McGill Journal of Education
Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill

A Discursive Approach to Recognition in the Practicum
Une approche discursive de la reconnaissance dans les entretiens de stage

Kristine Balslev, Sabine Vanhulle and Edyta Tominska

Cite this article

Article abstract

This article is part of a larger research project on professional development, and more specifically the emergence of "professional knowledge" among pre-service teachers. The intent here is to analyze recognition phenomena in supervisory discussions. We consider recognition of pre-service teachers' discourse as a condition for the emergence of professional knowledge. What "recognition markers" do evaluators seize from this discourse to decode its content and meaning, to adjust and influence it? How do these markers contribute (or fail to contribute) to establishing "shared communicative spaces"? Our analyses show that the emergence of these shared communicative spaces involves tensions that reveal (or fail to reveal) forms of recognition. These forms of recognition affect the shaping of pre-service teachers' professional knowledge, as well as components of pre-service teachers' identity that also influence the elaboration of professional knowledge.

A DISCURSIVE APPROACH TO RECOGNITION IN THE PRACTICUM

KRISTINE BALSLEV, SABINE VANHULLE & EDYTA TOMINSKA
Université de Genève

ABSTRACT. This article is part of a larger research project on professional development, and more specifically the emergence of "professional knowledge" among pre-service teachers. The intent here is to analyze recognition phenomena in supervisory discussions. We consider recognition of pre-service teachers' discourse as a condition for the emergence of professional knowledge. What "recognition markers" do evaluators seize from this discourse to decode its content and meaning, to adjust and influence it? How do these markers contribute (or fail to contribute) to establishing "shared communicative spaces"? Our analyses show that the emergence of these shared communicative spaces involves tensions that reveal (or fail to reveal) forms of recognition. These forms of recognition affect the shaping of pre-service teachers' professional knowledge, as well as components of pre-service teachers' identity that also influence the elaboration of professional knowledge.

UNE APPROCHE DISCURSIVE DE LA RECONNAISSANCE DANS LES ENTRETIENS DE STAGE

RÉSUMÉ. Cette contribution s'insère dans une recherche plus large portant sur les processus de développement professionnel, plus spécifiquement l'émergence de savoirs professionnels, chez des enseignants en formation. Cet article est centré sur les phénomènes de reconnaissance à l'oeuvre dans les entretiens de stage. Nous considérons en effet la reconnaissance du discours de l'enseignant en formation comme une condition d'émergence des savoirs professionnels. Quels « repères de reconnaissance » les évaluateurs prennent-ils dans ce discours pour en décoder le contenu et le sens, pour s'y ajuster et l'influencer ? En quoi ces repères contribuent-ils ou non à l'établissement de « zones de compréhension mutuelle » ? D'après nos analyses, l'émergence de ces zones de compréhension est soumise à des tensions qui révèlent ou non des formes de reconnaissance. Celles-ci influencent la configuration des savoirs professionnels que l'étudiant élabore, et partant, les composantes identitaires qui entrent dans cette élaboration.

INTRODUCTION

Supervisory discussions are an important part of teacher education. They provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to link theory and practice, and they represent the partnership between the university and the profession. But what professional learning takes place when a cooperating teacher (CT), a university supervisor (US), and a pre-service teacher (PT) meet to evaluate the PT's practicum? What elements help the PT's professional development? Considering that recognition plays an important role in helping the PT to build professional knowledge, we analyzed recognition phenomena in two evaluative interviews. Our aims are twofold: to point out the roles interactive discourses play in the elaboration of professional knowledge and to reveal recognition phenomena in supervisory discussions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS AND KEY CONCEPTS

Professional knowledge

In the field of professional didactics, and according to Raisky (1993, p. 118-119), professional knowledge is neither the juxtaposition of practical, technical and scientific knowledge, nor their sum, but a rereading of these three types of knowledge reinterpreted according to a logic of action. In the field of teacher education, Bromme and Tillemma (1995) assert that

> From a cognitive point of view, professional knowledge is developed as a product of professional action, and it establishes itself through work and performance in the profession, not merely through accumulation of theoretical knowledge, but through the integration, tuning and restructuring of theoretical knowledge to the demands of practical situations and constraints. From a socio-historical point of view, professional knowledge evolves gradually in a process of enculturation of the professional within a working context which is in itself part of a certain culture. (p. 262)

We subscribe to these definitions and add that the elaboration of professional knowledge results from a linking of different types of knowledge coming from different sources: academic, prescriptive, and practical (Vanhulle, 2008, 2009).

