENTS

CLAN *for Conversation Analysis*

To do Conversation Analysis (CA), one needs more than just good transcriptions. Immediate access to sound and/or video data at all times is essential for analysis. Digital technology has for some years now given researchers the opportunity to access data easily, and the available software has matured to allow stable links between transcriptions and data.

In particular, there is the Conversation Analysis version of the CLAN (Computerized Language Analysis) software, which is under constant development by the CHILDES and Talkbank project. The software is freely available and runs under several operating systems (Apple system 9 and X, Windows, and Linux). Transcription files can be exchanged between platforms. The CA standard for the CLAN software builds on the CHAT standard, which for more than a decade has been core software for first language acquisition research.

CLAN-CA allows the creation of a network, where the transcription is at the center. Linking from the transcript to a number of relevant file formats is easy (e.g. audio, video, JPEG, textfiles) as well as exporting into other software (e.g. PRAAT, PitchWorks). In this way, audio and video documents, pictures, and field notes, as well as tools for prosodic analysis, are available directly from the transcription. A selection of CA transcripts can be downloaded from www.conversation-analysis.net.

The workshop

The workshop was part of a recently launched NFLRC research project on *Conversation Analysis as an Approach to Second Language Acquisition* (co-directors: Gabriele Kasper, Department of Second Language Studies, and Maryann Overstreet, Department of Languages and Literatures of Europe and the Americas). As the interest in exploring the potential for CA for studying foreign language learning, use, education, and assessment is growing, the NFLRC felt that colleagues nationwide might find it useful to update themselves on analytical practices and technological options for doing CA and was fortunate that Professor Johannes Wagner from the University of Southern Denmark accepted its invitation to conduct the workshop.

Due to the popularity of the topic, the NFLRC received a flood of applications to participate, and so the decision was made (with Dr. Wagner's approval) to have two workshops instead of just the one originally planned. The first would be held on March 31–April 4, 2003 (comprised mostly of mainland and international participants), and the second would be held the following week on April 7–11, 2003 (comprised entirely of local participants). Both workshops were the same content-wise and included hands-on training in CLAN for Conversation Analysis, transcription principles and problems, and connecting soundfiles, videofiles, and transcripts, amounting to 15 teaching hours (lectures, demonstrations, and hands-on activities), plus exercises, which allowed the participants to get on friendly terms with the software and be able to discuss problems and questions during the workshop.

Organization of the workshop

Staff for the workshop consisted of NFLRC staff and the workshop facilitators. The NFLRC staff included Jim Yoshioka (program coordinator), Deborah Masterson (publications specialist), and Heidi Agunias (student assistant). The workshop facilitators were Gabriele Kasper (workshop director) and Johannes Wagner (workshop facilitator).

Publicity for the workshop

Advertising to solicit participants followed the pattern of previous NFLRC workshops. Flyers and ads were distributed at professional conventions, such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) conference in Salt Lake City (November 2002). Email ads were sent to people on the NFLRC mailing list and to a number of CA-related listservs. Most of the internet publicity as well as the workshop website (located at nflrc.hawaii.edu/prodev/CLANforCA/) was done by the program coordinator, Jim Yoshioka. The workshop was highlighted on the main page of the NFLRC website and in its Professional Development section.

Selection of participants

Potential participants applied by completing a web-based application form available on the NFLRC website (see Appendix A). A total of 55 language educators and researchers applied for the workshop. The applications were rated holistically by members of the *Conversation Analysis as an Approach to Second Language Acquisition* research project, primarily based upon the applicants' background and interest in CA and their statements of purpose, where they were to describe their reasons for wanting to participate in the workshop, the specific goals they wished to achieve, and their plans to disseminate what they learned in the workshop.

Of the 55 applicants, 31 were accepted, 5 were selected as alternates (although none were ultimately invited), 17 were rejected, and 2 withdrew their applications.

Pre-institute communications

After the selection of the participants, the NFLRC was in frequent contact with each participant. Jim Yoshioka sent the usual congratulatory email message to those selected, followed by an acceptance packet (containing a letter of invitation, a registration form, a health insurance verification form, per diem information/forms, and detailed information about optional accommodations, transportation, parking, meals, and services). He sent email reminders when necessary regarding deadlines, answered any queries participants sent his way, and took care of any problems or requests (e.g., parking passes) that arose as they prepared to come to Hawai'i.

Facilities

The workshop took place in the Language Analysis and Experimentation (LA'E) General Lab, located in TP #107 on the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus, which is equipped with Macintosh and PC computers with various language analysis software programs installed, two sound-attenuated booths, and other equipment. The facilitator and most of the participants brought their

own laptop computers (and data to work with), which they set up on the long laptop computer table and connected to the internet via the Ethernet hub and cables provided by the NFLRC. The NFLRC wishes to express its thanks to the Department of Linguistics for the use of its facilities and in particular, Victoria Anderson, LAʻE General Lab director, for her help in making all the arrangements.

