

Combining analytical tools to inform practice in school-based professional experience

Authors:

Jess Harris, Maryanne Theobald & Jayne Keogh

Abstract:

While always an interdisciplinary endeavour, rapid growth in the fields of Ethnomethodology (hereafter EM) and Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA) has led to the broader application of EM/CA methodologies and the engagement of researchers from beyond the more traditional fields of sociology and linguistics. EM/CA methodologies are being used to both understand the orderliness of social interaction and also to address specific institutional issues, in this instance in higher education settings. This paper explores the challenges inherent in using these approaches to researching institutional relationships, particularly when a primary aim of the research is to inform practitioners of practices used within institutional settings. We argue the need to draw on a variety of analytical tools to understand *in situ* practices alongside other lenses to translate these understandings of institutional practice to practitioners. Drawing on data from a study of audio-recorded conversations between supervisory and preservice teachers during the school-based professional experience component of initial teacher education, our analysis illustrates how the tools of conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis reveal the intricacies of how supervising and preservice teachers negotiate issues of asymmetry and position themselves through references to specific institutional documents. We then use the work of Dorothy Smith to support the translatability of descriptive findings to support interventions in the field. We use this example to demonstrate the affordances of using various analytic tools in complementary ways to overcome methodological challenges and provide new insights into institutional relationships and inform future practice.

Keywords: Qualitative research methodologies; Conversation analysis; Membership Categorisation Analysis; Dorothy Smith; School-based professional experience; Education

Introduction

Conversation analysis (hereafter CA) has always been an interdisciplinary endeavour. One aspect of its continuing development and the growth of the method has been to expand its reach beyond 'mundane talk' to engage researchers from beyond the more traditional fields of sociology and linguistics (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). Emerging from the problematisation of traditional approaches to sociological research represented by Garfinkel's work in ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967), developments have included the application of conversation analytic methods to build new understandings of social, linguistic, and institutional practices, including through *interventionist applied* studies, wherein CA is used to illuminate and propose changes to overcome practical interactional issues (Antaki, 2011).

In his description of six kinds of applied conversation analysis, Antaki (2011) draws a parallel between interventionist applied CA with applied physics. In so doing, he states that CA as theory "is used to make sense of a practical problem, which is not actually part of its intellectual framework, with no guarantee of theoretical return" (Antaki, 2011, p. 8). This analogy makes a clear distinction between the practical goals for research held by the institution and the motives of the conversation analyst. When engaged in applied interventionist CA research, institutions receive practical recommendations to solve their interactional problems. The conversation analyst, on the other hand, has no guarantees of having completed academic research and is described as simply being able to "depart the scene having done some good in a practical way, having added to her stock of data, and having refined her theories accordingly" (Antaki, 2011, p. 9). We argue, however, that distinctions between the institutional and researcher goals of many applied interventionist CA studies are far from definite. Building on Antaki's analogy, the goals of fundamental disciplines of science and their applied counterparts are not always mutually exclusive. Rather, the relationship between applied and theoretical approaches in science can be described as having a "complicated and tangled history" (Suppes, 1974, p. 9). Similarly, the emergence of CA programs of research within a range of fields can blur the lines between traditional CA research and institutional research using theories and methods of CA, such as interventionist applied CA (Antaki, 2011).

Despite developments in the use of CA, the continuing evolution and development of applied CA studies in institutional settings have not always been initiated with the intention of solving specific practical problems. Neither have these studies always aimed with the sole focus of

exploring and uncovering structures of interaction in these settings. However, a number of CA studies in institutional settings have been designed with a dual-aim of identifying patterns of talk-in-interaction *and* to inform practitioners' improvements in practice. The combination of these approaches can "interact and mutually enrich each other" (Suppes, 1974, p.9) and develop rich understandings of social interactions within specific settings that can, in turn, help to solve practical problems therein.

Using data from a study that investigated audio-recorded conversations between preservice teachers and their supervisors during in-school professional experience, this paper explores the use of complementary methods to research institutional relationships and translate findings in ways that inform practitioners and change practice. First, we detail the moves within the program of CA that have aimed to understand *in situ* institutional practices. We then present an analysis demonstrating how the work of Dorothy Smith can be used to build on the findings of conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis (MCA) to both support new understandings of how supervising and preservice teachers negotiate issues of asymmetry and to translate findings from descriptive micro-analysis for practitioners. We argue that the "horizontal" and "vertical" additions (Tellings, 2011, pp.12-13) of these various analytic tools can overcome methodological challenges in order to provide clear new insights into these critical institutional relationships in ways that inform both method and practice.

Moves toward applied CA studies within CA programs of research

While a fundamental focus on uncovering order at all points (Sacks, 1984) has been retained, CA has developed further as applied CA in at least four significant ways. First, the interrogation of singular sequences of conversation has expanded, particularly in the 'West Coast program' of CA research (Reynolds, 2013). While single case analyses are still well-represented in studies using CA and related methods, collections of data are frequently used to analyse particular social practices across a range of settings. Moves away from single case studies to strategies of analysing collections of data have been similarly proposed for Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) (Stokoe, 2012). One aim of this shift has been to provide understandings of interactional practices that might be evident in a more general way.