In this paper, we study the emergence of professional knowledge in supervisory discussions because we consider that such discussions represent opportunities for pre-service teachers to comment their actions in the classroom by referring to different sources of knowledge.

Supervisory discussions

These last years have seen a growing interest in the way that professional conversations support and stimulate professional development (Tillema & Orland-Barak, 2006). Supervisory discussions are at the center of a large number of research projects (Caroll, 2005; Cartaut & Bertone, 2009; Chal-

iès, Ria, Bertone, Trohel & Durand, 2004; Crasborn, Hennissen, Brouwer, Korthagen, & Bergen, 2008; Hennissen, Crasborn, Brouwer, Korthagen, & Bergen, 2008; Orland-Barak, 2006; Orland-Barak & Klein, 2005). These studies have various objects: beliefs or the transformation of beliefs among pre-service teachers; the different roles teacher educators take on in practicum settings; power relations in the interactions between pre-service teacher (PT), university supervisor (US), and cooperating teacher (CT); mentors' representations of mentoring conversations; and types of conversations and their effects on professional learning.

These studies shed light on important features of supervisory discussions in line with professional development, but do not tell us much about linguistic processes and aspects of recognition in supervisory discussions. We consider that studying these processes contributes to a better understanding of the emergence of professional knowledge.

Features of professionality in discourse

We consider four features of personal discourse related to professional knowledge.

1. This discourse is a combination of two discursive types (Bronckart, 1996): *narration* and *statement*. Within these discursive types, the subject talks about him- or herself in a situation or states generalities, expresses statements based on single and concrete examples, or expresses theoretical ideas. Thus, *narration* oscillates between an *interactive account* and an *independent narration*; and a *statement* oscillates between an *interactive discourse* and a *theoretical discourse*.

Evaluators recognize the PT's professionality in this heterogeneous discourse, and they judge the strength of the PT's account and elaboration on his/her professional preparation. This account is more than a mere statement of theoretical contents expected by the evaluators. The evaluators' challenges are as follows: to grasp the way in which the PT makes meaning of his/her actions, to rate his/her ability to establish a distance from these actions, to move off center through interpretations and call some actions into question, to make sense of the situations and knowledge components that the PT uses to analyze his/her own actions, and to measure the PT's involvement in the situation.

2. Recognition markers are based on the way the subject treats contents, elaborates various knowledge components, and mobilizes experience. These contents include contextual (spatial and temporal aspects, presence of other people) and situational markers (circumstances in which the subject encountered actions, problems, obstacles, etc.). The preciseness of these aspects provides indications on the way the subject is rooted in the situations he/she reveals. The contents incorporate the elements of knowledge linked to the situations that the subject analyzes. They include *referential markers* (theories, concepts, and knowledge acquired in previous experiences or during the professional

preparation period) that indicate that the subject can mobilize elements of analysis and can critically distance him- or herself from existing situations.

3. The subject elaborates on content by attributing *motives* (Schütz, 1953) to his/her own actions. These motives are either "in-order-to" motives or "because" motives. According to Schütz (1953), an "in-order-to" motive has to do with "… the state of affairs, the end, in view of which the action has been undertaken. From the point of view of the actor this class of motives refers to the future" (p. 16) (for example, "To check that the pupils understood, I suggested a new exercise…"). A "because" motive "refers from the point of view of the actor to his past experiences which have determined him to act as he did" (Schütz, 1953, p. 16-17). The subject also expresses *intentions*, and thus emphasizes a general understanding of professional action: "Based on this situation and my subsequent actions, I can say that, for me, teaching and motivating pupils mainly consists of …. Therefore, in my profession, I will be vigilant about…."

4. The subject talks about his/her actions using various linguistic means of enunciation. His/her discourse takes form in different *modalities*. Modalities represent important linguistic operations through which speakers interject their personal comment – through specific sentence structures, adjectives, adverbs, and so on. Inspired by Bronckart (1996), Vanhulle (2005, p. 300, our translations) identified four types of modalities: *logical* (which elaborates general laws, ideal rules – in other words, the "what's true?" order); *deontic* (oriented toward values and norms; in other words, "what's good to do and to think"); *pragmatic* (meaning, "what must be done"); and *appreciative* (meaning, "what seems good, valuable, true, fearful…" or not, for me).