Morning and afternoon refreshments were served out on the nearby NFLRC lanai each day, and on April 1, there was a special sunset reception for participants of both workshops.

DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

General overview

The workshop offered an introduction and hands-on training in CLAN for Conversation Analysis, transcription principles and problems, and connecting soundfiles, videofiles, and transcripts. It covered 15 teaching hours plus exercises, running over a 5-day period for each workshop. While the immediate goal of the workshop was to help participants gain practical experience in the use of the CLAN program, it was the hope of the organizers that the workshop would also provide a forum for CA practitioners to discuss some of the issues they encounter in their work, such as the methodological benefits (and limitations) that CA offers in comparison to other methods of data collection and analysis and problems relating to CA on nonnative data.

Participant profile

The participants represented universities and colleges across the US (California, Hawaiʻi, Illinois, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina). In addition, one participant came all the way from Örebro University in Sweden. All participants whose work impacts American students or US foreign language education received per diems to help defray the cost of coming to and staying in Hawaiʻi (per NFLRC grant regulations). Participants who did not meet these requirements accepted with the understanding that they would not be receiving a per diem.

Facilitator profile

As noted before, the workshop was led by Dr. Johannes Wagner, an expert on CA and CLAN software. Born in Germany, Johannes Wagner did his undergraduate and graduate studies at the Universities of Tübingen (Germany) and Uppsala (Sweden). He received his doctorate in 1982 from the University of Odense, Denmark. In 1998 he was awarded the Danish Hedorf Fond Prize for Business Language Research. He is currently a reader at the University of Southern Denmark. Since 1997, he has been the director of the International Graduate School in Language and Communication and has been a visiting professor in the Netherlands, Australia, and at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa. He is also a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Pragmatics, International Review of Applied Linguistics,* and the forthcoming *Journal of Applied Linguistics.* Among Dr. Wagner's many book publications, the volume most directly concerned with CA is *Second Language Conversations* (Continuum), to appear in 2004.

Workshop activities

The two workshops — March 31–April 4 (mainland/international participants) and April 7–11 (local participants) — met for three teaching hours each day for five days (The times varied with each workshop to provide hours that were convenient for participants and, in the case of the mainland and international participants, take into account their flight schedules; see Appendix B). The LAʻE General Lab was open all day, so participants could work on their homework exercises or the data they brought with them at their leisure. A number of participants chose to use their extra free time to enjoy Oʻahu and all it has to offer. The content of the workshop was as follows (with modifications based on the interest and questions of the participants):

Monday — Introduction
- Introduction
- What should transcription programs be able to do: expectations
- Digital audio and video: some basic facts
- Demonstration of CLAN-CA

Tuesday — Transcription
- Transcription standards and their potentials
- Transcription tools for audio and video in CLAN-CA
- Transfer of existing transcriptions into CLAN-CA

Wednesday — PRAAT
- Export facilities into PRAAT
- Pitch extraction with PRAAT
- Slicing and splicing audio files in PRAAT

Thursday — Data session with CLAN-CA

Friday — Database facilities in CLAN
- Coding and searching in CLAN
- Open questions

In addition to the regular workshop sessions, there were also two special CA-related presentations given by one of the workshop participants and by the workshop facilitator, respectively (see Appendix B for more details).

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTE: PARTICIPANT AND ADMINISTRATION

Summative

At the end of the workshop, 23 participants completed the summative evaluation form (see Appendix C). The participant responses to the evaluation questions are tabulated in Appendix D and include their additional comments. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Participant responses to workshop evaluation; N=23

item	question	mean
1	How did you find out about the CLAN for Conversation Analysis workshop? (journal/newsletter: 7%; flyer: 14%; email/WWW: 50%; conference: 0%; colleague: 29%)	–
2	The information I received about the workshop prior to coming was adequate for my needs.	3.2
3	The workshop was well organized and well run.	3.4
4	The staff was helpful.	3.8
5	The workshop facilities and technical support were adequate.	3.3
6	The length of the workshop (one week) was appropriate.	3.5
7	I enjoyed the overall format of the workshop (lectures, demos, hands-on exercises, discussions).	3.4
8	I found the workshop leader's expertise valuable and helpful.	3.7
9	I feel that the diversity of participants' experience with Conversation Analysis was a problem.	0.8
10	I feel that the diversity of participants' experience with CLAN was a problem.	0.9
11	Overall, my expectations of the workshop were met.	3.5

0=strongly disagree, 1=disagree, 2=neutral, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree

In general, almost all areas discussed in the evaluation form received high marks (mainly "strongly agree" and "agree"). Participants in particular spoke highly of Dr. Wagner and his helpful, patient, fun, very knowledgeable, hands-on approach to teaching them about CLAN and PRAAT as well as the sunset reception, the delicious daily morning and afternoon refreshments, and the helpful service and "aloha spirit" provided by Jim Yoshioka and other NFLRC staff. Overall, the participants were quite pleased with the workshop, finding it well organized and covering an appropriate period of time (one week — although some participants wished it were a little longer to gain more practice time or learn more advanced software features). They especially liked the lectures, the practical experience they gained working with and analyzing transcripts, audio files, and video files, and the daily Q & A sessions where problems from the day or night before (e.g., content, homework, etc.) could be addressed and solved. Participants felt that they learned a lot from Dr. Wagner and each other and were eager to use CLAN for their future research, data analysis, and presentations. A number of them also said they planned to disseminate what they learned in the workshop by including CLAN in the graduate courses they teach, introducing it to interested colleagues, and offering workshops at their home institutions. All in all, it was a positive experience (see Appendix D to view all ratings and comments).

> The workshop was well organized, particularly with regard to scheduling and handling business matters. Three hours a day of sessions were the right length for me. The reception was very nice. Jim Yoshioka was very helpful. Overall, I enjoyed the workshop very much. Thank you for this opportunity!! I'm really grateful.

> Everything! — the organization, the prior info, the snacks/reception, the people you invited, Dr. Wagner and Dr. Kasper were great.

The participants did have a number of suggestions for improvement, however, the biggest being the need for handouts (a frequent comment especially among the first group of participants) and the need for perhaps an additional tech person to assist Dr. Wagner.

> The instructions went too fast sometimes, and it was hard to follow and/or take notes. Some handouts summarizing the procedures would have been helpful. Also, it would be helpful if there were a couple of assistants going around to help some of the students individually. Prof. Wagner was very helpful, but there were too many students for one instructor.

> Would've been *very* helpful if there were *handouts*.

A few participants also commented that they would have liked to have received some pre-workshop reading or more instructions regarding what to bring (and in what format) to better prepare for the workshop. For this reason, the slightly lower scores on Items 2 and 5 are not surprising.

> It might have been nice to provide an article on CA beforehand for people who were not familiar with CA.

> Would have preferred some pre-reading exercises before coming to the workshop.

> It would have been helpful if we could have gotten a little more specific instructions about what to bring to the workshop (e.g., the kind of data, equipment) three or four weeks in advance.

> I brought a cassette tape recorder and a mini-disc player (along with my data), but neither was the right type and couldn't be used. Finding an alternative/appropriate tape-recorder was not easy.

The workshop organizers were concerned that differences in levels of experience with CA or CLAN might have been problematic, so they included Items 9 and 10. The low scores (mainly "strongly disagree" and "disagree") indicate that those were not an issue. Comments, however, revealed a different problem.

> The problem was really computer literacy (not necessarily specific to CLAN).

> While differences in expertise are to be expected, basic computer problems, lack of preparedness, and work on non-workshop related projects were distracting.

It seems that a number of participants did not really have a grasp of working with computers in general, and this tended to slow down the class: "The problem was more computer literacy — it sometimes held the group back." As one participant later recommended, "Screen applicants better for technological expertise."

Facilitator evaluation of the workshop

Dr. Wagner was asked to summarize what he thought worked well with the workshop and what could be improved.

> As a facilitator, I have been very satisfied with the two courses. The courses were very well prepared in terms of administration. The participants had received all course material in time. The computer lab worked exceptionally well and there were very few technical disturbances in spite of the fact that many participants had brought with them their own untested laptops. The participants had different degrees of computer literacy but all of them achieved the goals of the course, which is to become qualified to digitize audio and to run the CLAN program for transcription and data analysis. Of course, some participants with very high computer literacy were well acquainted with the CA transcription system and may have profited more from a course tailored to their specific abilities. Last but not least: the availability of fresh coffee and refreshments in the breaks helped the participants to overcome fits of mental fatigue which are unavoidable in this type of course.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2003 NFLRC workshop *CLAN for Conversation Analysis* at the University of Hawai'i successfully brought together 31 language educators (15 in the first workshop, 16 in the second workshop) to learn about, practice with, and utilize CLAN and PRAAT software for their future research and professional endeavors during the five days of their workshop. High ratings and comments such as those given by the facilitator and participants attest to the success of the workshop.

> Excellent organization, great lectures, non-intimidating and nicely selective in terms of the material chosen for presentation.

> I am very pleased that you put this workshop together! The openness and friendliness of the faculty and staff go a long way in making activities successful. You were very good at this. Thanks!