A second move has been the recognition that the methods of CA and MCA, while emerging independently (Sacks, 1992), can be employed in complementary ways to reveal the ways in which speakers co-construct and normalize particular versions of their shared (institutional) worlds. The combination of these two methods can be considered a "horizontal addition"

(Tellings, 2011, p. 12) as each of the approaches allows a researcher to analyse a different aspect of the same data. Benefits of the horizontal addition of approaches are clearly illustrated by Reynolds (2013) in his demonstration of the ways in which CA can uncover *how* interactional practices are enacted while MCA can examine the *social actions* that such practices enact. The complementary use of CA and MCA supports researchers to understand patterns of social interaction and also identify “cultural knowledge and logic *in use*” (Baker, 1997, p.103). In addition, CA researchers have used a variety of approaches, including but not limited to Foucauldian analysis (e.g. Silverman, 1997) and linguistic ethnography (e.g. Copland, 2010), alongside and in complement to the tools of CA. By bringing new perspectives to the data, these horizontal additions hold the potential to promote new findings and deepen our understanding of the affordances and limitations of CA and MCA.

A third significant move in CA methods has been its application to analysing talk in institutional settings. Sacks’ original work analysing calls to a suicide prevention centre (Sacks, 1966) can be said to be one of the earliest instance of CA examining talk in an institutional setting. Since then, the application of CA methods to institutional settings has expanded to include, for instance, talk in classrooms (Gardner, 2013; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979), amongst others (see Drew & Heritage, 1992). Studies of talk in institutional settings have challenged a number of traditional tenets of CA, including the distinction between analyses of the sequential and categorial structures of talk. Despite a somewhat contentious relationship between CA and MCA, Hester and Francis (2001) argued that the categorial roles and responsibilities of speakers are particularly important in the analysis of institutional talk. They further posit that research with an exclusive focus on sequential structures in institutional talk will “‘miss the phenomenon’ they seek to explicate” (Hester & Francis, 2001, p. 215). Indeed, the ‘horizontal addition’ or “*rapprochement*” (Hester & Francis, 2001, p. 208) of methods can develop a greater understanding of the sequential structures, power, and responsibilities within institutional talk by capitalising on the methodological strengths of both CA and MCA.

The fourth move of CA research has been to develop applications for its findings. The application of the detailed knowledge of CA has developed alongside the method in a range of ways (see Antaki, 2011). The application that forms the focus of this paper is *interventionist applied CA*, in which CA is used with the aim of overcoming practical interactional problems. Interventionist applied CA has gained substantial traction over the past decade (e.g., Lamerichs & te Molder, 2011; Stokoe, 2011, 2014; Wilkinson, 2014). The methodological benefits of CA and MCA are recognised beyond their traditional fields of sociology and linguistics to provide

'insider' knowledge of talk at work, across disciplines and for practitioners in a broad range of fields.

Insider knowledge in talk at work

Within ethnomethodological studies, being members of the disciplinary research settings and thus having 'insider' knowledge, has a long tradition. This expansion has become known as "the 'work studies' turn" (Quéré, 2012, p.305) and differs from traditional sociological research that relied on members' accounts to make sense of what was going on in the research setting. Arminen argues that, in studies of institutional talk, researchers' knowledge of institutional practices "may allow a more fine-grained account of the institutional practice, which would not be gained without a reference to a wider context, or to some background knowledge" (2000, p. 44). Garfinkel (unpublished manuscript cited in Wakefield, 2000, p. 48) also described the importance of an ethnomethodological researcher being

A competent practitioner of the science, the profession, the occupation, the work, the job, the skill, the discipline that [she] seeks to bring under examination

When researching talk in mundane settings, CA researchers draw on their own knowledge as 'competent practitioners' of similar sites of everyday talk. Wakefield reports Garfinkel's claim that having this type of 'inside knowledge' of the setting under examination "puts the investigator in a 'uniquely adequate' position to impart knowledge or give an account of what is going on in the field" (2000; p. 49). The concept of 'unique adequacy', in other words, suggests that researchers need to hold sufficient understanding of the setting in order to recognise and make sense of what is 'ordinary' therein, particularly within institutional contexts (Wakefield, 2000). Researchers can draw on their members' knowledge in their analyses and descriptions of events as sensible and routine actions within the setting, thereby demonstrating the reliability of their analyses (Iszatt-White, 2011). Research that is deeply embedded in practice contributes to the cumulative understanding of social interaction by developing deep understandings of talk-in-interaction in specific institutional settings that are related to the specific disciplinary areas of the academy in which conversation analysts are situated, such as speech pathology, health, and education,

Education using ethnomethodologically informed CA has enjoyed a long history of studies involving insider knowledge of institutions, with a variety of topics covered including for example,

classroom talk (e.g., Danby & Baker, 1998; McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Houen, Danby, Farrell & Thorpe 2016); parent-teacher talk (Silverman, Baker & Keogh, 1998); playground interaction (e.g., Evaldsson & Svahn, 2012; Theobald & Danby, 2017); and university lectures and tutorials (e.g., Benwell & Stokoe, 2002; Tyagnova & Greiffenhagen, 2017). These studies have identified (in)effective structures and patterns of interaction and offered descriptions of the interactions that practitioners have produced in the course of their institutional practices. As Houen et al. (2016) and Waring (2013) caution, the descriptions of specific strategies are not intended to provide direct prescriptions (Richards, 2005) of practice. Rather they offer illustrations of broader strategies. While these provide opportunities for reflection on what is possible in talk which may be useful for specific contexts, such as those with highly structured forms of institutional talk, they can, however, be difficult for practitioners to apply more generally. The problem of translating these findings from specific interactional contexts to their possible applications remains.