In their communicational action, subjects attempt to make their sayings valid and legitimate by situating these sayings within existing laws, social ways of functioning, values, or appreciations of their singular action. By doing so, PT's anticipate recognition. Their discourse is a kind of argumentation aiming to obtain the evaluators' support. In the discourse, professional knowledge is the result of schematization (Grize, 1996).

The schematization process

According to Grize (1996), *schematization* is a discursive organization in which the addressees *recognize* a meaningful point of view. The issue is not merely to *convince*, but also to *persuade* by using emotional and interpersonal aspects. Let us point out some characteristics of schematization:

A. Schematization is mainly linked to what it should represent and to situations encountered in actions mentioned above: "recognition is only effective, only takes place, when it links speech to action" (Lenoir, 2009, p. 11, our translation). Furthermore, others recognize the dimensions of an action that the subject represents in his/her discourse (Honneth, 2003). In other words,

when the subject talks about his/her actions he/she selects some specific elements of these actions, which are (or are not) taken into account by the subject's interlocutor.

B. *Notions* achieve schematization and are endowed with properties, relations, and predicates (Grize, 1996). By using, in a singular way, notions related to actions, the PT makes a schematization of his/her personal relation to action. For the evaluators, *recognition markers* concern the ways in which the PT talks about his/her actions, and the notions that he/she selects and imbues with specific meanings.

C. The subject uses *coherence effects* in her/his discourse. Among these effects, repetition establishes balance between presumed information and information previously acquired (Charaudeau & Maingueneau, 2002, p. 99). However, according to what the subject tries to hide or, on the contrary, intentionally show, other more opaque processes occur: his/her utterances contain *filtering* or *emphasizing* effects (Grize, 1996, p. 68).

Keeping this in mind, evaluators must, within the dynamics of the dialogue, make inferences regarding the meanings that the subject tries to put into his/her words. The evaluators must also bring out significations despite the subject's filtering or emphasizing effects. Their recognition work consists of cooperating with the subject to bring out professional knowledge based on what his/her utterances suggest, including what the subject does not say.

The creation of a shared communicative space

Another, more revealing way to explain these interviews is to say that the US, CT, and PT must use the discussion to create a *shared communicative space*, or an *inter-mental development zone* (Mercer, 2000, p. 141), but trainers and trainees obviously do not use knowledge the same way or maintain the same relationship with knowledge. Therefore, discrepancies occur in the form of misunderstandings and semi-understandings during the dialogues between the trainer and trainee (Balslev & Saada-Robert, 2007).

In conclusion, recognition processes in triadic interviews do not only depend on the markers that the evaluators select in the PT's talk; they also depend on their ability to adjust their interventions within the dialogue in order to elucidate or modify the PT's representations.

The issues of formative interviews and recognition

The last year of the pre-service teacher education program at the Université de Genève involves three practicum periods. Each practicum lasts from three to seven (part-time) weeks and is evaluated through two triadic interviews. The first is formative and held in the middle of the practicum, and the second is summative and held at the end of the practicum. These interviews take place

in the school where the PT is being trained, before or after class, and without the presence of any pupils. The cooperating teacher (CT) follows the PT's everyday actions in the classroom. Because the university supervisor (US) is only present for the two triadic interviews, he/she does not know much about the PT's interactions with the pupils in the classroom. Therefore, the CT, US, and PT relate differently to the PT's practical experience. The CT, US, and PT each participate in the interviews with their own references, representations, expectations, images of the profession, and images of themselves as a teacher, a future teacher, or a teacher trainer.

The first assumption of this exploratory study is that these triadic interviews help to understand the emergence of the PT's professional knowledge. Our second assumption is that the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher participate in the emergence of this knowledge by recognizing or not recognizing elements that the PT brings to the interviews. We also analyze how speakers create a shared communicative space and how recognition phenomena play a role in the creation of such spaces.

We focus on the elements of the PT's discourse that the CT and US point out in order to help the PT explain or clarify his/her knowledge and skills, the way he/she understands principles of the profession and develops his/her own professional identity. We call these elements "recognition markers."

The CT and US point out the way in which the PT draws on the knowledge required for the profession. We distinguish four different types of knowledge: *academic knowledge* (resulting from educational research); *institutional knowledge* (linked to formal recommendations and to school organizations); *practical knowledge* (resulting from practical experiences legitimized by the profession or the CT); and *experiential knowledge* (resulting from personal experience).

