How Reflection Works in Transformative Dialogue/Mediation: A Preliminary Investigation

Angela Cora Garcia
Bentley University, USA

Erik Cleven
Saint Anselm College, USA

Abstract: Transformative dialogue and mediation (TD/M) is an approach to conflict resolution used in mediation and inter-group dialogues about social justice and race, political polarization, and ethnopolitical conflict. TD/M practitioners believe their approach supports the agency of participants and helps them interact with greater confidence, self-awareness, and understanding of the perspectives of others. However, previous research on TD/M has not yet addressed how it achieves those outcomes. This pilot study works to fill that gap by investigating how reflection, the most commonly used TD/M technique, is utilized in a facilitated meeting of the steering committee of a non-profit organization. We conduct a qualitative sequential analysis of a video-recorded interaction to investigate how TD/M reflection is done. We show how the TD/M facilitator of the meeting reflects participants' statements with the techniques of mirroring, substituting, and omitting and how the participants respond to those reflections with agreement or repair. The results of the analysis are discussed in terms of their implications for understanding how TD/M facilitation works.

Angela Cora Garcia is a professor in the Department of Natural and Applied Sciences at Bentley University. Her main areas of research are conversation analytic studies of mediation sessions, emergency service calls to the police, air traffic communication, and political speeches and interviews. She is the author of a textbook on conversation analysis, *An Introduction to Interaction: Understanding Talk in the Workplace and Everyday Life* (Bloomsbury Academic Press, 2023), and a conversation analytic study of mediation, *How Mediation Works: Resolving Conflict through Talk* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).

email address: agarcia@bentley.edu

Erik Cleven is a professor in the Department of Politics at Saint Anselm College in Manchester, NH. He is also a fellow and a former board member of the Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation. His research focuses on dialogue and conflict, and he is the co-editor with Judith A. Saul of a forthcoming volume to be published by Rowman and Littlefield entitled *Co-Creating Conversations: Transformative Dialogue in Communities and Organizations*.

email address: ecleven@anselm.edu

The

transformative approach to conflict intervention has been widely used in mediation and dialogues in a range of conflicts, including social justice and race (Bush and Folger 2005; 2010; Press and Deason2020), political polarization, and ethnopolitical conflict (Cleven, Bush, and Saul 2018; Cleven and Saul 2021). It was first developed in the 1990s by Robert Bush and Joseph Folger (1994) as a new approach to mediation, which differed in key ways from facilitative mediation. First and foremost, transformative mediators see the most important goal of mediation not as facilitating agreement between parties but in reversing the negative spiral of interaction that occurs in conflict and improving the quality of conflict interaction, whether or not agreement is reached.[1] Practitioners of transformative dialogue and mediation (TD/M) believe their approach better supports the self-determination of participants and helps them interact with greater confidence and self-awareness while nurturing greater understanding of the perspectives of others. However, previous research has not yet addressed how it achieves those outcomes. This paper works to fill that gap by investigating the use of reflection, the most commonly utilized TD/M skill.

The TD/M skill of reflection differs from related skills used in facilitative mediation. Facilitative mediators typically paraphrase or reframe clients' perspectives and positions using language that is more conducive to getting to agreement (Moore 1996; Boulle, Colatrella, and Picchioni 2008; Frenkel and Stark 2012; Goldberg et al. 2017; Garcia 2019; Maxwell and Ingram 2022). That might include using very different language to describe the issues than the parties used. In contrast, the TD/M skill of reflection aims to mirror or reflect what the participant is presenting, using words as close as possible to those used by the parties themselves and may also reflect emotional display, or even silence or withdrawal from the exchange. In theory, reflections are used to help participants gain clarity about their situation, what they want to say, or decisions they want to make. Reflection is also meant to support participants as they interact with others.

The goals of this pilot study are twofold. First, the study aims to investigate how reflection is used by TD/M facilitators and whether it is utilized as described in the theoretical literature. Second, it aims to show how participants respond to reflection as a facilitator move. TD/M has ethical objectives on two levels—the facilitator's respect for the participant's self-determination is ethical regardless of any empirical outcome, and there are also goals of enhancing the participants' sense of agency and empowerment. It is the latter we focus on in this article by examining how reflections are constructed by the facilitator and how participants respond. With the TD/M approach, reflections are designed to empower the participant by mirroring their current thinking rather than using more directive methods, such as those often used in facilitative mediation. We conduct a qualitative sequential analysis relying on conversation analytic concepts and findings to examine how the TD/M reflection technique is used during a steering committee meeting of a non-profit organization.

While this study will be of interest to TD/M scholars and practitioners and scholars of mediation more widely, we believe this research has potentially greater significance as well. TD/M techniques are

---

[1] Practitioners of transformative dialogue and mediation are referred to as "facilitators" of the interaction; that is not to be confused with the term "facilitative mediation," which refers to a specific type of mediation.

designed to facilitate conversations between people on challenging topics, whether in the context of the mediation of a dispute or a community dialogue about racial justice or other social and political issues. As the United States and many other countries struggle with extreme political polarization, which may make it difficult for people to engage in political discourse, a better understanding of facilitation approaches such as TD/M is timely. We need to understand how such techniques work and how they impact the interactions between participants to best assist people to engage in difficult conversations constructively.

In the next section, we review scholarship on the TD/M approach and its use for mediation and dialogue. We then describe our theoretical perspective, methods and data, and our analysis of the reflections in the data. We show that reflections are constructed using the techniques of mirroring, omitting, and substituting and that participants respond to them with agreement or repair. Taken together, those actions constitute what we call reflection-response sequences. The paper concludes with a summary of findings and a discussion of further research directions.

Literature Review

The transformative theory of conflict (Bush and Folger 1994; 2005) differs in key ways from other perspectives on conflict, such as facilitative and narrative mediation (Moore 1996; Winslade and Monk 2000). Mediation programs in the US have typically focused on problem-solving and creating agreement between disputing parties (Moore 1996; Woolford and Ratner 2008; Bush 2013; Bishop et al. 2015; Seaman 2016). Christopher Moore (1996:54) acknowledges a continuum of mediator directiveness ranging from "orchestrators" whose "focus [is] on

empowering parties to make their own decisions" to "dealmakers" who "are often highly directive in relation to both process and the substantive issues under discussion...[and who] are very prescriptive and directive with respect to problem-solving steps." Nonetheless, the mediation process he outlines is one where the end stage is achieving formal settlement (Moore 1996:67). In contrast, the transformative theory was described as building on a relational worldview rather than an individualist or transactional worldview (Della Noce 1999). While transformative mediators could be described by Moore's (1996) category of "orchestrators" since they seek to empower parties to make their own decisions, the goal of transformative mediation is not necessarily formal settlement but improvement of the conflict interaction between parties (though it may also include settlement if that is what the parties desire). That is based on an analysis of how people *experience* conflict and what people primarily want when seeking help from a mediator. Thus, in transformative theory, conflict is understood as a crisis in human interaction where people experience relative weakness and self-absorption that hinders them from interacting constructively with others or recognizing the perspectives of others. That experience can become a downward spiral that can degenerate, causing interactions to be negative, alienating, and ultimately dehumanizing (Bush and Pope 2002; Bush and Folger 2005).

Transformative theory posits that what people want most from mediators and other conflict interveners is support to shift their conflict interaction from negative to positive (Bush and Pope 2002). From that perspective, the role of transformative facilitators is to support people as they interact and help them gain clarity, and thus empowerment, without supplanting their agency.

Finally, the theory makes explicit premises that inform decisions interveners make as they mediate or facilitate people's conflicts (Bush and Folger 2010; Folger 2020). Those premises are based on beliefs about what constitutes success in conflict intervention and about people's motivation and capacity in their relation to others. Transformative theory posits that human beings have inherent capacities for both self-determined choice and compassionate responsiveness to others, even when confronted with adverse circumstances. A transformative mediator or facilitator's main role is to support but never supplant each person's voluntary decision-making and each individual's interpersonal perspective-taking (Bush and Folger 2010). Though transformative theory focuses on conflict as a crisis in human interaction, it also posits that people can shift from weakness to strength and from self-absorption to responsiveness to others with the proper support of a conflict intervener (Bush and Folger 2005).