With academic researchers facing increased pressures to meet external expectations and make impact within their disciplinary areas (Morley, 2003; Taylor, 2001), a key methodological problem for conversation analysts working in the field of education, in particular, is the matter of how to make the findings of CA and MCA studies translatable to educational practice. Rather than engaging in a study of an institutional setting to illuminate the workings of institutions (Antaki, 2011), there is a need for interventionist studies that are developed *for* the institutions being examined. Thus, the goal of many CA researchers, and those in related fields of MCA and DP, is to develop a deeper understanding of the institutional practices and, equally importantly, to translate these understandings in practical ways that, ideally, have measurable effects on the field (e.g. Lamerichs & te Molder, 2011; Stokoe, Hepburn, & Antaki, 2012; Wilkinson, 2014).

In order to have a wider impact of studies of talk-in-interaction, the discoveries made *in situ* need to be translatable in ways that can be adapted for practical use. We argue that the “vertical addition” (Tellings, 2011, p.13), or addition of a different model of research can be useful to support the translation phase of CA and MCA research for education practitioners. Unlike the ‘horizontal addition’ of approaches, which describes the use of different lenses or tools to explore the same phenomenon, ‘vertical addition’ describes the use of additional theories or methods at different phases of the development of a process or idea. In this paper, we argue that the tools of CA and MCA can reveal the intricacies of how supervising and preservice teachers co-construct their relationships *in situ*. The vertical addition of other methods, in this case Smith’s (1990, 2005) feminist sociology, can then build on the results of this research to

develop theories that can translate findings in ways that can further inform and improve practice in educational settings. Like ethnomethodology, Smith's approach begins with local, everyday practices. Her approach, however, then looks more broadly to examine the institutional practices, policies, and norms that shape this everyday work.

Description of the data

This paper originates from a study of a series of professional development seminars (six in total) for new and experienced supervising teachers (hereafter referred to as STs) who would be undertaking the supervision of preservice teachers (hereafter referred to as PTs) during school-based professional experience at an Australian independent girls' school. Participating STs were asked to record interactions with their PTs during supervision meetings. These audio-recordings were transcribed according to Jeffersonian transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004) and subsequently analysed to provide insight into the ways that supervising and preservice teachers engage in reflection (**Authors – removed for blind review**) and deliver feedback (**Authors – removed for blind review**). While acknowledging the importance of analysing social interaction and identifying patterns of talk in this critical element of preservice teacher education, this research was designed as a study *for* teacher education using CA methods, rather than a CA study *of* teacher education.

Analysis

For the purposes of this paper, ST/PT interactions are viewed as examples of institutional talk-in-interaction that work to legitimise, naturalise and normalise particular ways of interacting (Schegloff, 1987; 1991). The role of supervising preservice teachers during their in-school professional experience is recognised within the literature as being complex and multi-faceted. STs must negotiate the competing demands of acting as observer, trainer, mentor, and evaluator of PTs in practice (Copland, 2010). Despite this complexity, much of the current research relies on self-reports from supervising teachers, who tend to present idealised descriptions that differ from practices observed *in situ* (Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005). Cohen, Hoz & Kaplan (2013) conducted a systematic literature review of 1113 empirical studies of practicum of preservice teacher education between 1996-2009. They found that, of the 260 data collection tools used in the studies, document analysis and interviews were most commonly. Observational research methods were one of the least common, with only 28 studies of 1113 using observations of actual practice.

This study adds to the limited number of observational research on reflection and feedback in initial teacher education training. Copland (2010), for example, has examined the relationships and potential tensions that can arise due to the difference in expectations by mentors and mentees in feedback sessions. Copland & Mann (2010) further observed that PTs can be resistant to feedback processes and a dialogic approach can help them to develop reflective skills and analytical skills about their own practice. These studies, however, involve groups of PTs, who are encouraged to give peer feedback post-observation, rather than a dyadic relationship between ST and PT.

In this paper, we provide insights of one particular ST/PT conversation wherein a ST provides observational and evaluative feedback of the PT's classroom practices. We do not intend to provide a full analysis. Rather, this paper offers illustrations of our findings using CA and MCA (horizontal addition), followed by the 'vertical addition' (Tellings, 2011) using the work of Dorothy Smith to provide a supplementary lens that enriches our understandings of ST/PT talk and supports the translation of research findings to inform practitioners. We argue, however, that using these particular methods in combination not only supports our analysis of features within the conversation, it also allows us to translate findings into theory to inform and improve practice. The analytic discussion that follows focuses on three key findings that include 1) the interactive achievement of asymmetry, 2) production of membership categories, and 3) managing the complex ST role.

One extract from early in a supervisory meeting, which involves discussion on the preservice teachers' classroom practice, is presented here in full and various parts will be referred to in the analysis that follows.