Moreover, the PT has to meet other expectations, that is, prove his/her abilities to theorize knowledge and skills that he/she has built from everyday experiences, particularly during the professional preparation period; take into account the aims of the professional preparation; and have a reflective point of view of his/her actions.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

We based our analyses on the transcripts of filmed interviews. Our analyses combine two complementary approaches. The first concerns the interactional dynamics and refers to microgenetic studies (Balslev & Saada-Robert, 2007), while the second concerns microanalysis of the enunciations.

1. Microgenetic studies involve identifying sequences containing frames of reference in which the trainee builds his or her professional knowledge, postures endorsed by the speakers through the conversation (dissymmetry, symmetry,

initiators, followers, etc.), the communication methods linked to these postures, and the more or less successful creation of a shared communicative space.

2. Professional knowledge is elaborated through utterances. Our analyses take into account different types of discourse (narrative/statement; autonomous/ involved) and different discourse modalities, as well as the various aspects of schematization.

CASE STUDY

The two interviews take place at the beginning and the end of a practicum, in a double-grade class (first and second year of the elementary division, ages 4 to 6). In this period, the trainee should prove his/her organizational and management skills (mastering "how to teach"), and didactic competencies (mastering "what to teach"). The first interview is formative and takes place two weeks after the beginning of the practicum. The second is summative and takes place at the end of the practicum. In these two interviews, we hope to describe the evolution in the ways the PT shapes his/her professional knowledge.

We divided the first interview into 15 sequences (753 turns and 67 minutes), and the second into 16 sequences (513 turns and 58 minutes) (Tables 1 and 2). Tables 1 and 2 (see Appendix B) indicate the sequences, the timing of the turns (column 1); the reference frames and types of knowledge that the speakers treat (academic knowledge – AK, institutional knowledge – IK, experiential knowledge - EK, and practical knowledge - PK); moments of recognition (R) or non-recognition (NR) of the PT's discourse or action (columns 2, 3, 4); the shared communicative spaces; and the relations in the discourse between the speakers. We tried to identify whose (US's, CT's or PT's) significations are dominant in the sequence and identify whether the significations (of one or two speakers) are imposed on the others; whether two or three significations are juxtaposed; whether a speaker tries to gain access to the significations of the other speaker; whether there is a construction of shared significations; or whether the significations of the three speakers are convergent (column 5).

Interactional dynamics

Evolutions between the first and the second interview deal with the slow and laborious construction of a shared communicative space. In this space, the two evaluators cooperate with the PT to clarify his/her knowledge and his/ her own position in relation to this knowledge.

During the interviews, the two evaluators both recognize some of the PT's discourses and actions, but they do not each seize the same elements in the PT's discourse.

In the first interview, the CT finds opportunities in the PT's discourse to recognize her adaptational attitudes, the relevance of her actions, and the

emergence of her professional skills. The CT's attitude is caring and protective. She gives value to the PT's actions that are compatible with her own pedagogy. The US's job is to seek indicators of strong academic knowledge in the PT's discourse. She constantly confronts the PT by asking, "What are your objectives?"

In the second interview, the CT is less protective and more discreet. The US leads the interview and focuses her questions on didactic issues and on how the PT plans to handle heterogeneity in her group of pupils. At the end of the interview, that is, during the time when the two evaluators must agree on a grade to assign to the professional preparation period, the tension between their two positions subsides as their new goal is to combine their findings about the PT.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE TWO INTERVIEWS

The formative interview

Conflict between two perspectives. In the following sequence, and throughout the interview, the US frequently refers to official documents that frame the evaluation (see Table 1). The US prompts the PT to make her objectives known. The PT's discourse is mainly narrative, interactive, and addressed to the US, even if she sends some nonverbal signs to the CT in order to get support from her. This narrative discourse relates to elements of the practicum and experiences in the classroom (tasks for the children and their reactions). The PT schematizes her actions by describing them in their chronological order and by relating them to adaptations she has carried out. She does not mention educational aims. Instead, she bases her discourse on various documents coming from her activities with the pupils. Many gestures complete her description of tasks, in particular when she is not able to formalize the objectives related to these tasks. Repetition, screening, and emphasizing effects show the tensions between US's demands (for example, asking the PT to clarify her objectives) and the PT's answers. The two discourses clearly differ in the way they treat the objects of actions.