The main areas for improvement involve areas that should be taken care of prior to the participants' arrival and should be particularly kept in mind when organizing a technology-focused workshop in the future, namely, a) ensure in the application and selection process that applicants are appropriately screened for level of computer literacy (something that was not done this time around); b) provide pre-workshop reading, information on required equipment, and support materials (i.e., handouts) as appropriate to prepare participants for the anticipated technical content they will learn; and c) provide sufficient technical support so that the facilitator need not take time away from the lecture/practice sessions to attend to technical problems that arise. Input such as this will help the NFLRC to further improve the quality of its future workshops, providing stimulating and useful content knowledge at our high standards for service.

Interested language researchers and educators are welcome to apply! Please take the time to *completely fill out and proofread all three sections* of the application form before submitting it. *Whether or not you are selected for participation will depend on the quality of your application.* The deadline for applications is December 15, 2002. We will send you an email confirmation after we have received your application. (Please be patient — it may take several business days to reply). Mahalo for your interest in participating in the 2003 NFLRC *CLAN for Conversation Analysis* Workshop!

CLAN for Conversation Analysis Workshop Application Form

DEADLINE: DECEMBER 15, 2002

CONTACT INFORMATION

last (family) name: _____

first (given) name: _____

position/title: _____

department: _____

institution or affiliation: _____

contact address (please include street address, city, state, zip code, country, etc.: _____
_____
_____

contact phone: _____

fax number: _____

e-mail: _____

YOUR BACKGROUND AND INTERESTS IN CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

1. Do you have any prior training in discourse analysis? Explain. _____
   _____
   _____

2. Do you have any prior training in Conversation Analysis (CA)?

   If you do, please specify the source: Courses? Self-study? Data sessions? _____
   _____
   _____

3. Have you used CA in a research study?

   If you have, please specify the language and topic/object of analysis _____
   _____
   _____

4. Are you currently conducting CA research?

   If you are, please specify the language and topic/object of analysis _____
   _____
   _____

5.   If you answered 'yes' to questions 3 and/or 4, indicate whether the material for analysis was or is:
   • audio-recorded
   • video-recorded
   • both audio-recorded and video-recorded

6. Have you worked with digitized audiofiles? videofiles? If so, please explain. _____
   _____
   _____

7. If you answered 'yes' to question 6, what hardware and software have you used? _____
   _____
   _____

8. Are you familiar with CLAN (Computerized Language Analysis)? If so, please explain. _____
   _____
   _____

9. If you are accepted for this workshop, are you planning on bringing your own data to work on? If so, please describe it. _____
   _____
   _____

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

In the space provided (500 words maximum), please describe the following in English:

   • Your reasons for wanting to participate in the CLAN for CA workshop
   • Any specific goals you would like to achieve through this workshop
   • Your plans to disseminate what you learn in this workshop

REMINDER: **Please make sure to complete all items above and carefully proofread your entries before clicking the submit button (once only). After you submit your proposal, you will receive an email confirmation message within the next several business days.**

Mahalo for your interest in the 2003 NFLRC CLAN for Conversation Analysis Workshop!

Submit Request		Clear Form

APPENDIX B: WORKSHOP SCHEDULE AND SPECIAL EVENTS

Sessions held in the LA'E Lab (TP #107)

FIRST CLAN WORKSHOP (MARCH 31–APRIL 4)

Monday	2:00–5:00pm
Tuesday	2:00–5:00pm
Wednesday	9:00am–12:00pm
Thursday	9:00am–12:00pm
Friday	9:00am–12:00pm

SECOND CLAN WORKSHOP (APRIL 7–11)

Monday–Friday	2:00–5:00pm

SPECIAL EVENTS DURING THE CLAN WORKSHOPS:

Tuesday, April 1   5:00–6:00pm

Sunset reception on the NFLRC lanai (pupus, beverages, and more!)

Thursday, April 5   12:00–1:15pm

Methodological considerations in the study of compliments (Andrea Golato, St. John 11)

This talk will discuss how different methods of data collection — discourse completion tasks (DCT), field notes, and electronic records of authentic interaction — and different procedures of data analysis — linguistic analysis of compliment formulae and Conversation Analysis — affect research outcomes in the study of compliments. Although the talk centers on one particular speech act, the evidence offered has direct implications for research on speech acts and pragmatics more generally.

Tuesday, April 8   12:00–1:15pm

CA for SLA: why and how? Theoretical and methodological perspectives on the use of Conversation Analysis for second language acquisition research (Johannes Wagner, Moore Hall 119)

Evaluation: CLAN for Conversation Analysis Workshop
March 31–April 4 & April 7–11, 2003

Please check the phrase or statement that best applies to your experience. Feel free to add any comments to clarify or enhance your response.