There are five essential skills a transformative mediator uses: listening, reflecting, summarizing, checking in, and letting go (e.g., Bush and Pope 2002; Bush and Folger 2005; Simon and West 2022). Listening means attending to the moment-to-moment interaction between participants. Because the purpose of TD/M processes is to support participants in making self-determined choices about their interactions or the issues being discussed, and because those processes build on premises that assert the capacity of people to do it themselves, interveners must keep that in mind to avoid acting on the impulse to fix people's problems or make decisions for them—no matter how well-intentioned such impulses might be. That requires "listening to *how* the parties are talking rather than *what* they are talking about" (Bush and Folger 2010:37).

When reflecting, facilitators are trained to repeat back to participants what they said and the emotions accompanying their statements. The purpose is to "mirror" what was said, allowing participants to feel heard and supported and to give them the chance to edit what they said or to add to it. While reflections are meant to be focused on one speaker, summaries are meant to be a recapitulation of part of a larger conversation. They are focused on themes discussed and differences between participants' perspectives rather than commonalities. Reflections are addressed to one person in the conversation and follow immediately after that person's statement. Summaries, on the other hand, are focused on all the parties to the conversation and offered after parties have been discussing several themes. Finally, "letting go" means staying out when participants are interacting constructively to not interrupt constructive interaction.

Those transformative skills and core practices are currently used not only in the mediation of conflicts, including relationship, neighborhood, and workplace conflicts but also to facilitate interpersonal or intergroup dialogue. TD/M facilitators may use them in the context of one-on-one conversations as they meet with members of communities or organizations to co-create the dialogue process or with large groups (Cleven and Saul 2021).

Reflection is the most commonly used TD/M skill. TD/M reflections are directed only at the party currently speaking (Bush and Folger 2005) and are used immediately after that person has spoken (Simon and West 2022). Robert Bush and Sally Pope (2002:88) state that "[i]n reflecting a party statement, the mediator simply says what she hears the party saying, using words close to the party's own language, even (or especially) when language is strong,

loud, negative, or strongly expressive." That is very different from paraphrasing used in facilitative mediation, where mediators typically rephrase what a party has said in terms more conducive to reaching an agreement (e.g., Garcia 2019). A TD/M reflection is inclusive, and the intervener should not leave out parts of what the person has said (Bush and Pope 2002) or soften language to make it easier for others in the room to hear (Bush and Folger 2005). According to the theory, an effective reflection "will usually evoke an immediate confirmation response from the speaker," and if the reflection "misses the mark," it will evoke a correction from the speaker (Bush and Folger 2005:146).

Dan Simon and Tara West (2022:87) explain that when thinking about when to reflect, they look for

> a high degree of emotionality, particularly frustration or anger. Frustration suggests the person feels stuck— they would like to change the situation but don't know how… Anger (which is often tied to frustration) suggests the person is experiencing self-absorption— they're having a hard time understanding the other person's perspective or seeing the situation through their eyes.

In transformative theory, it is often referred to as signs of weakness and self-absorption (Bush and Pope 2002; Bush and Folger 2005).

Taken together, the transformative skills are designed to support participants in making positive interactional shifts. In theory, reflections allow a person to hear themselves better and allow other people to hear them from a distance through the voice of the intervener. Reflection also allows people to choose to alter what they have said (Bush and Pope 2002). The effectiveness of the reflection is

therefore not only measured by the participant's response to it since both reflections that are responded to with agreement and those responded to by a revision of the reflection are presumably beneficial to the participant reflected. The reason for that is that, in either case, the person reflected gains clarity about what was said and, after revising the reflection presumably, gains the acknowledgment of the facilitator.

In the literature reviewed above, scholars describe how those skills and core practices *should* be used in the transformative framework. Both scholars and practitioners have made many claims about how such "moves" affect people and conversations, but existing studies have not specifically investigated how mediators reflect and how participants respond to those moves. James Antes, Joseph Folger, and Dorothy Della Noce (2001) assessed how the micro-level of conflict interaction changed in transformative mediation. That included documenting shifts in interaction to more calm and constructive conversation, but the authors did so by conducting focus groups with mediators after the fact. The study did not utilize transcripts or recordings of mediations, nor did it specifically connect the use of skills by the mediators to the specific changes in interaction. Della Noce (2002:299) studied transcripts of so-called individualist and relational mediations, focusing on what she refers to as "discursive moves and strategies." She writes that in the case of relational mediations, those closest to transformative mediation, such discursive moves and strategies were meant to "position the parties for constructive conversation" (Della Noce 2002:300). Strategies for doing so included orienting parties to their agency, orienting parties to each other, and "opening the parties' verbal conflict," for instance, focusing on disagreement (Della Noce 2002:301). Though Della

Noce (2002:301) does not use the term reflection, she notes that mediators were utilizing "second person in subject position" and "second person possessive adjectives" as well as subject names. Finally, she also notes that mediators use "open reformulations and questions that 'stay with' party-to-party content" (Della Noce 2002:301). Nonetheless, as Della Noce (1999:279) noted many years ago in an earlier publication, there has not yet been an "empirical examination of micro-level discursive practices" of TD/M beyond that described above. As far as we are aware, such a gap in the literature has yet to be filled. Previous micro-level research on the interactional organization of more common approaches to mediation (such as facilitative mediation) has documented not only substantial strengths but also some potential weaknesses, including the possibility of perceptions of bias, unintended consequences of attempts to empower weaker disputants, and challenges to the autonomy of disputants (e.g., Greatbatch and Dingwall 1989; Jacobs 2002; Heisterkamp 2006; Garcia 2019). In this paper, we fill that gap by empirically analyzing how participants use and respond to the most common TD/M technique—reflection.

Theoretical Perspective and Methods

The ethnomethodological perspective directs our attention to how social action and social organization are accomplished and maintained (Garfinkel 1967; Heritage 1984). Harold Garfinkel (1967) uses the term "documentary method of interpretation" to refer to how participants interpret their co-participants' actions (including utterances) to reflect an underlying pattern. That ethnomethodological insight is also explored in Lawrence Wieder's (1974) study of convicts in a halfway house, where he showed how the accounts given by participants, for example, staff members, used residents' behaviors as ac-

tions reflecting an underlying "convict code," which then reflexively explained the actions taken and the staff members' response to those actions. Similarly, in this paper, we explore how the facilitator of the meeting uses participants' actions as "documents" of underlying patterns, such as what TD/M theory considers weakness and self-absorption as they determine whether to reflect participants' statements and how to reflect them. Participants' response to the reflection (agreement or disagreement) displays their orientation to its accuracy.

Ethnomethodological studies of face-to-face interaction typically use the analytical approach of conversation analysis, a qualitative method for analyzing the procedures used to accomplish interaction, achieve and repair intersubjective understanding, and achieve goals in different types of interactional contexts (e.g., Schegloff 2007). As in ethnomethodological studies of work (e.g., Zimmerman 1969; Garfinkel 1986; Lynch 1991; Corsby and Jones 2020), conversation analytic studies of talk in institutional settings focus on how the work is done (e.g., Atkinson and Heritage 1984; Drew and Heritage 1992). For the TD/M facilitator, the meeting is the workplace and the work of facilitation is done through talk.

Conversation analysis enables the close and detailed examination of participants' actions in their sequential context so that participants' turns can be analyzed in terms of how they display an orientation to the production of prior turns. For example, conversation analytic studies of interaction in psychotherapeutic settings show how therapists use the sequential context and details of how clients' statements are produced to make inferences about clients' emotions, thoughts, or levels of self-awareness through the documentary method of interpretation (e.g., Muntigl and Horvath 2014;

Cannon et al. 2020). Danielle Pillet-Shore (2016:38) shows how parents in parent-teacher conferences can display their reluctance to articulate praise of the student, using hesitation, error avoidance, and "speech disfluencies, cutting off her in-progress talk each time it projects student-praise." Pillet-Shore (2016) also argues that those are conflict-avoidance moves that minimize the likelihood of conflict between the parent and teacher in the conference. On the other hand, when teachers praised the students, they did so "fluently (without speech perturbations, e.g., sound cut-offs or silences) and straightforwardly, without delay, mitigation, qualification, or account" (Pillet-Shore 2016:38). When conveying criticisms of the student's work, teachers constructed their turns with hesitation and pauses (including "um" and "uh"), cut-offs and self-repair, qualifications (such as "kind of"), as well as indirect formulations, which avoid specifying the student's responsibility for the problems (Pillet-Shore 2016:42).