TRANSCRIPT 1. Sequence 2, turns 36 to 42

(see Appendix A for transcription conventions)

36.   PT: regarding the continuity of didactics [◌] well I firstly chose mathematics and the playroom (looks at CT) I had some days of observation and then I discussed with CT since she knows the class better than me (PT laughs), about activities I could do [CO, PK] and as the weeks went by we planned them and I went ahead / so I began with the numerical band (points at a paper posted on the wall) [AK didactics : object taught : counting] that is on the blackboard then I had to divide this activity into smaller daily activities so I chose the "smarties" activity [the task and its unfolding ◌] where I ask the pupils to fetch a specific token [unfolding of the task] / here we are ending the caterpillar [◌] (*She points out the cards she has in front of her*) / an activity we did in the playroom and that we continued in the classroom

37   US: you are describing all sort of activities / numerical band / smarties / caterpillar / but I would like to hear more about your purposes / your objectives

38   PT: that's all / there is a part that is counting and a part that is spatial / and we also worked on that with the caterpillar / actually sometimes one learns math in the playroom and that's why we chose spatiality [Justification of the "playroom" place regarding the "space" objective] [e/ s]

39   US: could you please be more accurate when you talk about your aims? / what do you expect the pupils / um / for example / what do you expect them to build while doing these activities ? / how will you acknowledge that what they build is actually what you expect them to build? [>< emphasizing / screening : divergent reasoning : double configuration : US = objectives; PT = existing activities]

40   PT: um// it concerns the numerical order / being able to count to ten / um // being able / for example to search for example / when I ask for a number / being able to fetch an object to reproduce um something like the caterpillar (*she draws circles in the air*) or in the playroom/ memorize [N in relation to the objective "memorize"] / in fact we follow the program and we leave some moments

41   US: yes yes / but what are your objectives? When you talk about fetching the right number [⟦⟧] could you in theoretical terms

42   PT: its when he has / or he memorizes cardinal numbers and he looks for / no / he counts by himself the object that he brings back and at that moment there is a regulation and then he notices himself if there are too many or too few (*makes a gesture with her hand*) // and as he has to walk some steps he immediately sees if he has a different number or not / and for the theoretical aspect / to know for example in the smarties activity know when he has a token (*she shows a token with her thumb*) / in the smarties activity it's the symmetrical axis (*shows axiality on a paper in front of her with her forefinger*)

The PT clarifies her preoccupations and thus partly answers the US's question about objectives. Her preoccupations are the two activities' spatio-temporal characteristics: the "smarties" activity deals with chronological continuity, and the "caterpillar" activity takes place at two separate times and in two different places (the classroom and the playroom). She clarifies that the tasks promote memorization of numbers (turn 42, particularly). The explanation remains unclear regarding the idea she defends: by "doing," the pupils have to memorize and therefore they "regulate" (somehow naturally) their activity. The US does not announce or question the fact that the pupils are confronted with a problem solving activity. Therefore, the pupil's ability to regulate is not natural but provoked by the task. This could be considered a missed opportunity to elaborate professional knowledge based on didactic concepts. At that point in the interview, the US does not acknowledge this latent knowledge. However, she will come back to it later.

The CT intervenes after receiving various verbal and non-verbal signals from the PT. She intervenes in order to validate the PT's actions (not according to didactic objectives) that she estimates are well adapted to the teaching teams' practices. The CT also points out some of the PT's qualities: her openness and her ability to integrate a program established by others (turns 48 to 51).

Beginning of construction of a shared communicative space. The US encourages the PT to analyze her own actions, as well as to differentiate her interventions in

relation to each pupil. Together, they create a shared communicative space based on the childrens' drawings.

TRANSCRIPT 2. Sequence 4, excerpts

135   CT: the discussion about all the drawings was interesting

136   PT: *(picks a poster)*

137   CT: yeah because even if they all have the same caterpillar, we note that they do not draw the same thing / there are a lot of differences between drawings, and that is really interesting (...)

142   PT: *(opens a poster)* and that's how we made the observations *(written on the paper)*

143   US: OK, so the children made the observations [ ]

144   PT: yes exactly and I wrote them down

(...)

147   US: OK

148   PT: so here they are *(all three look at the notes on the paper)*

149   US: *(reads the paper)* caterpillars have a body / caterpillars have paws / OK so how did you proceed ? / you made a list

150   PT: so I wrote a list and reminded them that they were going to the playroom and that's where they made their second drawing

151   US: and your objective regarding the first drawing was to see what remained in their memory? [ ]

152   PT: it was mainly to see if they all drew the same thing / and / not at all / they had all made different caterpillars

153   US: OK

(...)