1. How did you find out about the CLAN for Conversation Analysis workshop?

   ❑ journal/newsletter   ❑ flyer   ❑ email/WWW   ❑ conference   ❑ colleague

   Other? Comment _____

   _____

2. The information I received about the workshop prior to coming was adequate for my needs.

   ❑ strongly agree   ❑ agree   ❑ neutral   ❑ disagree   ❑ strongly disagree

   Comment _____

   _____

3. The workshop was well organized and well run.

   ❑ strongly agree   ❑ agree   ❑ neutral   ❑ disagree   ❑ strongly disagree

   Comment _____

   _____

4. The staff was helpful.

   ❑ strongly agree   ❑ agree   ❑ neutral   ❑ disagree   ❑ strongly disagree

   Comment _____

   _____

5. The workshop facilities and technical support were adequate.

   ❑ strongly agree   ❑ agree   ❑ neutral   ❑ disagree   ❑ strongly disagree

   Comment _____

   _____

6. The length of the workshop (one week) was appropriate.

   ❑ strongly agree   ❑ agree   ❑ neutral   ❑ disagree   ❑ strongly disagree

   Comment _____

   _____

7. I enjoyed the overall format of the workshop (lectures, demos, hands-on exercises, discussions)

   ❑ strongly agree   ❑ agree   ❑ neutral   ❑ disagree   ❑ strongly disagree

   Comment _____

   _____

8. I found the workshop leader's expertise valuable and helpful.

   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
   Comment _____
   _____

9. I feel that the diversity of participants' experience with Conversation Analysis was a problem.

   ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
   Comment _____
   _____

10. I feel that the diversity of participants' experience with CLAN was a problem.

    ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
    Comment _____
    _____

11. Overall, my expectations of the workshop were met.

    ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ neutral ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree
    Comment _____
    _____

Please respond to the following questions. Your comments will assist in the preparation of the evaluation report.

1. Please describe your most valuable learning experience(s) at the workshop (e.g., specific session, conversation with a workshop facilitator/another participant, etc.). _____
   _____
   _____

2. What effect will the workshop have on your teaching/professional development? _____
   _____
   _____

3. How do you expect to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution? _____
   _____
   _____

4. What could we have done better at the Workshop? _____
   _____
   _____

5. What did we do particularly well? _____
   _____
   _____

APPENDIX D: TABULATION OF EVALUATION FORM RESULTS AND GENERAL COMMENTS PROVIDED

1. **How did you find out about the CLAN for Conversation Analysis workshop?**

   journal/newsletter (2)   flyer (4)   email/WWW (14)   conference (0)   colleague (8)

   "I'm working in the CA NFLRC project."
   "Dr. Kasper" (x2)

2. **The information I received about the workshop prior to coming was adequate for my needs.**

   strongly agree (9)   agree (11)   neutral (2)   disagree (1)   strongly disagree (0)

   "The info regarding what had to be downloaded came too close to the workshop, and I was out of town. Needed to know what kind of tape recorder to bring (e.g., with 'line in')."
   "It would have been helpful to receive the info regarding the required software and data formats."
   "It would have been helpful if we could have gotten a little more specific instructions about what to bring to the workshop (e.g., the kind of data, equipment) three or four weeks in advance."
   "But it would have been best to get a clearer sense of the workshop schedule earlier as I was planning my trip."
   "I really liked the web pages!"
   "I was *very* surprised that several participants did not have the software installed and did not know the difference between digital and analog data! Apparently one needs to state prerequisites even more explicitly..."

3. **The workshop was well organized and well run.**

   strongly agree (15)   agree (4)   neutral (3)   disagree (1)   strongly disagree (0)

   "It was a great workshop!"
   "It would have been helpful to have a small handout on the procedures for some of the CLAN and PRAAT analyses."
   "The support for the workshop was organized; the actual teaching could have been better organized and better presented and more systematic."
   "Would have preferred better information regarding services available on campus at the weekend; would have preferred some pre-reading exercises before coming to the workshop."
   "Great effort — though I am a fan of more rigid scheduling — wouldn't have minded consistent afternoons."
   "I liked Johannes' style. Very relaxed, calm, *extremely* patient, and on top of it very knowledgeable. However, I don't think he expected the range of technical expertise people brought to the workshop and the variety of different equipment."

4. **The staff was helpful.**

   strongly agree (18)   agree (5)   neutral (0)   disagree (0)   strongly disagree (0)

   "Great"
   "Thank you *very* much, Jim!"
   "Jim is a jewel."
   "Jim was great!"
   "Excellent in all respects — exemplary care — and fantastic food. ☺"
   "Jim is awesome!"