Data

This pilot study is the first step in a program of research that will examine the use of TD/M techniques in a larger collection of interactions, including meetings, public dialogues, and mediation sessions. The steering committee meeting analyzed in this paper not only produces initial findings about how TD/M reflections are done and responded to but also demonstrates how the qualitative analysis of the interaction using conversation analysis can make visible the specific actions and ways of formulating and placing utterances that make the technique work. We will examine the sequential organization of the talk in the meeting to understand the interactional techniques used to accomplish reflections and to respond to them.

The participants in the meeting were members of the steering committee of a non-profit organization whose purpose was to facilitate inter-racial understanding and the transmission of knowledge about racism by organizing a series of dialogue events ("conversations") for the broader community. In the meeting, they discussed issues around planning a future conversation about race and trauma. Originally scheduled to be held in person, the meeting was conducted via Zoom due to COVID issues.

The study was approved by an IRB, and all participants signed consent forms. Participants were not specifically informed that TD/M uses skills like reflection, but as part of the consent process, they were informed that the purpose of the research was to study the process of facilitation. All participants had previously taken part in facilitated conversations using TD/M because the steering committee is closely connected to a community mediation center that uses the TD/M approach.

The online meeting was video-recorded and transcribed using the techniques of conversation analysis (see: Hepburn and Bolden 2017). A simplified version of Gail Jefferson's (2004) transcribing conventions is used in the transcript excerpts—words are spelled as pronounced, brackets indicate simultaneous talk, numbers in parentheses are timed pauses, colons indicate a sound was drawn out, underlining indicates stress or emphasis, a dash indicates a word was cut off abruptly, capitalization indicates loudness, degree signs indicate something spoken more quietly than surrounding talk, and ".h" or "h" indicates inhalations or exhalations. Nonverbal behaviors are briefly described in double parentheses, and tentative transcriptions are enclosed in single parentheses. Pseudonyms were used for all names and identifying information. We are calling the fa-

cilitator of the meeting Nora, and the participants are Leo, Rena, Ava, Tina, and Hal.

Both authors independently analyzed the data to identify all reflections that occurred. We agreed on all 13 instances of TD/M reflections we identified in the collection. A reflection is not the same as a formulation because it is not a summary or gist of what has gone before or the action being accomplished (Heritage and Watson 1979; 1980; see also Gibson 2022). However, as we shall show in the analysis, participants' responses to reflections have similarities with responses to formulations (Heritage and Watson 1979; 1980). For example, the recipient of the reflection may respond with a confirmation or agreement with the reflection, on the one hand, or a revision or correction of the reflection, on the other.

A previous paper (Garcia 2024) analyzed the turn-taking system in the meeting. The participants chose to let the facilitator (Nora) select the next speakers, and it was decided that they would raise their hands to request a turn to talk. Once selected by the facilitator, the participant had the floor for an extended turn, which was typically constructed of several turn constructional units (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974). When the speaker was done, the facilitator could produce a reflection of that participant's turn or could select the next speaker.

The transformative theory of conflict proposes that changes occur both internally (in the perspectives, beliefs, or emotions of the participant) and externally (in actions, such as how participants contribute to the interaction and how they formulate their contributions). The facilitator is trained to identify aspects of a participant's actions that indicate a lack of clarity or need for empowerment. The facilitator is trained to reflect back, as closely as possible in the speaker's words, those aspects of the statement. The sequential analysis of the data shows how the construction and placement of participants and the facilitator's actions work together to produce reflection-response sequences.

We first analyze participants' turns that do not lead to facilitator reflections and show how aspects of the participants' turn construction led to a presentation of strength and confidence. We then analyze participants' turns that led to facilitator reflections and show how the construction of the turn displays some type of vulnerability or lack of clarity. Finally, we analyze how reflections are constructed, as well as participants' responses to reflections, and describe the reflection-response sequence.

Analysis

Participants' Statements That Are Not Reflected

In the data, the facilitator, Nora, does not reflect every participant's turn at talk. We found that the statements that are not reflected use techniques conveying greater clarity, certainty, or confidence than those reflected. For example, Excerpt 1 shows parts of Ava's lengthy statement about how white people and African Americans have experienced trauma differently and how those differences may affect the steering committee's choices about how to structure the next event they are planning—a public "conversation" about race and trauma. Ava's statement, although lengthy, makes a clear and coherent statement of how she sees the relationship between race and trauma and how she feels such differences should affect the committee's design of the event they are planning (as a single session or as two related sessions). Ava speaks with authority about the positions on race and trauma that she expresses:

Excerpt 1

1	Ava:	<u>one</u> of thuh things that I've been saying ever since we've started is that (0.4)
2		<u>A</u>frican Americans a:nd <u>whit</u>e (0.1) folks on two completely different <u>pa</u>:ths ((Leo
3		nods)) ((Tina nods emphatically)) ((Rena nods emphatically)) when it comes to:
4		dealing with issues around trauma and and bad experiences. so for example,
5		(0.3) <u>most</u> African Americans suffer microaggressions <u>E</u>:very day! ... <u>mo</u>st of our
6		parents, and their parents, <u>all</u> gave thuh kinds of conversations to their children?,
7		that ((Leo small nods)) would <u>help</u> them to survi:ve!, (0.2) from Jim Crow to:
8		((Rena starts nodding)) discrimination in thuh <u>work</u>place! (0.4) <u>So</u>!, <u>A</u>frican
9		Americans are on uh much ((Rena nods)) <u>dee</u>:per <u>dif</u>ferent <u>pa</u>:th ((Tina nods))
10		(0.3) when it comes to dealing with (0.4) quote <u>day</u> to <u>day</u> microaggression
11		((Nora small nods)) kind of experiences that <u>they</u> learn to deal with relatively
12		early. ... so I <u>think</u> what we <u>gra</u>:pple with in presenting this <u>topic</u> is, it has <u>two</u>
13		levels of ((Tina nods)) (0.4) information. ((Rena nodding)) (0.3) we can talk
14		generally about theh hi<u>stor</u>ic <u>trau</u>ma of <u>rac</u>ism on African Americans. <u>that's</u> uh
15		topic in itself. (0.4) that's uh topic about microaggressions?, that's thuh topic
16		about thuh hurt, thuh process of getting better and thee effect that this has had o~n
17		(0.1) generations of African Americans, is uh topic in it°self.° (0.5) <u>if</u> we want to
18		talk about <u>E</u>:veryone!, (0.4) because white folks have experienced trauma <u>too</u>!
19		(1.0) <u>that's</u> <u>a</u> <u>big</u> topic. that <u>al</u>most has to be (done) in two sessions because
20		we have to go back historically ((Tina nodding)) WA:Y back ((Rena nodding))
21		(0.5) um for what for Af- for white Americans to be in <u>touch</u> with with <u>the</u>:ir
22		traumatic experiences. because there's historical trauma for them too. ... so it's uh
23		<u>big</u> topic and ((Nora nods)) I've heard <u>many</u> <u>many</u> talks on it so (0.3) um ((Rena
24		smiles)) we're- we're going to have to do uh lot more interviewing uh lot more
25		information gathering to see <u>ju</u>:st how we can pare that down. <u>so</u> that thuh public
26		(0.4) community (0.5) (so truly) some people are not talking about this every day
27		so they have no idea. ((Tina starts nodding, hand over mouth)) (0.5) so we've <u>got</u>
28		to be able to reach all those people.=
29		=((Tina raises hand))
30		(5.0)
31	Nora:	<u>Ti</u>na.
32		(2.0)
33	Tina:	Yeah Ava what I I I actually (0.3) <u>think</u> I started picking away at tha:t...