Extract

21. ST: That's right ye:s (.) so (.) what I wanted to ask
22. you was actually to do with behaviour management and
23. tha(h)t [wa::s] (.) in that kind of situation how do=
24. PT: [Yes]
25. ST: =think perhaps you could work with the gi::rls(.)
26. especially who are sitting (.) on the ri::ght,
27. PT: Yep
28. ST: u:m in trying to get them to stay focused with you
29. because they had their [back turned]
30. PT: [Yeah I found] that and

31. that's something that I no:ted down as well (.) um
32. when I was doing my reflection:ns,
33. ST: Mm mm
34. PT: but (.) I thought (.) what I would do diffrentl::y,
35. is rather than just saying eyes to me: actually get
36. them to switch their chai:r, (.) [u:m] [(coughs)]=
37. ST: [Yes]
.
.
.
53. ST: other than that (.) -that's
54. probably the o::ne thing I've notT::ced and on
55. your sheet here you can see where I've (.)
56. basically (.) I mean you're doing really really
57. we:ll .hh
58. PT: °>Okay<°
59. ST: um ju:st wT:th the:se getting the girls' attentT:ons
60. maintain- atten [tion] >maintaining it< ,hh tho:se
61. [are]=
62. PT: [Yeah]
63. ST: =the areas that you've sti:ll gotta work on because
64. a couple of the gi:rls know that you're a prac
65. teacher
66. PT: [Yeah]
67. ST: [Oka:y] and so they (.) do::n't switch on as much as
68. they would perhaps if I'm [stand]ing there
69. PT: [Yeah]
70. ST: growling at them, or you know whatever it is so
71. . hhh tha:t's >probably and I< -think I've spoken to
72. you about that before as well that's probably the
73. o::ne thing that just the one area there and I
74. noticed that as well today um .tch °ah what else
75. have I #written# here° umm mm mm .tch oka:y o::h (.)
76. I loved the wa::y you pa:ced out >the video< that
77. was (.) [excellent]

Uncovering the interactive achievement of asymmetrical relations

Using CA to examine this example of ST/PT talk uncovered sequential structures within the interaction. In particular, the sequential analysis illustrated the ways in which the ST and PT worked to collaboratively co-construct asymmetrical talk (Maynard 1991; ten Have, 1991). Waring (2013) argues that asymmetry is inherent in the institutional roles of PT and ST. However, like Copland and Mann (2010), Waring (2013) argues that this asymmetry, particularly the assessment or advice provided by STs, can provide opportunities for PTs to initiate reflection on their own practice.

A key feature of the talk, which served to construct this asymmetry, was the ST directing the interaction through the introduction of topics and initiation of topic transition. In lines 21-23, for example, ST introduces the topic of the talk as that of behaviour management in a move that sets the agenda for the talk that follows.

- 21.ST: That's right ye:s (.) so (.) what I wanted to ask
22. you was actually to do with behaviour management and
23. tha(h)t [wa::s] (.) in that kind of situation how do=

ST continues to to direct the conversation, by maintaining the floor for extended turns that include multiple turn construction units. Her ability to lead the talk continues during the meeting, where she further directs the talk by initiating topic transitions, as illustrated in lines 53-57:

- 53.ST: other than that (.) -that's
54. probably the o::ne thing I've notT::ced and on
55. your sheet here you can see where I:'ve (.)
56. basically (.) I mean you're doing really really
57. we:ll .hh

In her extended turn, between lines 53 and line 57, the ST draws the PT's attention to the 'sheet', with her incomplete statement "on your sheet you can see where I have basically..." (lines 55 and 56). This statement makes reference to a document, which she describes as the "feedback sheet" earlier in this interaction (not shown in extract). The document in question is a pro forma produced by the university that the PT attends that requires the ST to note feedback

on the PTs classroom performance. By making reference to this document, the ST moves the talk away from the previous topic, which has focused on the PT's classroom management skills, and towards a positive assessment of the PT's overall teacherly practices. The ST uses this reference to the document to move to the new topic, further demonstrating the asymmetrical relations in this institutional talk-in-interaction.

That the PT also interactively collaborates with the production of an asymmetrical institutional relationship with ST is further evidenced by her minimal responses to ST's assessment of her practices as, for example, in lines 66 and 69:

- 66.PT: [Yeah]
- 67.ST: [Oka:y] and so they (.) do::n't switch on as much as
68. they would perhaps if I'm [stand]ing there
- 69.PT: [Yeah]
- 70.ST: growling at them, or you know whatever it is so
71. .hhh tha:t's >probably and I< -think I've spoken to
72. you about that before as well that's probably the
73. o::ne thing that just the one area there and I
74. noticed that as well today um .tch °ah what else
75. have I #written# here° umm mm mm .tch oka:y o::h (.)
76. I loved the wa::y you pa:ced out >the video< that
77. was (.) [excellent]

Analysis of the other ST/PT interviews included within our data collection has shown that this type of interactional asymmetry is routinely produced and reproduced in the feedback interactions between the STs and PTs in our data. Furthermore, there are no examples of PTs challenging STs' initiation of topic shifts or their rights to the conversational floor evidenced in any of our data.

In can here be noted that our findings are in keeping with Drew and Heritage's findings regarding many forms of institutional conversations, when they stated that

Interactions may be characterized by role-structured, institutionalized, and omnirelevant asymmetries between participants in terms of such matters as differential distribution of

knowledge, rights to knowledge, access to conversational resources and to participation in the interaction (Drew & Heritage 1992, p.49).

So it is that the ways in which the STs set the agenda for the talk that follows, initiate changes of topics, and take the longer turns, in addition to the more minimal and compliant PT responses to STs' evaluative feedback regarding their practices, and their shorter turns at talk vividly evidenced across our data demonstrate that such relationships are routinely talked into being as fundamentally asymmetrical.