5. **The workshop facilities and technical support were adequate.**

strongly agree (11)   agree (9)   neutral (1)   disagree (2)   strongly disagree (0)

"It would be nice if Japanese fonts were installed on the computers in the lab"

"Would be good to have access to the lab/Ethernet in the evening."

"I brought a cassette tape recorder and a mini-disc player (along with my data), but neither was the right type and couldn't be used. Finding an alternative/appropriate tape-recorder was not easy."

"The digitizing process part might have gone more smoothly, but this might have been difficult to find facilities for."

"It might have been helpful to have some notes (instructions perhaps?) as handouts to support the learning during the workshop."

"I would have liked a tech person to turn to with computer basics (for a smoother flow of the workshop."

"The lab was a bit cramped — but the computers were great."

"There should have been at least one other person present who (just like Johannes) also knows CLAN, PRAAT, and Mac and Windows; this person could have helped out with the purely technical aspects (such as things that have to do with how to work a computer in general and CLAN specific things). Since there was no second person present, the lecture/demo needed to be interrupted. Alternatively/Additionally, instruction sheets would have been good; one could then have caught up with the rest of the group when one's computer acted up, etc."

6. **The length of the workshop (one week) was appropriate.**

strongly agree (12)   agree (11)   neutral (0)   disagree (0)   strongly disagree (0)

"Wish it's longer so we can do the video editing, etc."

"Although a little bit longer for practice would have been great."

"A week seemed about right especially working with half days."

"It was fine — but a few more hours (lab w/group project perhaps) would have been even better (now that I've been to the beach) ☺"

"In Hawai'i — much better to have five short days. ☺"

7. **I enjoyed the overall format of the workshop (lectures, demos, hands-on exercises, discussions)**

strongly agree (11)   agree (11)   neutral (0)   disagree (1)   strongly disagree (0)

"Hope to have more of this type."

"Would have benefited from a bit more supervised hands-on time."

"Need hands-on experience after introducing each new program/maneuver."

"I really liked the supportive and fun atmosphere."

"A handout with an overview of the CLAN features/options/commands would have been helpful — like quick reference guide."

"It would have been nice to have more handouts."

"I found it annoying (and terribly rude) that some people wrote emails, etc. during the workshop (and then got behind!). Suggestion: Doing a group project. Organizer brings 45 minutes of data. Every participant has to transcribe five minutes each of data during the workshop. Transcripts and data then made could be made available online for all. Forces everyone to work during class or after hours; 45 minutes of data will then be added to user community, and there is a sense of accomplishment at the end."

Jim Yoshioka

8. **I found the workshop leader's expertise valuable and helpful.**

   strongly agree (17)   agree (5)   neutral (1)   disagree (0)   strongly disagree (0)

   "Very communicative and friendly. Dr. Wagner was great."

   "Wonderful leader!"

   "Would've been *very* helpful if there were *handouts*."

   "Johannes was helpful and fun to interact with."

   "It felt sometimes like JW's knowledge was very selective; there were times also when I felt the knowledge he had was not being communicated completely effectively."

   "Definitely. Would have liked to have more time to learn about what he knows (and what about that SLA lecture next Tuesday?)"

   "I particularly liked the question/answer section in the morning where problems from the day/night before could be addressed!"

9. **I feel that the diversity of participants' experience with Conversation Analysis was a problem.**

   strongly agree (0)   agree (0)   neutral (5)   disagree (9)   strongly disagree (9)

   "It might have been nice to provide an article on CA beforehand for people who were not familiar with CA."

   "We have a good team with diverse experience and background."

   "I had no expertise, and I don't think I slowed down the class."

   "Although I did feel less experienced than others, I appreciated the opportunity to learn from them."

   "This did not seem to figure in any way."

   "A stronger goal orientation for individual participants would have been helpful."

   "The problem was more computer literacy — it sometimes held the group back."

   "It was not a problem since we all worked on individual transcripts and data."

10. **I feel that the diversity of participants' experience with CLAN was a problem.**

    strongly agree (0)   agree (3)   neutral (2)   disagree (7)   strongly disagree (10)

    "We learn from each other"

    "N/A — everyone was new to CLAN"

    "Nobody knew how to use it. Maybe the diversity of computer hardware, platform, and expertise."

    "Didn't seem to be an issue."

    "This did not seem to figure in any way."

    "While differences in expertise are to be expected, basic computer problems, lack of preparedness, and work on non-workshop related projects were distracting."

    "We seemed all on the same level. Beginners!"

    "I believe that unequal levels of 'computer literacy' might have been more of a problem than lack of previous experience with computer-assisted research."

    "The problem was really computer literacy (not necessarily specific to CLAN)."

11. **Overall, my expectations of the workshop were met.**

    strongly agree (14)   agree (8)   neutral (0)   disagree (1)   strongly disagree (0)

    "Very good"

    "Wonderful opportunity; hope we can continue the community beyond the workshop."