In Excerpt 1, Ava begins with a clear statement of her position that there are differences between Af-

rican Americans and white people regarding trauma (lines 1-4). She then gives the example of the

microaggressions African Americans experience and their ability to learn to survive those as an illustration of how trauma can be experienced (lines 4-12). Ava uses the transition marker "so" (line 12) to introduce the upshot of that explanation. She explains that there are two paths they could take: focus the event on "theh historic trauma of racism on African Americans." (line 14), on the one hand, or include how whites have experienced trauma as well as how African Americans have experienced trauma ("talk about E:veryone!,"; line 18). The second option would entail having two sessions rather than one (lines 17-22). Ava's entire statement is clear, well-organized, and supported with examples. She draws relevant conclusions as to how the committee can organize the event to attract an audience. While there are occasional instances of hesitation or error avoidance (e.g., "and and" in line 4, "um" in lines 21 and 23, and "we're- we're" in line 24), her speech is relatively fluent and delivered in a calm, confident manner. While "I think" can be used as an uncertainty marker, Ava's use of stress on "think" ("I think" in line 12) conveys some level of confidence in her opinions rather than tentativeness. Her points and suggestions are made in direct declarative statements rather than as indirect or hedged suggestions. Here are some examples of statements she makes that convey clarity and confidence:

most African Americans suffer microaggressions E:very day! (line 5)

we can talk generally about theh historic trauma of racism on African Americans. that's uh topic in itself. (lines 13-15)

so we've got to be able to reach all those people.= (lines 27-28)

When Ava reaches the end of her extended turn (line 28), Nora does not produce a reflection of it. Instead, Tina raises her hand (line 29). After a 5-second pause (line 30), Nora selects Tina as the next speaker (line 31). Tina then begins her response to Ava's turn (line 33).

In the next sections of this paper, we use several excerpts to illustrate our analysis of the 13 participant statements that the facilitator reflected. We begin by showing how the turns reflected were constructed in a way that made a reflection relevant.

Participants' Statements That Are Reflected by the Facilitator

In the data, the facilitator reflects turns that show a lack of clarity or self-confidence, self-absorption (sometimes displayed as frustration), or uncertainty. There are several ways in which participants' turns can display those underlying characteristics, including linguistic and paralinguistic aspects of the talk, such as self-correction or error avoidance (Jefferson 1974), the use of techniques to mitigate or display uncertainty (e.g., I think), requests for confirmation (e.g., questioning intonation on the ends of statements or the use of "you know"), or repetition.

Excerpt 2 shows a participant's extended statement that was reflected by the facilitator. There are several ways in which Rena's construction of her turn differed from Ava's turn in Excerpt 1. In general, the interactional techniques used and the details of its production created a presentation of less clarity, more uncertainty, and more vulnerability than Ava's turn did. First, note that Rena begins her turn in line 2 with "well" followed by "I think," which conveys tentativeness. She then uses an error correction format (hesitation "um" followed by a replacement—Jefferson 1974) ("[well] I think as um .h I think it's:").

Excerpt 2

```
1        Nora:  Rena. (0.2) you've got your [hand up]
2        Rena:                              [well    ] I think as um .h I think it's:
3               ea:sy to talk about thee opportunities um ((Ava nods)) because
4               .h with our pa:st: all of our past conversations big conversations
5               (0.2) we've rea:lly reaped thuh- thuh rewards of them:?, .h you
6               know that from thuh very first one of I didn't know .h u:hm: we've
7               seen so many other: (0.2) pro:grams and things come out of that so
8               .h I I I think that that's going to be thuh SA:me? (0.3) wi:th um this
9               upcoming one? (0.4) but I think thuh challenges of just ((Ava
10              nods)) um (0.2) is is how we present it. ((Ava smaller nods))
11              and ((Leo nods)) we go through this! .h every TI:me! you know
12              we- this is struggle for us to .hh be able to figure out just thee
13              exA:ct wa:y .h of how to present it so we gather (0.3) you know an
14              AUdience! heh ((Nora small nods)) we gather people who want
15              to come .h and um that's that's just uh huge challenge and I think
16              where we a:re right no:w?, °of° .hh (0.2) of we know that there's
17              going to be rewards.  because there have been in every one that
18              we've done so far and there have been .h additional programs that
19              have come out! of our past conversations. .h so I expect it'll be
20              thuh sa:me, (0.3) but it's just how do we get there from here right
21              no-h-heh-h-w!
```

Rena uses several interactional techniques in lines 2-21 of her turn that may have contributed to Nora's decision to reflect it. Bogdana Humă, Elizabeth Stokoe, and Rein Sikveland (2019) give an example of the recipient of a sales call "tentatively" agreeing to a sales visit by beginning their turn with hesitation (uh) and a brief cutoff of the first word of their response (see also Humă and Stokoe 2023). In Rena's statement, she uses several techniques that may indicate uncertainty, beginning in line 2 with "I think" and hesitations ("um"). Error correction is evident in line 2 ("I think as um .h I think it's:"), which may indicate the speaker is editing her utterance in progress (Jefferson 1974). Additional hesitation, self-repair, and error avoidance (Jefferson 1974) occur as Rena talks about the conversations (public events) the group has organized in the past. For example, there is self-repair in line 4 ("with our pa:st: all of our past conversations big conversations") and error avoidance in line 5 ("we've rea:lly reaped thuh- thuh rewards of them:?,"). In

addition, speech perturbations, repetitions, and hedges occur frequently (such as "I I I think that"; line 8, "is is"; line 10, "that's that's"; line 15). Also note the use of questioning intonation at several points throughout Rena's turn, which may convey less confidence and certainty than period intonation (e.g., lines 5, 8, 9, 16).

When Rena refers to the topic of a previous event the group had organized (titled "I didn't know"; line 6), she expresses a tentative expectation that positive results will also be obtained from the event they are currently planning (lines 8-9). She expresses uncertainty as she makes that claim (".h I I I think that that's going to be thuh SA:me?"; line 8). That part of her turn shows error avoidance (note the repetition in "I I I"; Jefferson 1974) and the use of "I think". Rena then produces a description of the challenge of trying to figure out "how to present" it (lines 9-13).

Emanuel Schegloff and Harvey Sacks (1973) describe the use of "so" in closing sequences as a transition marker (see also Jefferson 1984a on "so" as a transition marker in "troubles talk"). Rena uses "so" (line 7) to mark a transition between talking about previous conversations to talking about future expectations. One problem facing them in the future is the issue of gathering "you know an AUdience! heh..." (lines 13-14), which she describes as "uh huge challenge" (line 15).

Rena then repeats her entire argument in a shorter form (lines 16-20), ending with a statement of a problem "but it's just how do we get there from here right no-h-heh-h-w!" (lines 20-21). There is, thus, evidence in the excerpt of both strengths

(previous successes and expressions of confidence in the likelihood of future success) and weaknesses or uncertainties (hesitation, self-repair, and error avoidance, and expressed uncertainty about how to achieve those positive outcomes with the event they are currently planning).

The analysis of Excerpt 2 reveals the interactional techniques through which Rena constructed her statement. Nora's subsequent reflection of the statement displays her orientation to it. As noted in the literature review section, the TD/M facilitator is trained to listen more to *how* the participants talk than what they say (Bush and Folger 2010). That does not mean they are not paying attention to the meaning of the words spoken but that they are also attending to how the turn was produced. Our use of conversation analytic transcripts, concepts, and findings to analyze how Rena constructs her statement reveals the interactional resources Nora can observe that inform how she does the work of TD/M facilitation. Nora's next action is a reflection of Rena's statement, which displays her orientation to Rena's statement as warranting reflection.

Constructing and Responding to Reflections

In this section, we analyze the facilitator's reflection of Rena's turn in Excerpt 2 to show how the reflection displays an orientation to the participant's turn. Nora uses three interactional techniques to construct her reflection of Rena's turn: mirroring, substituting, and omitting. Excerpt 3 begins with the last 3 lines of Rena's extended turn from Excerpt 2, followed by Nora's reflection of the turn:

Excerpt 3

```
19          have come out! of our past conversations. .h so I expect it'll be
20          thuh sa:me, (0.3) but it's just how do we get there from here right
21          no-h-heh-h-w!
22          (0.2)
23  ((off screen voice or Nora?)): °right.°
24          (0.5) ((Tina raises hand))
25  Nora:  °okay.° so so Rena for you: ((Tina lowers hand to forehead))
26          thu:h thee opportunities ((Rena nods)) thuh rewards are thee
27          easy part because you've ((Leo nods)) experienced it befo:re
28          and you've you've (0.3) (you) imagine that you'll experience it
29          again with this conversation but right now thuh cha:llenge i:s how
30          to get there. (0.2) and [how to]
31  Rena:                          [yep!   ]
32  Nora:  how to present this topic.
33          (0.2)
34  Rena: ((Tina raises hand)) yeah how to get there from here chinh!=
35  Nora:                                      =okay how to get there
36          from here. Tina!
```

The goal of reflecting is not to summarize an entire turn but to reflect the weaknesses and do so in a way that uses the participants' words, actions, and emotional valence as closely as possible. Excerpt 3 shows that Nora's reflection of Rena's statement starts by summarizing strengths and ends with the uncertainties Rena expressed, either explicitly or implicitly (lines 25-30). The interactional techniques Nora uses in the reflection include mirroring, omitting, and substituting.