Identifying the production of membership categories

The next section draws on MCA to illustrate a key finding of our analysis of the categorial work produced by participants in this interaction. In response to feedback by the ST on behaviour management problems in her teaching, the PT works to produce herself as belonging to the membership category of a 'competent preservice teacher', who can engage in reflective practice and independently identify potential issues in her classroom practice, as lines 25-33 show:

25.ST: =think perhaps you could work with the gi::rls(.)
26. especially who are sitting (.) on the ri::ght,
27.PT: Yep
28.ST: u:m in trying to get them to stay focused with you
29. because they had their [back turned]
30.P: [Yeah I found] that and
31. that's something that I no:ted down as well (.) um
32. when I was doing my reflection:ns,
33.ST: Mm mm

By asking a question about the behaviour management issue, the ST is giving the PT an opportunity to demonstrate her competence in reflecting on her professional practice and proposing alternative approaches. By prefacing her response with "yeah I found that" (line 26) and "that's something that I noted down as well when I was doing my reflections" (lines 27-28), the PT refers to a document (reflective notes) as evidence to claim her professional competence. The ST here draws on a standardised relational pair (SRP) or collection K, that the participants interactively produced by them through reference to a special distribution of their relative institutional knowledge (Sacks, 1972). Collection K is "a collection constructed by reference to special distributions of knowledge ... that allows [this ST] to offer dispassionate 'advice'" (Silverman, 1998, p.82). Part of the work involved in presenting herself within the

membership category as “competent teacher” is indicating a knowledge plus (K+) position (Heritage, 2012). The PT’s K+ claim is supported by her reference to her reflections, which provide evidence that she had held this knowledge prior to it being conveyed by her supervisor. Drew (2006) has argued that speakers often refer to documents when they are managing potentially problematic information. In making reference to her reflective journal (line 28), the PT negotiates the delicate situation of receiving critical feedback by demonstrating her own prior recognition of the practices being described, indicating that she noticed the issue “as well” (line 27). This action draws the ST’s attention to the PT’s competency as a reflective practitioner.

In lines 30-32 and 34-37, the PT reflects on alternative approaches to managing the issue of girls who are not focused. The PT further constructs herself as a competent teacher by articulating what she would do to improve her teaching strategies in her next lesson, in lines 34-37:

34.PT: but (.) I thought (.) what I would do diffrentl::y,
35. is rather than just saying eyes to me: actually get
36. them to switch their chai:r, (.) [u:m] [(coughs)]=
37.ST: [Yes]

The notion of the knowledgeable ST and novice, or less knowledgeable, PT are inherent in their institutional roles. However, the PT indicates that this observation is not new knowledge for her noting, “yeah, I found that and that’s something that I noted down as well” (lines 26-27). As such, the ST/PT talk support a shared K+ position, and the production and reproduction of common-sense and assumed to be shared understandings of what it means to be a member of each of these categories (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). In lines 34 -41, PT states explicitly that she will change her teaching practices by getting the girls to move their chairs and asking them to ensure that they are “facing the front” when she gives instructions. This demonstrates an ability to independently identify the issues that the ST has raised, thereby strengthening a version of herself as a competent teacher. In this way she has rebutts ST’s implied criticism of her teaching practice.

Despite the PT’s claims to competence, this is challenged by the ST in lines 59-66:

59.ST: um ju:st wT:th the:se getting the girls’ attentT:ons
60. maintain- atten [tion] >maintaining it< ,hh tho:se
61. [are]=

- 62.PT: [Yeah]
- 63.ST: =the areas that you've sti:ll gotta work on because
64. a couple of the gT:rls know that you're a prac
65. teacher
- 66.PT: [Yeah]

The ST once again here orients to her K+ position in delivering a form of projected evaluation on the teacherly practices demonstrated by PT during her professional experience, suggesting that the students are also responding to the category-bound activities of a PT who is being evaluated by ST. By only offering minimal responses, the PT does not challenge the ST. The PT's action contributes to the collaborative achievement of asymmetry within the supervisory relationship.

In the previous two sections of this paper, we have provided a detailed analysis of the sequential and categorial orders within this talk that shows how the PT and ST, in this instance, oriented to and collaboratively achieved asymmetrical relationships. In the next section, we will draw on the work of Dorothy Smith as an example of how the vertical addition of another theory can support the translation of findings from descriptive analyses to theories to inform future practice.

Translating descriptions of practice in the complex role of supervision

Dorothy Smith's (1990) work offers a feminist response to the sociology of knowledge. Smith critiques traditional sociology as focusing primarily on the abstract, conceptual world and proposes an alternative, feminist sociology that is grounded in the everyday world. The concept of an alternative sociological approach that is grounded in the everyday, including everyday social relations, resonates closely with ethnomethodology. A primary point of difference is that Smith's feminist sociology of knowledge begins from the standpoint of the everyday but also looks out from beyond these deeply contextualised practices to the broader extralocal "ruling relations" (Smith 2005, p. 58). Often embodied through texts, these 'relations of ruling' represent "that total complex of activities ... by which our kind of society is ruled, managed and administered [and that such management] includes the professions, it includes government and the activities of those who are selecting, training and indoctrinating those who will be its governors" (Smith, 1990, p.14). In other words, the ruling relations sit beyond individual action but often regulate or alter its practice.