155   CT: but the second time there was *(points to the drawings and picks one)* / they had their first drawing in the playroom

156   US: yes

157   CT: so each child had his drawing in front of him and had to correct it / agree to do the same caterpillar again and then there was the soup moment *(laughs)*

158   PT: *(laughs)* and then

159   CT: it's really interesting because some don't look at all / don't work according to what they have in their hands /they just observe what is different between what they imagined and what they have to do / that exercise was really interesting

In this activity of co-pointing around the drawings, the three utterers adopt the position that any teacher would if he or she were confronted with learning phenomena. By doing so, they set aside dissymmetry. A new feature appears: the US seizes elements of answers to the question about the objectives (151) in the PT's discourse. We consider it a sign of the US's recognition of the way the PT treats the objects of her actions.

The summative interview

New communicative space and configuration of professional knowledge. The PT begins by presenting the main issue of her professional preparation period (that is, how she handled heterogeneity in the double-grade class). Her discourse is again narrative and interactive, but it now includes theoretical segments: her utterances deal with the context of the fight against academic failure as well as with teaching reforms. Her discourse refers to institutional knowledge (IK) and she relates her IK to the school's educational policies and curricula. She refers to a situated experience, and clarifies the terms she uses by means of *examples*. She does not fully respond to the academic requirements: she does not seem to have mastered the knowledge that comes from her research on differentiated learning. She gives priority to ideological issues (fight against academic failure); her discourse belongs to the world of values and of practices that correspond to these values. Compared with the first interview, the PT's utterances are more strongly marked, and include her personal appreciations (appreciative modality), as well as her pragmatic and deontic considerations. She refers to knowledge based on experience (EK) in order to justify her choices, and relates to experiences from other professional preparation periods (for example, "I noticed that..."). Furthermore, "in-order-to" motives (Schütz, 1953), which explain her activities with her pupils, now appear in her speech with greater clarity. Finally, the PT projects herself into the future as a teacher.

TRANSCRIPT 3. Second interview, sequence 12, excerpts

310.   PT: I think that if I were in the daily life / I think I would have reacted in a completely different way / I admit that the fact that it's in the context of professional preparation influenced me a lot / because in daily life / *I think* I would have taken the time *I would have thought more about it* / and/ it's true that I wasn't in that process / and *I was fully aware of that* when I came to the end of the professional preparation period

311.   US: mm hmm

312.   PT: when I began to analyze / to do things I realized that / I said to myself *"the day that I will have my own class, I definitely won't do things that way"*

313.   US: what will change, then?

314.   PT: first of all, we follow them // XX/ we discussed that with CT (*points at CT*) / She's here since the beginning of the school year / therefore she can see progression / she knows the pupils much better than me / I just arrive for the professional preparation period and / I think one organizes things differently / I just come / I have to do my disciplines / I must have my planning, etc./ I observe two pupils / In other words, I wasn't in that process / I think that when I will have my own class / I will have a pupil like Sara and take note of elements and say to myself "I have to do some things with her again" / I thought that / I always noted "I must do this and this thing again, etc."

What explains the evolution of the PT's utterances towards an affirmation of a "capable subject"? Perhaps it is the fact that the three partners react as teachers concerned by the same crucial question: how to avoid "giving up" on some pupils (turns 272 and sequence 12). A new schematization about the representation of teachers' tasks appears in the PT's discourse. For the

PT, this task consists of going beyond the double-grade issue. Regarding equal opportunities for succeeding, there will always be differences between pupils, whatever their age. Therefore, teachers should adopt specific professional gestures in order to, for example, follow children's individual progress in tasks and accomplishments.

CONCLUSIONS: "THE EXERCISE WAS INTERESTING," OR WHEN MUTUAL RECOGNITION PROVOKES SHARED MEANINGS AND ACTIVITIES

We observed a conflict between the PT's and the US's perspectives (juxtaposition of meanings). The US seeks conceptualization and scrupulously respects the items of the academic contract for evaluating the professional preparation period, whereas the PT bases her discourse on her direct experience. The CT particularly recognizes the PT's actions that are legitimate according to the professional context.

The phenomena observed here are typical of supervisory discussions:

• The trainee (or PT) refers more often to pragmatic notions than to theoretical and academic concepts;

• Professional knowledge is built on field practices and on the identification of the PT's practices; and

• There is personal positioning based on values, to the detriment of research-based knowledge about education.