Mirroring. The repetition of words or phrases is one way transformative mediators are trained to reflect a participant's statements. Nora's reflection pulls relevant elements from Rena's longer statement and mirrors them in a short turn. She uses several of the same words Rena used in her reflections (opportunities, rewards, easy, conversation, and challenges; lines 26-29).

Another way in which Nora's reflection mirrors Rena's statement is in the ordering of the elements in her reflection. Both Rena and Nora start with the strengths, such as the opportunities and the rewards, and then mention the challenges (such as how to get there and present it).

Omissions. One reason the reflection is shorter than the original statement is that some items are left out. First, there is repetition in Rena's statement that is absent in Nora's shorter reflection of it. Recall that in Excerpt 2, in lines 2-15, Rena described the rewards

and challenges; then, in lines 15 to 21, she briefly repeated those points. Nora's reflection refers to each of those points once rather than twice.

Second, parts of Rena's statement are left out of the reflection. For example, Nora does not include Rena's point about the need to get an audience for the event they are planning ("you know an AUdience!... gather people who want to come"; Excerpt 2, lines 13-15). Instead, she focuses her reflection on more general descriptions of opportunities, rewards, and challenges. The need to gather an audience is an example of a challenge that Rena provided in her statement, but it is not explicitly mentioned in Nora's reflection. Rena constructed her statement about the audience as a parenthetical comment within her broader statement. Charles Goodwin (1984) analyzed ordinary conversations and showed how parenthetical remarks are embedded in an ongoing story. The facilitator correctly interprets those items as peripheral to the main point and does not include them in her reflection.

Substitutions. Another way in which the reflection differs from the original statement is that there are some instances where substitutions are made instead of directly mirroring the original statement by using the same words or phrases. For example, while Rena conveyed her expectation that the event they are organizing will produce rewards, she conveyed uncertainty around this expectation (".h I I I think that that's going to be thuh SA:me? (0.3) wi:th um this upcoming one?"; Excerpt 2, lines 8-9). We noted above that several interactional techniques in the utterance that may indicate uncertainty.

Nora's reflection of the issue of future rewards also conveys uncertainty, but rather than mimicking the techniques Rena used in her turn, Nora uses the term "imagine" to convey the future-oriented expectation ("(you) imagine that you'll experience it again"; Excerpt 3, line 28). The choice of the word "imagine" conveys a future possibility rather than conviction that that is what will transpire. Such a formulation concisely conveys uncertainty while still capturing the tone of Rena's statement.

In short, there are several aspects of Nora's reflection of Rena's statement that display an orientation not just to the substance of what Rena has said but to how she constructed, organized, and produced her extended turn. In Rena's response to Nora's reflection, she first agrees with and then repairs the reflection once it has been completed (Excerpt 3, lines 31 and 34). The final action in the sequence is Nora's reflection of Rena's repair of the initial reflection (lines 35-36). Taken together, Excerpts 2 and 3 illustrate what we are calling a reflection-response sequence.

Rena's first response to Nora's reflection is a clear agreement with what Nora has said in her reflection so far ("[yep!]"; Excerpt 3, line 31). There is a slight overlap at the turn transition with Nora's extension of her reflection ("and [how to] how to present this topic."; lines 30, 32). Rena's statement of agreement overlaps Nora's turn continuation, which is an error in transition timing (overlap) rather than an interruption (Schegloff 2000).

When Nora's reflection reached an apparent transition relevance place (Sacks et al. 1974) at "thuh cha:llenge i:s how to get there." (Excerpt 3, lines 29-30), she paused briefly before adding an increment to her turn (Ford, Fox, and Thompson 2002; Lerner 2004; Bolden, Mandelbaum, and Wilkinson 2012; Schegloff 2016). Nora's completion of her turn ("and [how to] how to present this topic."; Excerpt 3, lines

30, 32) displays an orientation to the simultaneity with Rena's agreement by repeating "how to" in the clear as soon as the overlap is ended (Excerpt 3, line 32) (Schegloff 1987). The increment to Nora's turn extends her reflection by mirroring Rena's point about one of the challenges being "<u>how</u> we pre<u>sent</u> it." (in Excerpt 2, line 10).

Rena's response to Nora's reflection thus far has displayed an orientation to the accuracy of Nora's reflection of her turn. However, after Nora's turn increment ("and [how to] how to pre<u>sent</u> this topic."; Excerpt 3, lines 30, 32), Rena responds again. She produces another agreement token, which is followed by a correction of Nora's completion of her reflection ("yeah how to get there from here chinh!="; Excerpt 3, line 34) (Jefferson 1987). Note that Rena's turn-initial "yeah" (in line 34) is a less emphatic agreement than the "yep!" she produced in line 31 (Excerpt 3). In that interactional context, where Rena is a listener responding to a prior speaker's turn (Nora's extension of her reflection), "yeah" can be used to make a transition from a listener role to a speaker role rather than serving as a stand-alone agreement token (Jefferson 1984b). Rena does not produce "yeah" with completion intonation; instead, she flows through that agreement token with a repair of Nora's reflection.[2] In line 34, Rena refocuses attention on the issue of "how to get there from here chinh!=". Rena does not explicitly disagree with Nora's completion of her reflection but implicitly corrects it by shifting the emphasis from "how to present the topic" to "how to get there from here." In other words, Rena's concern is about what the steering commit-

---

[2] Garcia (2022) describes "flowing through" as a "pre-emptive strategy at a possibly complete turn constructional unit to avoid providing space for a turn transition." Schegloff's (1982' 2000) term "rushing through" is similar, except it also involves speaking more quickly to provide less time for another speaker to take a turn.

tee is going to have to do to solve those potential challenges rather than concern about specific ideas about how to present the topic. Rena's turn ends with a sound that is something like a laugh particle ("chinh!"; Jefferson 1979), which seems to serve a mitigating function, thus contributing to the framing of her correction of Nora's reflection as an agreement rather than a challenge or disagreement.

Rena has not taken issue with the first part of the reflection, where the strengths are described, but has repaired the end of Nora's reflection, where the weaknesses or uncertainties are described. With her response to the second part of Nora's reflection, Rena displayed how it did not accurately reflect her position. By producing that correction, Rena displays for herself, the facilitator, and the other participants in the meeting a more accurate statement of what she meant. That repair furthers the transformative work of the meeting by helping all parties clarify their understanding of what Rena is saying.

After Rena's correction of the reflection in line 34, Nora very quickly responds with a second reflection ("=okay how to get there from here."; Excerpt 3, lines 35-36). Because Rena's correction of Nora's reflection was short, substitutions or omissions are not needed to reflect it. Nora uses the technique of mirroring and repeats Rena's prior turn almost verbatim. That second reflection is followed by the selection of the next speaker ("Tina!"; Excerpt 3, line 36).

In sum, the sequential analysis of Excerpts 2 and 3 reveals how the facilitator's approach to reflecting a participant's statement is accomplished. The strengths and weaknesses in the participant's statement that led the facilitator to reflect the statement are visible (e.g., through the use of such interactional techniques as hesitations, error correction, and

questioning intonation). We have examined how the reflection was formulated to display an orientation to the elements of the statement being reflected. We identified techniques used by the facilitator (mirroring, omitting, and substituting) to accomplish the task of reflecting the statement. Rena's subsequent responses to the reflection display her interpretation of the reflection—clearly identifying where she agrees with the reflection and where she disagrees (as evidenced by her correction in line 34 [Excerpt 3]). The facilitator then displays an orientation to the participant's repair of parts of the initial reflection by producing a second reflection in response to the participant's repair move.

Taken together, those actions constitute what we refer to as a reflection-response sequence (participant's turn, facilitator's reflection, participant's response to the reflection, and, if necessary, facilitator's second reflection). The reflection-response sequence provides a framework for each party to display an orientation to their interpretation of the prior turn in the sequence so that reflections can be performed, verified as accurate or corrected, and a place created for a second reflection if necessary. The work of the reflection is to reflect the participant's position, perspective, emotion, or other action in a sequential context, which creates a space for verification and repair. That furthers the work of transformative mediation by providing for the accurate reflection of participants' weaknesses or contradictions to empower them or increase their self-awareness of their perspective. At the same time, it serves to display their perspective for the other participants who are listening to the reflection repair sequence, thus increasing their understanding as well. The participant's response to the reflection and the facilitator's subsequent repair or second reflection, if necessary, are parts of the process taught to TD/M facilitators.