"It felt more like a brief introduction than a thorough training, but my expectations may have been unrealistic."

"Indeed — I learned a lot, met interesting colleagues who generously shared ideas and expertise. Wish I had another week."

"I would recommend to future participants if they do not have any PRAAT experience to get a quick tutorial from a colleague prior to coming."

"I feel very confident now in using CLAN and to experiment on my own. I somehow have the sneaking suspicion that CLAN is more powerful than it appears to me now — search/tagging functions, making collections, etc. I would have loved to learn some more of these advanced features (maybe we'll cover them on Friday) and to have time to practice on my own with these features and be able to ask questions. More CA data sessions (using CLAN) would have been great!"

1. **Please describe your most valuable learning experience(s) at the workshop (e.g., specific session, conversation with a workshop facilitator/another participant, etc.).**

"Hands-on, with someone to help with technical problems and how to. Also, the data discussion is also helpful."

"Being able to actually use my own data and analyze it using CLAN and PRAAT."

"I find basically everything valuable since I had no prior knowledge of CLAN."

"Transcriptions, Q/A w/ workshop facilitator."

"Tuesday, Friday sessions were best; talking to workshop organizer and other participants; working together to figure things out."

"The extensive hands-on practice throughout the whole workshop."

"Sound editing (digitizing). Transcription work (sound and video)"

"Participants' Q's and facilitator's responses to them."

"Performance of CLAN application, CA session (on Thursday)"

"The learning of the technology itself and the discussion about transcriptions"

"Hands-on use of programs"

"Helping each other with what we know and don't know were beneficial to understanding more profoundly and practically CLAN."

"Hands-on learning, going over the steps several times, question sessions, solving problems with neighbors."

"Initial sessions on nuts and bolts of CLAN; final data session."

"Learning CLAN"

"Learning to use CLAN and PRAAT"

"All the sessions (esp. digitizing audio, transcription tools for audio) were very helpful and I'm really happy that I attended this workshop."

"Exposure to new software was good and an important step in deciding what will work best for my research. Meeting and interacting with others who have similar research interests is good, creating a community of researchers and users with a software is a great goal!"

"I can't point to any one experience — it was beneficial to have variation in the content. I appreciated the openness of the leader and the way he facilitated group progress."

"I felt that after day 2, I was able to go back to my old transcript, copy it into CLAN, and insert bullets of all kinds."

"The transcription session and homework assignments were wonderful. Dr. Wagner was very helpful and patient! I enjoyed the reception to get to know other colleagues."

"The second session (Tuesday), in which we took our first steps with CLAN, was certainly an eye-opener. The potential of the software for my future research is very high, and I intend to use it for my forthcoming dissertation research."

"Day 2 (here in particular, the transcription of video in CLAN) of the workshop, having a chance to mingle with other participants at the reception."

2. **What effect will the workshop have on your teaching/professional development?**

"I am better informed about available software and support and the progress in the field."

"I will be able to use what I learned in this workshop for analyzing data for my dissertation."

"I'll be able to use CLAN for my data analysis and presentation."

"Lots of potential"

"Good tool to use in my work and to teach together with CA."

"It will help me a lot with my future transcriptions, which I need for my own research as well as for my work in the CA project on German."

"Great — I'll use all of these in my current and new projects."

"Use of more technology in my research"

"I will use CLAN for my presentation purposes."

"I will definitely use it."

"I will be using them to transcribe my data for my dissertation."

"It was helpful to learn how to approach the hands-on analysis."

"It will help me produce high quality transcripts and do some parts of analysis quickly."

"I hope to use the software for my own research but also in teaching CA/DA."

"Will enrich my research being able to use the transcription program and especially PRAAT"

"This will transform the way I transcribe and archive and work w/data."

"I will be using what I learned in the workshop in my research as well as in teaching, although I still need to learn a lot more."

"I'm not sure at this point."

"I hope to be able to be able to use CLAN both in my own future project and the projects of two of my students. I hope to be able to introduce aspects of CLAN in my research group."

"I will be able to use CLAN for transcriptions (new ones) and especially presentations. Planning teacher workshops on the multimedia presentation aspect."

"I will definitely be using CLAN in the future for all my transcriptions — I love the program."

"I expect it to have a large effect on both my own research and on the workshops I will be offering in the nearby future."

"Will teach my grad students and colleagues what I have learned! I will definitely use CLAN for new data I transcribe and for presentations."

3. **How do you expect to share/disseminate what you have learned with colleagues at your home institution?**

"Use in my research and instruction development."

"I'll share what I've learned with whoever will be interested in CLAN."

"When need be."

"I can give a demonstration of CLAN is there is interest."