How is it possible for evaluators to overcome these limits? They can probably do so by recognizing elements in the PT's discourse in order to create openings. In the two interviews that we analyzed above, we observe that the PT's action-related interventions involve references to the fundamental objectives that she should pursue. After some time, the US seizes these references. Her role seems to consist of confronting the PT. On the other hand, the CT offers caring support. The two roles are indeed complementary, but could cause difficulties if each evaluator restricts him- or herself to one single defined role.

The distinctions between the three partners fade as they try to respond together to educational dilemmas based on practical problems. The CT's intervention in Sequence 4 in the first interview shows that she participates in this work of understanding. Her simple statement, "The exercise was interesting," does not just point to superficial recognition of the PT's actions, but to recognition of what this action allows the evaluators to develop in terms of their knowledge of the teacher's work. The interdependence between research and the reality of the job can finally be consolidated, with the new data that pragmatic experiences bring to the research. Within this interdependence, the "trainee" becomes the "future teacher": "in my class, I will pay attention to...."

When two types of reasoning meet, keen professional knowledge can emerge. This knowledge can be rational, and it considers the responsibility of the subject to be able to place him- or herself in a collective professional activity that is pre-organized by academic and institutional knowledge. However, the trainee should also demonstrate the knowledge of a critical and creative subject.

REFERENCES

Balslev, K. & Saada-Robert, M. (2007). Les microgenèses situées. Unités et procédés d'analyse. *Recherche qualitative, 26, n°2,* 85-109.

Bromme, R., & Tillemma, H. (1995). Fusing Experience and Theory: The Structure of Professional Knowledge. *Learning and Instruction, Vol. 55,* 261-267.

Bronckart, J.-P. (1996). *Activité langagière, textes et discours. Pour un interactionisme socio-discursif.* Neuchâtel : Delachaux et Niestlé.

Carroll, D. (2005). Learning through interactive talk: A school-based mentor teacher study group as a context for professional learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(5), 457-473.

Cartaut, S. & Bertone, S. (2009). Co-analysis of work in the triadic supervision of preservice teachers based on neo-Vygotskian activity theory: case study from a French university institute of teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25* (8), 1086-1094.

Chaliès, S., Ria, L., Bertone, S., Trohel, J., & Durand, M. (2004). Interactions between preservice and cooperating teachers and knowledge construction during post-lesson interviews. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20* (8), 765-781.

Charaudeau, P. Maingueneau, D. (Dir.) (2002). *Dictionnaire d'analyse des discours.* Paris : Seuil.

Crasborn, F., Hennissen, P., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2008). Promoting versatility in mentor teachers' use of supervisory skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 499-514.

Grize, J.-B. (1996). *Logique naturelle et communications.* Paris : Presses Universitaires de France.

Hennissen P., Crasborn, F., Brouwer N., Korthagen, F. & Bergen, T.(2008). Mapping mentor teachers' roles in metoring dialogues. *Educational Research Review, 3* (2), 168-186.

Honneth, A. (2003). La reconnaissance : une piste pour la théorie sociale contemporaine. Dans R. Le Coadic (dir.), *Identités et démocratie. Diversité et mondialisation : repenser la démocratie.* Rennes : Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Lenoir, Y. (2009). Les pratiques d'enseignement : l'enjeu de la reconnaissance. Papier présenté au Symposium international de Carcassonne, *Education, recherche et société,* Université d'été de l'Aude, juillet 2009.

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words & Minds. How we use language to think together.* London and New York: Routledge.

Orland-Barak, L. (2006). Convergent, divergent and parallel dialogues: knowledge construction in professional conversations. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 13-31.

Orland-Barak, L., & Klein, S. (2005). The expressed and the realized: Mentors' representations of a mentoring conversation and its realization in practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(4), 379-402.

Raisky, C. (1993). Problème du sens des savoirs professionnels agricoles, préalable à une didactique. In P. Jonnaert et Y. Lenoir (Eds.), *Didactique du sens et sens des didactiques* (p. 101-121). Sherbrooke: Éditions du CRP.

Schütz, A. (1953). Common-sense and scientific interpretation of human action. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 14,* 1,(1) 1-37.

Tillema, H., & Orland-Barak, L. (2006). Constructing knowledge in professional conversations: The role of beliefs on knowledge and knowing. *Learning and Instruction 16* (6), 592-608.

Vanhulle, S. (2005). How future teachers develop professional knowledge through reflective writing in a dialogical frame. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature 5* (3) 287-314.

Vanhulle, S. (2008). Au coeur de la didactique professionnelle, la subjectivation des savoirs. In P. Pastré & Y. Lenoir (Eds.), *Didactique professionnelle, didactique des savoirs professionnels* (pp. 227-254). Toulouse : Octarès.