In Excerpt 4, we examine a reflection-response sequence in which the facilitator successfully reflects the uncertainty and ambiguity in the participant's turn, resulting in the participant's agreement with the reflection. Leo produces his statement in lines 3 through 28, reaching a transition relevance place with completion intonation in line 27 and using embodied action to emphasize that completion (Goodwin 1984). Leo ends a repeated hand gesture, puts his fist under his chin, and stops speaking (note the 2.0-second pause in line 29). Nora then reflects the statement (lines 30-37). Leo expresses agreement with Nora's reflection, first through embodied action (head nods in lines 33, 35, and 39) and then with a verbal agreement after the reflection is completed ("absolutely."; line 39).

Excerpt 4

```
1       Nora:  Leo!
2              (1.0)
3       Leo:   When we first started on this subject of trauma, (0.4) you kno:w
4              trauma to me was always uh physical (0.8) ((Ava nods)) u:m
5              (0.3) manifestation. ((Rena nods)) (0.4)  a:nd once I started
6              reading uh grandma's hands, ((Rena nods)) (0.7) ((Ava
```

7		smiles)) uh it became <u>clear</u> to me that trauma (an) was <u>so</u> much
8		more (0.3) a:nd in t- and in relating to what <u>Ti</u>:na was saying, (0.3)
9		<u>one</u> it makes it ((Leo starts gesturing)) especially in Afr-
10		African American <u>ma:</u>le!,
11		(0.3) ((Ava nods)) ((Rena nods)) makes themselves
12		<u>vu:</u>lnerable, (2.0) or <u>feel</u> as though they make themselves
13		vulnerable, if they SA:y you know this- (0.2) <u>thi</u>s happened to me:
14	?:	(hm)=
15	Leo:	=this was and it was uh traumatic effect! (0.3) but (you know)
16		<u>most</u> of us don't want to don't want to admit that ((Rena nods))
17		u:m we're ((Leo raises hand)) human! (0.2) priddy much. and
18		that things aff<u>ec</u>t us. so- ((Leo gestures with pointed index
19		finger)) <u>o</u>ne of thuh things >you know< I look at is say <u>how</u> do I
20		bring (1.5) u::h ((Leo closed fist)) <u>my</u> peers:, (0.2) or ((Ava
21		nods)) ((Rena nods)) <u>o</u>thers that <u>I</u> know along on ((Nora
22		nods)) this journey!, (0.5) and s- and let them <u>know</u> that u:h ih-
23		there is no- uh <u>judg</u>ment made on them because they relate to aye
24		<u>trau</u>ma! (0.4) u:h it's it's human (con[ventional]]
25	??:	[(chum] chum)]]
26	Leo:	but they just need to have somebody u::h that they're <u>com</u>fortable
27		with (0.2) t' explain it to 'em. ((Leo ends repeated hand gesture
28		and puts fist under chin))
29		(2.0)
30	Nora:	°okay.° so for <u>you</u> <u>as</u> uh (0.2) as an African American male?, you
31		(0.2) <u>you</u> feel like its um (1.0) people are put in uh vulnerable
32		position to <u>ta</u>lk ((Rena nods)) about trauma they generally don't
33		<u>want</u> to talk about trauma, ((Leo nods)) (0.4) and you're
34		wondering, (0.4) how you as sort of that maybe thuh <u>ro</u>le model or
35		thuh representative ((Leo nods)) in this <u>group</u>! (0.2) can bring
36		your peers <u>in</u> to that conversation in uh way that will (0.4) <u>make</u>
37		them feel comfortable to talk about things.
38		(0.5)
39	Leo:	((Leo nods)) absolutely.
40		(0.3)
41	Nora:	okay. (0.2) thanks.
42		(15 seconds)
43		((Tina raises hand))
44	Nora:	Tina!

Leo's statement conveys strength and also vulnerability in several ways. Leo initially discusses trauma and his process of learning about trauma, starting in line 3. There are several instances of error avoidance and error correction (Jefferson 1974) throughout Leo's statement. Jefferson (1974) describes error avoidance as different from error correction in that the item replaced is never produced. Instead, the hesitation (e.g., "uh," pause, and/or cut off) displays a break in the production of the turn before its completion, which may indicate some type of problem with completing the turn. As in Garfinkel's (1967) discussion of the documentary method of interpretation, the error avoidance format may be taken to reveal an underlying pattern—perhaps the speaker is deciding what to say next or may be editing their utterance in progress. In line 4, Leo first says, "trauma to me was always uh <u>phys</u>ical", then pauses briefly. After the pause, Leo says, "u:m (0.3) manifestation." (lines 4-5). That use of the error avoidance format suggests time was needed to complete the turn (perhaps he was searching for the word "manifestation."). Leo then uses an error correction format (error, cut off, replacement—Jefferson 1974) in line 8 ("a:nd in t- and in relating to what <u>Ti</u>:na was saying,"). He also accomplishes self-repair in lines 11-13 ("makes themselves <u>vu</u>:lnerable, (2.0) or <u>feel</u> as though they make themselves vulnerable,"). It is not until line 9 that Leo clarifies that the points he is making about trauma refer "especially in Afr- African American <u>ma</u>:le!," (lines 9-10). It is not until line 16 that he includes himself in the category of persons experiencing feelings of vulnerability. He does not accomplish that inclusion through an explicit identification but instead through a transition in pronouns and other forms of reference. He had originally used "they" and "themselves" (lines 11, 12) to refer to those who may experience vulnerability, but then switches to "<u>most</u> of us", "we're", and "us." (lines 16-18), thus implicitly including himself in the category of African American males who may be made to feel vulnerable when admitting to experiencing trauma.

Nora's reflection of Leo's statement effectively conveys Leo's uncertainty in several ways, including hesitations, error correction, error avoidance, and self-repair. For example, after acknowledging Leo's statement ("°okay.°"; line 30), in line 30, Nora begins her reflection by centering Leo's experience ("so for <u>you</u> as"), then uses "uh", pauses briefly, and completes her turn with "as an African American male?," (line 30). She thus mirrors both the term he used to describe his racial/ethnic and gender identities while also mirroring the uncertainty and hesitation conveyed in his statement by her use of error correction format. Notice that Nora first used "uh" in line 30, which could be a filled pause, indicating hesitation, but could also be the indefinite article "a." When she completes the turn, she uses "an". That raises the question of whether she was performing an error avoidance move, perhaps cutting herself off before producing a word beginning with a consonant (e.g., "Black man") and replacing it with a word beginning with a vowel ("African American male?,"). The use of the same term that Leo used makes her reflection more closely mirror his statement.[3]

Furthermore, Nora uses "?," intonation in line 30, which indicates a questioning tone could be heard

---

[3] Jefferson (1974) shows how the use of definite and indefinite articles "the" and "a" can reveal when an error correction may be occurring. She shows how the "thuh" form of the definite article followed by cut off and/or hesitation (as in "I told that to thuh- uh- officer"; Jefferson 1974:189) can be a resource for participants to discover that a word beginning with a consonant (such as "cop") may have been replaced with a word beginning with a vowel (e.g., "officer") as the speaker was producing the turn.

in addition to the comma intonation conveying on-going speech rather than giving up the floor. Nora's use of questioning intonation with the term "African American male?," may also work to mirror the uncertainty in Leo's statement.

Finally, Nora's reflection leaves ambiguous the nature of Leo's role in the process of communicating with people about trauma. She does not claim to know whether a "role model" or "representative" is the correct way to describe his role (lines 34-35). She uses several words to reflect the uncertainty or ambiguity expressed in Leo's statement. In particular, the use of "you're wondering," "sort of", "maybe" "thuh role model or thuh representative" (lines 33-35) convey that ambiguity. Notice that Leo nods in line 35, indicating his agreement with her characterization of his statement as she is in the process of producing it.

The reflection techniques Nora used in Excerpt 3 are also used in Excerpt 4. For example, Nora uses *mirroring* by repeating words Leo used in his statement (African American male, vulnerable, trauma, peers, and comfortable). She uses *substitution* by transforming the bulk of his longer explanation into the concise and open-ended "how you as sort of that maybe thuh role model or thuh representative ((Leo nods)) in this group!" (lines 34-35). One of the ways *omission* is used is by leaving out details of Leo's reasoning process as he described the challenge of inspiring African American males to attend the event they are organizing. For example, Leo describes how a book he read helped clarify his thinking about trauma (lines 5-8). That information is not included in Nora's reflection.