Within Smith's feminist sociology of knowledge, a "bifurcation of consciousness" "with the abstracted, conceptual practices on the one hand and the concrete realizations, the maintenance routines, and so forth, on the other" (Smith, 1990, p. 27) is described. Drawing on these tools, we can build on the analysis of this interaction between the PT and ST and use it as an example of everyday, routine social interaction, which is organised by 'relations of ruling' (Smith 1997, 2005). The relations of ruling are particularly evident in the ST and PT's references to documents, specifically the feedback sheet and their own reflections. These documents represent official texts required by the university that organise or structure relations between ST and PT. The CA analysis of these data show that the ST in this interaction makes repeated reference to a feedback sheet, which is a document that is produced by the initial teacher education program at the university that all STs are required to complete throughout the PT's professional experience. This prior analysis, therefore, illustrates that the feedback sheet organises the type of knowledge that is required to be recorded by ST.

The CA study of this talk has identified the ways that the PT and ST have co-constructed an asymmetrical relationship. A feature of this analysis that is highlighted when viewed through the lens provided by the vertical addition of Smith's approach, however, is that the talk is specifically structured through the ST's repeated references to the official document. In lines 54 and 55, for example, ST produces a reference to the document which directs the conversation into a "stepwise topic transition" (Jefferson 1984), within an extended turn.

53.ST: other than that (.) -that's
54. probably the o::ne thing I've notT::ced and on
55. your sheet here you can see where I:'ve (.)
56. basically (.) I mean you're doing really really
57. we:ll .hh

The same strategy can be seen in lines 74-75, where the ST makes reference to the document "what else have I written here" as a preface to a topic transition while maintaining the floor.

67.ST: [Oka:y] and so they (.) do::n't switch on as much as
68. ST they would perhaps if I'm [stand]ing there
69.PT: [Yeah]
70.ST: growling at them, or you know whatever it is so

71. .hhh tha:t's >probably and I< -think I've spoken to
72. you about that before as well that's probably the
73. o::ne thing that just the one area there and I
74. noticed that as well today um .tch °ah what else
75. have I #written# here° umm mm mm .tch oka:y o::h (.)
76. I loved the wa::y you pa:ced out >the video< that
77. was (.) [excellent]

This interactional move, in lines 74 and 75, is illustrative of how the ST references to this document to organise her feedback and structure her interaction with the PT. These types of references to university-generated professional experience evaluation documents were common within our data, positioning PTs not as co-interactants but as an “overhearing audience” to reading of the document (Heritage, 1984). The actual content of the document does not appear to be vital to developing an understanding of what it is that the ST is doing within this local setting. Rather, it seems that it is prioritised as the official record or documentation, substantiating this version of PT's practice. In Smith's terms, the document functions as an “apparatus of ruling” (1990, p. 65) that is used to structure the local work of the ST and PT. Furthermore, by prioritising what is written on the sheet, the ST's role as producer of the text is reduced. In this instance, she is taking on the role as one who is led by the text, thereby minimising her role as PT's assessor.

The ruling relations represented by references to these organisational documents, however, is not the only work achieved within these interactions. As the MCA analysis has shown, substantial interactional work is produced to demonstrate the PT's membership in the competent preservice teacher category. While our brief illustration of the MCA analysis focused on the work accomplished by the PT, the extracts of talk (above) show the ST is producing substantial local work to communicate that the PT is doing well. In lines 56-57, for example, the ST prefaces her report from the feedback document by stating “I mean, you're doing really really well”. Similarly, immediately following her topic transition in lines 74-75, the ST produces a positive, affiliative assessment “I loved the way you paced out the video” (line 76). These positive assessments could be viewed as positioning the PT as a competent preservice teacher, one who is “doing well” and can “pace out videos”. The assessments further suggest that doing affiliative work may be associated with the institutional role of ST.

On the other hand, the ST's positive assessments can also be viewed as doing affiliative work. The ST is offering the PT positive assessments of her professional practice, which the CA analysis has shown routinely precedes evaluations of the PT's practice, or requests for the PT's evaluation of their own practice. We can identify from the sequential organisation STs are using personalised positive assessments, such as "*I mean, you're doing really, really well*" (line 56-57) and "*I loved the way you paced out that video*" (line 76), before doing the potentially delicate interactional work of evaluating PT practice. While we can infer that the ST is supporting the PT by positioning her as a member of the competent preservice teacher and is prefacing official evaluations of practice, as framed by the feedback sheet, with positive assessment, neither the sequential nor categorial analysis gives us insight into why the ST is doing this affiliative work.

While the ST's references to the "feedback sheet" organise the institutional requirements of the relationship, these positive assessments could be used in the management of the local. Smith's theory of the bifurcation of consciousness posits that we do not only need to manage the abstract, conceptual practices of institutional needs, we also need to consider the immediate, everyday world. When we add this perspective to the findings from our CA and MCA analyses, we can see that the immediate and everyday practices, in this case, include relational work between the ST and PT. The ST is positioned not only as an evaluator but also as a mentor and support person for the PT, while they practice their teaching in real classroom settings. As members, we recognise that this affiliative work is conducted to manage the local work of showing care for the PT. The ST is working to build a relationship and manage the PT's feelings by providing reassurance alongside the necessary evaluations and feedback.