"I'll pass on my knowledge of how to work with CLAN to whoever needs it."

"Familiarize myself with CLAN to the level where I myself can lead a workshop at a later date"

"I will use it at presentations, guiding them into the introduction of CLAN to others."

"I am not sure yet."

"I will share them with future students!"

"Anytime I hear of others interested in CLAN, I can show them how to use it. If there are a lot of people interested, some of us who participated in this workshop could form a group and hold a workshop here in the College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature."

"If possible, I'd like to introduce them to the software, although since most are PC users and I use a Mac, I'm not sure I'll manage this well!"

"After I get used to the most essential programs and procedures, I'll gather a small number of people and explain."

"I will share these techniques w/my students and colleagues immediately."

"Some of my colleagues (and also students) are already interested in knowing about CLAN, and I will be demonstrating what I've learned to them."

"I'll share my experience with the software for colleagues to consider."

"Through 1) a 1/2 day workshop in the autumn; and 2) incorporating it in the research plans of two large project applications due in April and May this year."

"We'll have a tutorial in our Cognitive Science Academy — we'll see who shows up (psychologists, linguists, educators)."

"I will (already scheduled for April) conduct a symposium for Spanish/Linguistics and all other language departments interested."

"I am offering workshops on how to teach pronunciation, L2 speech, and on how to use the internet (and multimedia in general) in the language classroom."

"I will give a presentation of CLAN and incorporate it into my seminars."

4. **What could we have done better at the Workshop?**

"It couldn't have been better."

"Larger table for second group (not enough table space)"

"Nothing"

"Wish there were more time in terms of working with video (digitizing, cut/paste, etc.)"

"Nothing in particular"

"More PC oriented instruction in addition to what we had."

"Maybe a smaller group would have gone faster. Great workshop!"

"Internet connection — on the first day, some of us tried to download programs through the internet but couldn't. If there was an internet connection, we could have used the CLAN manual on the Web."

"Fine as is."

"Handouts on the use of CLAN and PRAAT" (x2)

"The instructions went too fast sometimes, and it was hard to follow and/or take notes. Some handouts summarizing the procedures would have been helpful. Also, it would be helpful if there were a couple of assistants going around to help some of the students individually. Prof. Wagner was very helpful, but there were too many students for one instructor."

"Handouts would *really*, *really* have been helpful. This kind of 'technical teaching' needs better step-by-step descriptions and lists of definitions and terms to be most effective. Might have been a more effective approach to give participants a data set for practicing especially for the last day playing with coding and such."

"Perhaps be a little less understanding of individual desire to explore the island; clearer expectations (final project to be posted on Web or something)."

"I feel the PRAAT session was a bit too advanced — without having any prior experience with the program, it was a bit overwhelming."

"It might have been a good idea to use the computers in the lab. Most of the problems with the hardware/software could be tackled this way."

"Screen applicants better for technological expertise."

5. **What did we do particularly well?**

"Organizing the workshop, very refreshing refreshments! Thanks!"

"Organizing"

"Very well-organized workshop. Thanks!!"

"Location, technical facilities in room, refreshments, and time to socialize, content of workshop"

"I particularly appreciated the expertise and helpfulness I encountered."

"All — Everything's superb!"

"Snacks!! Many thanks!"

"Pupus and CA session."

"The coffee break pupus were excellent!"

"The food was great! Otherwise, it was great!"

"Everything except for #4 above (it's the problem the lab has). Especially your flexibility and Dr. Wagner's generosity in having a second workshop to give us an opportunity to learn about CLAN. I really appreciate it! (Pupus were great too!)"

"Introduce the software in a relaxed atmosphere that encourages questions, comments and exploration"

"Nice teacher! Good food!"

"The facilities, the support staff, and the workshop leader were all excellent — great snacks, too!"

"The workshop was well organized, particularly with regard to scheduling and handling business matters. Three hours a day of sessions was the right length for me. The reception was very nice. Jim Yoshioka was very helpful. Overall, I enjoyed attending this workshop very much. Thank you for this opportunity!! I'm really grateful."

"The 'aloha spirit' of welcoming us and making us feel at home was great. The social aspect was appreciated."

"I am very pleased that you put this workshop together! The openness and friendliness of the faculty and staff go a long way in making activities successful. You were very good at this. Thanks!"

"Excellent organization, great lectures, non-intimidating and nicely selective in terms of the material chosen for presentation."

"Everything! — the organization, the prior info, the snacks/reception, the people you invited, Dr. Wagner and Dr. Kasper were great. Jim was a great program director. The only suggestion would have been to post signs the first day on campus guiding us a bit to the workshop room, for those of us staying off campus. MAHALO to you!"

"*Organization* of workshop, *quality* of the instruction"

"Making us feel at home!"