Leo responds positively to Nora's reflection in several ways. He nods his head during her reflection,

thus expressing agreement with major components of her reflection (e.g., lines 33 and 35), and nods at the end of her reflection (line 39). Leo also produces a strong verbal agreement ("absolutely."; line 39). Note that Leo's "absolutely." has period intonation, thus displaying that his turn is complete. In the data, we found that a participant's agreement with a reflection ended the sequence. The next action is typically the selection of the next speaker by the facilitator.

The analysis of Excerpt 4 shows a use of reflection consistent with the goals of TD/M in terms of the transformative theory discussed in the introduction to this paper. The focus of the reflection on weaknesses or uncertainties in the participant's statement is evident in Excerpt 4, as opposed to Excerpts 2 and 3, in which both strengths and weaknesses were reflected. Leo expressed agreement with Nora's reflection of his statement, which lets participants in the meeting (as well as analysts) see that the reflection accurately reflected his turn; no repair or revision of the reflection was required. The excerpt also illustrated how reflection techniques can be successfully used to convey uncertainty and ambiguity in the participant's statement. The goal of the facilitator is not to "fix" the uncertainty; it is to reflect it accurately for the participant so that they and others can see the current state of their beliefs and emotions. However, in the TD/M approach, regardless of whether the reflection was accurate, it has fulfilled the goal of helping the participant clarify their thoughts. The sequential analysis of Excerpt 4 shows us how that was done—how the facilitator used the techniques of mirroring, omission, and substitution to construct an effective reflection of the participant's statement while, at the same time, displaying an orientation to those elements of the participant's statement that were responded to in the reflection.

Discussion and Conclusion

In this pilot study, we investigated how TD/M reflections are used and how participants respond to their use in a steering committee meeting led by a trained TD/M facilitator. We analyzed how participants' constructions of their turns were tied to whether the facilitator reflected the turn or not and showed how interactional techniques used by the participants contributed to the impression of clarity or uncertainty.

We found that the facilitator used reflection techniques we refer to as mirroring, substituting, and omitting. Mirroring is repeating all or part of a participant's action in the reflection; it can convey the emotional valence or level of certainty expressed in the participant's statement. The facilitator may also omit parts of the original statement from the reflection. The omission may have been used frequently in the data because the participants' statements tended to be quite lengthy. In transformative dialogues or mediations where utterances tend to be shorter, it may be that the omission technique is used less frequently; that is a topic for further research.

Substitution involves repeating a key concept or element of the participant's statement using closely related words rather than the same words the participant used or summarizing the gist of a longer statement. While such rephrasing can alter the meaning of what is being reported (Atkinson and Drew 1979; Hutchby 2005; Barnes 2007), in the data, the substitutions worked to reduce the length of the reflection without introducing inaccuracy (as evidenced by the participant's agreement with the reflection). That differs markedly from how facilitative mediators sometimes use significant paraphrasing or interpretation of what was said with the main

goal of facilitative mediation being to get parties to agreement.

While the mirroring technique is specifically identified in transformative theory, substituting and omitting are not, and, to some extent, they contradict the goals of the approach. Further research should investigate whether their use extends to larger data sets and if so, whether they enhance or work against the effectiveness of the transformative approach to facilitation.

One goal of this paper was to discover whether reflection is used as described in the theoretical literature. We found that, in at least one instance, the facilitator reflected both strength and weakness in a participant's statements, which is a potential area of contrast with the transformative theory reviewed at the beginning of this paper. According to the theory, weaknesses or self-absorption should motivate reflections rather than strengths. Further research should explore whether reflecting strength as well as weakness is a common practice among TD/M facilitators and whether it is more or less effective than simply reflecting weakness.

We found that the participants in this pilot study produced what we call a reflection-response sequence. The sequence begins with the participant's turn and the facilitator's reflection of it and typically ends with the participant's agreement with the reflection. In 2 of the 13 reflections in the data, the participant repaired the reflection instead of agreeing with it. A participant's repair of a reflection may be followed by the facilitator's reflection of that repair move (the "second" reflection). Further research on the reflection-response sequence can lead to assessments of the effectiveness of different reflection techniques and evaluations of their accura-

cy and show how the sequence impacts the ongoing interaction and potential outcomes of the dialogue or mediation. In TD/M interventions, if a participant repairs a reflection rather than agreeing with it, it may mean the reflection was incomplete or inaccurate in some way. However, regardless of whether the reflection was accurate or not, transformative theory posits it helps the participant clarify their thoughts. Follow-up studies on a larger data set should examine the impact of both accurate and inaccurate reflections on participants and the subsequent interaction during the dialogue or mediation. In his study of client resistance in psychotherapy sessions, Peter Muntigl (2013) investigated how sequences (therapist's question, client's response, therapist's response to the client) worked to manage instances of client resistance and how the way those sequences unfolded impacted the trajectory of the talk in the session. Future research on TD/M reflections should explore how the reflection-response sequence unfolds and how that affects the trajectory of the rest of the dialogue or mediation that follows the completion of the sequence.

In terms of the application of conversation analytic theory, Pillet-Shore's (2016) study of parent-teacher conferences found a preference organization in the types of responses parents and teachers produced when discussing the student's work. Further research on the use of reflection-response sequences in mediations or dialogues facilitated with TD/M should be conducted to determine whether there is a preference for agreement after a reflection.

Further research should examine the use of TD/M reflection in a larger data set of meetings facilitated by several different facilitators. While this pilot study found that disagreement or repair of a reflection is rare (in our data set it occurred in 2 of 13 instances of reflection), a larger data set would allow for the study of more reflection-response sequences to investigate whether the second reflection is a common response to disagreement with a reflection.

Finally, a comparison of the TD/M reflection technique with related interventions used in facilitative mediation (e.g., paraphrasing) should be conducted. Such a comparison should examine how TD/M reflections may differ in their impact on participants and the subsequent course of the interaction when compared to paraphrasing and related techniques used in facilitative mediation.

In sum, the more we learn about how TD/M techniques such as reflection are practiced and responded to, the better practitioners can facilitate constructive conversations around conflict, whether in the context of meetings, mediation sessions, community dialogues about racial justice, or interactions about other social or political issues. TD/M techniques are designed to facilitate conversations between people on difficult and challenging topics. We need to understand how those techniques work and how they impact the interaction between participants to best help people engage in difficult conversations constructively. In a time of intense political polarization, not just in the United States but around the globe, that has potential applicability and interest far beyond those who study mediation and alternative dispute resolution.

Acknowledgments

References

Antes, James R., Joseph P. Folger, and Dorothy J. Della Noce. 2000. "Transforming Conflict Interactions in the Workplace: Documented Effects of the USPS Redress Program." *Hofstra Labor and Employment Law Journal* 18(2):429-468.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell and Paul Drew. 1979. *Order in Court: The Organisation of Verbal Interaction in Judicial Settings*. London: Macmillan Press.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell and John Heritage, eds. 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnes, Rebecca. 2007. "Formulations and the Facilitation of Common Agreement in Meetings Talk." *Text & Talk* 27(3):273-296.

Bishop, Peter et al. 2015. *The Art and Practice of Mediation*. Toronto: Emond Montgomery Publications.

Bolden, Galina B., Jenny Mandelbaum, and Sue Wilkinson. 2012. "Pursing a Response by Repairing an Indexical Reference." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 45(2):137-155.

Boulle, Laurence J., Michael T. Colatrella Jr., and Anthony P. Picchioni. 2008. *Mediation: Skills and Techniques*. Newark, NJ: Lexis Nexis.

Bush, Robert A. Baruch. 2013. "Mediation Skills and Client-Centered Lawyering: A New View of the Partnership." *Clinical Law Review* 19:429-488.

Bush, Robert A. Baruch and Joseph P. Folger. 1994. *The Promise of Mediation: Responding to Conflict through Empowerment and Recognition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bush, Robert A. Baruch and Joseph P. Folger. 2005. *The Promise of Mediation: The Transformative Approach to Conflict*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bush, Robert A. Baruch and Joseph P. Folger. 2010. "Transformative Mediation: Core Practices in Transformative Mediation." Pp. 31-50 in *Resources for Conflict Intervention Practitioners and Programs*, edited by J. P. Folger, R. A. B. Bush, and D. J. Della Noce. The Hague: Association for Conflict Resolution and Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation.