The lens provided by Smith's work helps us to show that this is the everyday, local work, which is being produced alongside the institutional/ conceptual work of evaluating the PT's practice. Building on our understanding of the sequential and categorial structures in the talk, this theoretical standpoint supports us in translating for practitioners how the ST is concurrently managing these competing perspectives, as illustrated by analyses of practice but without focusing exclusively on context-specific sequences of talk. Using this lens, we can see that references to the 'feedback sheet' are made not only to identify the 'ruling apparatus' but also to provide a distinction between the local work of constructing a supportive mentoring relationship and the work of the ST as evaluator and teacher.

Discussion and conclusion: moving from description to informing method and practice

In this paper, we argue that the vertical addition of Smith's theory offers a way of translating findings from CA and MCA research on the relationship between the PT and ST to inform the professional practice of preservice and supervising teachers. In the brief illustrations of analysis offered in this paper, we have shown how Smith's work can provide a way of extrapolating from specific instances of practice to broader understandings of the relations and themes at play. The vertical addition of Smith's feminist sociology builds on the findings of our previous research to make the broader themes of institutional order and relations of ruling more explicit for practitioners. The sequential analyses of the PT/ST data from our projects indicated that the ST and PT worked to co-construct an asymmetrical relationship. Furthermore, the ST often used references to an official institutional document to initiate topic transitions and 'direct' the conversation. The analysis of categorial roles and responsibilities further demonstrated that both the PT and ST worked to construct the PT's membership in the category of competent preservice teacher. The ST was also engaged in doing affiliative work, which could be associated with their institutional role of mentor for the PT. These analyses offered an examination of the micro-level order of how the relationships between STs and PTs were co-constructed *in situ*. Nonetheless, when presented to educators at conferences these analyses were received as descriptions of deeply contextualised practice. While teacher educators and teachers who attended presentations of the data expressed interest in seeing the practice, it became clear that further work would be required in order to translate the findings of our research of interactional practices in the professional experience to provide interventional applied research for supervising and preservice teachers. While the CA and MCA approaches allowed a deep exploration of the social actions produced by these STs and PTs, the additional perspective offered by Smith's work provided a way to theorise these findings in ways that could be understood by education practitioners. As Klette (2011) indicates, in order to change practice, we often need to combine different theoretical positions.

A central promise of studies of institutional talk is to examine relational matters to do with "knowledge, power and, authority" from an EM/CA standpoint (Hester & Francis, 2001, p. 208). Like the work of Dorothy Smith, this approach is grounded in the examination of everyday actions. Unlike the CA study of talk in institutional settings, however, Smith's work builds on an understanding of everyday actions to explore broader themes, including institutional order, regulation, and power. As such, a key element of Smith's work is to build on this standpoint by developing theories of action. In the case of the interaction between the ST and PT that we draw on for this paper, the lens provided by Smith's work provides us a tool to extrapolate from

particular instances of the local action in these conversations and develop a theory of how STs can manage the competing roles of mentoring and evaluation in talk by thinking about both the abstract and the local. While CA and MCA methods illuminate the specific methods used by the ST to accomplish this task, adopting the analytic perspective offered by Smith has allowed us to develop broader explanations and guidelines for action that can support the translation of the context-driven analysis into changes of practice for other educators. In other words, while the sequential and categorial analysis might inform practitioners of how this interactional work can be done, the concept of needing to consider both the local, relational work between ST and PT and the institutional requirements of the roles can inform practice.

The horizontal and vertical additions of analytic tools enables us, as researchers, to not only uncover specific structures and patterns within the talk but to also offer some explanation and generalised guidelines for future practice. The process of building on descriptive analyses by creating theories for further testing closely resembles how knowledge is constructed in the natural sciences (Klette, 2011). We argue that there is a need to engage with this process of developing theory to translate our findings, in order to engage in interventional applied CA that addresses the needs of both researchers and practitioners.

References

1. Antaki, Charles (Ed.). (2011). *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. Springer.
2. Atkinson, J. Maxwell & Heritage, John (eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Baker, Carolyn D. (1997). Ticketing rules: Categorization and moral ordering in a school staff meeting. In D. Hester and P. Eglin (eds.). *Culture in action: Studies in membership categorization analysis*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, pp. 77–98.
4. Benwell, Bethan & Stokoe, Elizabeth (2002). Constructing discussion tasks in university tutorials: shifting dynamics and identities. *Discourse Studies*, 4(4), pp. 429-453.
5. Copland, Fiona. Causes of tension in post-observation feedback in pre-service teacher training: An alternative view. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26.3 (2010): 466-472.
6. Copland, Fiona. and Mann, Steve. (2010). Dialogic talk in the post-observation conference: An investment in reflection. In G. Park (Ed). *Observation of teaching: Bridging theory and practice through research on teaching*. Lincom Europa Publishing.

7. Cohen, Esther, Hoz, Ron, and Kaplan, Haya (2013). The practicum in preservice teacher education: a review of empirical studies. *Teaching Education*, 24 (4), 345-380. DOI: 10.1080/10476210.2012.711815
8. Danby, Susan & Baker, Carolyn D. (1998). How to be masculine in the block area. *Childhood*, 5(2), pp. 151-175.
9. Drew, Paul & Heritage, John (1992). "Analyzing talk at work: An introduction". In P. Drew & J. Heritage (eds.). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, UK., Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–65.
10. Evaldsson, Ann-Carita & Svahn, Johanna (2012). School bullying and the micro-politics of girls' gossip disputes. In Susan Danby & Maryanne Theobald (eds.) *Disputes in everyday life: the social and moral orders of children and young people*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, pp. 297-323.
11. Gardner, Rod. "Conversation analysis in the classroom." *The handbook of conversation analysis* (2013): 593-611.
12. Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
13. Heritage, John. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*, Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
14. Heritage, John. (2012). The epistemic engine: Sequence organization and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1): pp. 30–52.
15. Hester, Stephan. & Francis, David (2001). Is institutional talk a phenomenon? Reflections on ethnomethodology and applied conversation analysis. In Alec McHoul & Mark Rapley (eds) *How to analyze talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods*. London & New York: Continuum pp. 206-217.
16. Houen, Sandy, Danby, Susan, Farrell, Ann & Thorpe, Karen (2016). "I wonder what you know...": Teachers designing requests for factual information. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, pp. 68-78.
17. Housley, Will & Fitzgerald, Richard (2002). The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. *Qualitative research*, 2(1), pp. 59-83.
18. Iszatt-White, Marian (2011). Methodological crises and contextual solutions: An ethnomethodologically informed approach to understanding leadership. *Leadership*, 7(2), pp. 119-135.
19. Jayussi, Lena (1984). *Categorization and the moral order*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

20. Jefferson, Gail (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13-31.
21. Klette, Kirsti (2011). The role of Theory in Educational Research. *The role of theory in educational research: Report from the March Seminar 2011*. Report from the Research Council of Norway.
22. Lamerichs, Joyce & te Molder, Hedwig (2011). Reflecting on your own talk: The discursive action method at work. In Charles Antaki (ed.) *Applied Conversation Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 184-206.
23. Maynard, Douglas (1991). Interaction and asymmetry in clinical discourse. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(2), pp. 448-495.
24. McHoul, Alec (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in society*, 7(2), pp. 183-213.
25. Mehan, Hugh (1979). 'What time is it, Denise?': Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice*, 18(4), pp. 285-294.
26. Morley, Louise (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
27. Quéré, Louis (2012). Is there any good reason to say goodbye to "ethnomethodology"? *Human Studies*, 35(2), pp. 305-325.
28. Reynolds, Edward (2013). Enticing a challengeable: Instituting social order as a practice of public conflict. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. School of Journalism and Communication: The University of Queensland.
29. Richards, Keith (2005). Introduction. In Keith Richards & Paul Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying Conversation Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1- 15.
30. Smith, Dorothy (1990). *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. Boston: Northeastern University.
31. Sacks, Harvey (1966). Transcripts of unpublished lectures. *Department of Sociology, University of California, Irvine*.
32. Sacks, Harvey (1984). Notes on methodology. *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 21-27.
33. Sacks, Harvey (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, Vols. 1 & 2 (Abbreviated as LC in the text). Gail Jefferson (Ed.), with an introduction by Emanuel Schegloff. Combined in one paperback vol. 1995.

34. Schegloff, Emanuel (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, pp. 101-114.
35. Schegloff, Emanuel (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J. Levine & S. Teasley. (eds.). *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington, DC.: American Psychological Society, pp. 150, 171.
36. Sidnell, Jack & Stivers, Tanya (eds.) (2013) *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
37. Silverman, David, Baker, Carolyn D., & Keogh, Jayne (1998). The case of the silent child: Advice-giving and advice reception in parent-teacher interviews. *Children and social competence: Arenas of action*. London & Washington, DC. Falmer Press, pp. 220-240.
38. Stokoe, Elizabeth (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14(3), pp. 277-303.
39. Stokoe, Elizabeth (2011). Simulated interaction and communication skills training: The 'conversation-analytic role-play method'. In Antaki, Charles (Ed.) *Applied Conversation Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 119-139.
40. Stokoe, Elizabeth, Alexa Hepburn, and Charles Antaki. "Beware the 'Loughborough School' of Social Psychology? Interaction and the politics of intervention." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 51.3 (2012): 486-496.
41. Suppes, Patrick (1974). The place of theory in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 3, pp. 3 -10.
42. Taylor, Jeanette (2001). The impact of performance indicators on the work of university academics: evidence from Australian universities. *Higher education quarterly*, 55(1), pp. 42-61.
43. Tellings, Agnes (2011) Theories and research in the field of education: An indissoluble union. *The role of theory in educational research: Report from the March Seminar 2011*. Report from the Research Council of Norway.
44. ten Have, Paul (1991). Talk and institution: A reconsideration of the "asymmetry" of doctor-patient interaction. *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. University of California Press, pp. 138-163.
45. Theobald, Maryanne & Danby, Susan (2017). Co-producing cultural knowledge: Children telling tales in the school playground. In Amanda Bateman & Church, Amelia (eds.) *Children's Knowledge-in-interaction: Studies in conversation analysis*. Springer, Singapore, Republic of Singapore, pp. 111-125.

46. Tyagunova, Tanya & Greiffenhagen, Christian (2017). Closing seminars and lectures: The work that lecturers and students do. *Discourse Studies*, 19(3), pp. 314-340.
47. Wakefield, Ann (2000). Ethnomethodology-The problems of unique adequacy. *NT Research*, 5(1), pp. 46-53.
48. Waring, Hansun Zhang. (2014). Mentor invitations for reflection in post-observation conferences: Some preliminary considerations. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5(1), 99-123. DOI: 10.1515/applirev-2014-0005
49. Wilkinson, Ray (2014). Intervening with conversation analysis in speech and language therapy: Improving aphasic conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 47(3), pp. 219-238.