Bush, Robert A. Baruch and Sally Ganong Pope. 2002. "Changing the Quality of Conflict Interaction: The Principles and Practice of Transformative Mediation." *Pepperdine Dispute Resolution Law Journal* 3:67-96.

Cannon, Caitlyn et al. 2020. "A Conversation Analysis of Asking about Disruptions in Method of Levels Psychotherapy." *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research* 20(1):154-163.

Cleven, Erik and Judith A. Saul. 2021. "Realizing the Promise of Dialogue: Transformative Dialogue in Divided Communities." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 38(3):111-125.

Cleven, Erik, Robert A. Baruch Bush, and Judith A. Saul. 2018. "Living with No: Political Polarization and Transformative Dialogue Virtual Symposium." *Journal of Dispute Resolution* 2018(1):53-64.

Corsby, Charles L. T. and Robyn L. Jones. 2020. "Complicity, Performance, and the 'Doing' of Sports Coaching: An Ethnomethodological Study of Work." *Sociological Review* 68(3):590-605.

Della Noce, Dorothy J. 1999. "Seeing Theory in Practice: An Analysis of Empathy in Mediation." *Negotiation Journal* 15(3):271-301.

Della Noce, Dorothy J. 2002. "Ideologically Based Patterns in the Discourse of Mediators: A Comparison of Problem-Solving and Transformative Practices." Ph.D. Dissertation, Temple University.

Drew, Paul and John Heritage, eds. 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Folger, Joseph P. 2020. "Conflict Analysis and Conflict Intervention: Do Theoretical Understandings of Conflict Shape Conflict Intervention Approaches?" Pp. 74-86 in *Comparative Dispute Resolution: Research Handbooks in Comparative Law*, edited by M. F. Moscati, M. J. E. Palmer, and M. Roberts. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox, and Sandra A. Thompson. 2002. "Constituency and the Grammar of Turn Increments." Pp. 14-38 in *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, edited by C. E. Ford, B. A. Fox, and S. A. Thompson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frenkel, Douglas N. and James A. Stark. 2012. *The Practice of Mediation: A Video-Integrated Text, Second Edition*. New York: Wolters Kluwer Law & Business.

Garcia, Angela Cora. 2019. *How Mediation Works: Resolving Conflict through Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garcia, Angela Cora. 2022. "Suicide Announcement Calls to Emergency Services: The Interactional Context for Emotion Work in Call Taker's Efforts to Help the Caller." Paper presented at the *Eastern Sociological Society* annual meetings, March 10, 2022 (Boston, March 10-13, 2022).

Garcia, Angela Cora. 2024. "Embodied Action in Remote Online Interaction. A Preliminary Investigation of Hand Raising Gestures in a Zoom Meeting." *Language and Dialogue* 14(1):3-32.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Garfinkel, Harold, ed. 1986. *Ethnomethodological Studies of Work*. London, New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gibson, David R. 2022. "Minutes of History: Talk and Its Written Incarnations." *Social Science History* 46(3):643-669.

Goldberg, Steven B. et al. 2017. *How Mediation Works: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.

Goodwin, Charles. 1984. "Notes on Story Structure and the Organization of Participation." Pp. 225-246 in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greatbatch, David and Robert Dingwall. 1989. "Selective Facilitation: Some Preliminary Observations on a Strategy Used by Divorce Mediators." *Law & Society Review* 23(4):613-641.

Heisterkamp, Brian L. 2006. "Conversational Displays of Mediator Neutrality in a Court Based Program." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(2006):2051-2064.

Hepburn, Alexa and Galina B. Bolden. 2017. *Transcribing for Social Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, John and D. Rod Watson. 1979. "Formulations as Conversational Objects." Pp. 123-162 in *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, edited by G. Psathas. New York: Irvington Press.

Heritage, John and D. Rod Watson. 1980. "Aspects of the Properties of Formulations in Natural Conversations: Some Instances Analysed." *Semiotica* 30(3/4):245-262.

Humă, Bogdana and Elizabeth Stokoe. 2023. "Resistance in Business-to-Business 'Cold' Sales Calls." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 42(5-6):630-652.

Humă, Bogdana, Elizabeth Stokoe, and Rein Ove Sikveland. 2019. "Persuasive Conduct: Alignment and Resistance in Prospecting 'Cold' Calls." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 38(1):33-60.

Hutchby, Ian. 2005. "'Active Listening': Formulations and the Elicitation of Feelings-Talk in Child Counseling." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38(3):303-329.

Jacobs, Scott. 2002. "Maintaining Neutrality in Dispute Mediation: Managing Disagreement while Managing Not to Disagree." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(2002):1403-1426.

Jefferson, Gail. 1974. "Error Correction as an Interactional Resource." *Language in Society* 13(2):181-199.

Jefferson, Gail. 1979. "A Technique for Inviting Laughter and Its Subsequent Acceptance Declination." Pp. 79-96 in *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, edited by G. Psathas. New York: Irvington Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984a. "On Stepwise Transition from Talk about a Trouble to Inappropriately Next-Positioned Matters." Pp. 191-222 in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984b. "Notes on a Systematic Deployment of the Acknowledgment Tokens 'Yeah' and 'Umhm.'" *Papers in Linguistics* 17(2):197-216.

Jefferson, Gail. 1987. "On Exposed and Embedded Correction in Conversation." Pp. 86-100 in *Talk and Social Organisation*, edited by G. Button and J. R. E. Lee. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. "Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction." Pp. 13-31 in *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, edited by G. H. Lerner. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lerner, Gene H. 2004. "On the Place of Linguistic Resources in the Organization of Talk-in-Interaction: Grammar as Action in Prompting a Speaker to Elaborate." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 37:154-184.

Lynch, Michael. 1991. "Laboratory Space and the Technological Complex: An Investigation of Topical Contextures." *Science in Context* 4:51-78.

Maxwell, Madeline M. and Matthew Bruce Ingram. 2022. "How Mediators Use Reformulation Practices to De-Escalate Risky Moments." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 39(3):221-243.

Moore, Christopher W. 1996. *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict*. San Francisco. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Muntigl, Peter. 2013. "Resistance in Couples Counselling: Sequences of Talk That Disrupt Progressivity and Promote Disaffiliation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 49(2013):18-37.

Muntigl, Peter and Adam O. Horvath. 2014. "The Therapeutic Relationship in Action: How Therapists and Clients Co-Manage Relational Disaffiliation." *Psychotherapy Research* 24(3):327-245.

Pillet-Shore, Danielle. 2016. "Criticizing Another's Child: How Teachers Evaluate Students During Parent-Teacher Conferences." *Language in Society* 45(1):33-58.

Press, Sharon and Ellen E. Deason. 2020. "Mediation: Embedded Assumptions of Whiteness? Jed D. Melnick Annual Symposium: Presumptive ADR and Court Systems of the Future." *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22(3):453-498.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50(4):696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1982. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'Uh Huh' and Other Things That Come between Sentences." Pp. 71-93 in *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981: Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, edited by D. Tannen. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1987. "Recycled Turn Beginnings: A Precise Repair Mechanism in Conversation's Turn-Taking Organisation." Pp. 70-85 in *Talk and Social Organisation*, ed-

ited by G. Button and J. R. E. Lee. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2000. "Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language in Society* 29(1):1-63.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2016. "Increments." Pp. 239-263 in *Accountability in Social Interaction*, edited by J. D. Robinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. and Harvey Sacks. 1973. "Opening Up Closings." *Semiotica* 8:289-327.

Seaman, Roger. 2016. *Explorative Mediation at Work: The Importance of Dialogue for Mediation Practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simon, Dan and Tara West. 2022. *Self-Determination in Mediation: The Art and Science of Mirrors and Lights*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Wieder, Lawrence D. 1974. *Language and Social Reality*. The Netherlands: Mouton.

Winslade, John and Gerald Monk. 2000. *Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Woolford, Andrew J. and Robert Ratner. 2008. *Informal Reckonings: Conflict Resolution in Mediation, Restorative Justice, and Reparations*. Abingdon: Routledge-Cavendish.

Zimmerman, Don H. 1969. "Record-Keeping and the Intake Process in a Public Welfare Agency." Pp. 319-354 in *On Record: Files and Dossiers in American Life*, edited by S. Wheeler. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Citation