Vanhulle, S. (2009). Dire les savoirs professionnels : savoirs de références et logiques d'action. In R. Hofstetter & B. Schneuwly (Eds.), *Savoirs en (trans)formation. Au cœur des professions de l'enseignement et de la formation (pp. 245-264).* Bruxelles : De Boeck.

APPENDIX A. TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

(italics): pointings, gestures, laughs, etc.

[bold]: elements of professional knowledge, such as: 1) markers related to objects : contextual CO ; situationnal SIT ; referential; 2) stamps/markers related to references: academic knowledge (AK); institutional knowledge (IK); practical knowledge (PK); experiential knowledge (EK); 3) modalities: appreciative (AM); deontic (DM); logical (LM); pragmatic (PM); 4) motives: "because" motives (BM), and "in-order-to" motives (IOM); 4) intentions: Int; 5) Notions:N; 6) concepts: C

[⟲]: retroactions; [⟳]: proactions

[s,e,r,c]: screening, emphasizing, repetition, and other coherence effects

/: short pause ; ///: long pause

XX: inaudible

APPENDIX B. TABLES

TABLE 1. Formative interview

Sequences and minutes	PT	CT	US	Shared communicative space (patterns)
1 (1-32) Min. 0-5	*Acceptation*	*Acceptation*	Interview and professional preparation contract- IK	US>CT and PT Imposed significations
2 (33-55) Min. 5-10	Interview and professional preparation contract Teaching management – IK, AK	Teaching management – IK, PK *R of PTs attitude*	Interview and professional preparation contract *NR of PTs discourse* Teaching concept° – AK	PT<US PT<CT Juxtaposition of significations Building of shared significations
4 (100-185) Min. 14-20	Teaching concept° and management – EK, AK Observat° and evaluat° of pupils	Teaching concept° *R PTs discourse* Observat° and evaluat° of pupils – EK, PK	*R PTs discourse* Teaching concept°-EK, PK, AK Observat° and evaluat° of pupils	PT=CT=US Juxtaposition of significations and access to significations
5 (186-240) Min. 20-24	Observat° and evaluat° of pupils – EK Teaching management	Observat° and evaluat° of pupils -EK, AK, PK	Observat° and evaluat° of pupils *R of PTs discourse*	PT=FT=US Access to significations Building of shared significations
6 (241-273a) Min. 24-27	Teaching management - IK	Interview and professional preparation contract - IK	Teaching management Interview and professional preparation contract - IK	PT<US PT=US Building of shared significations
7 (273b-336a) Min. 28-35	Teaching management – EK, AK Observat° and evaluat° of pupils Professional preparation contract Teaching concept°	Observat° and evaluat° of pupils – EK, PK, AK *R of PTs attitude in the classroom*	Observat° and evaluat° of pupils – IK, PK, EK *NR of PTs discourse* *R of CTs discourse*	S=CT=US Building of shared significations
8 (336b-416a) Min. 35-41	Teaching concept° – EK, PK, AK Teaching management – IK, AK	Professional preparation contract Teaching management – S (?) *R of PTs attitude*	Teaching management – AK Teaching concept° – AK *R of PTs act°s* *R of PTs and CTs discourses* Knowledge to teach	PT=CT=US Building of shared significations
9 (416b-460) Min. 42-44	Teaching management - EK	Personal commitments and attitudes – PK Teaching management *R of PTs attitudes* *R of PTs actions*	*R of PTs discourse* Personal commitments and attitudes	CT=US>PT
10 (461-549) Min. 45-51	Teaching management Personal commitments and attitudes – PK, IK, EK	Personal commitments and attitudes – EK *R of PTs attitudes*	Personal commitments and attitudes *R of PTs and CTs discourse*	CT=US>PT Convergent significations
11 (550-593) Min. 51-55	Teaching concept° Teaching management – AK, EK Professional preparation contract	Teaching management *R of PTs actions*	Teaching concept° Professional preparation contract	CT=US>PT Convergent significations
12 (594-635a) Min. 56-60	Teaching management – EK Observat° and evaluat° of pupils	Teaching management – PK *R of PTs actions*	Teaching management Observat° and evaluat° of pupils	CT=US>PT
13 (635b-677a) Min. 60-62	Observat° and evaluat° of pupils – EK, AK Teaching concept° Teaching management - EK	*R of PTs discourse*	Teaching concept° *R of PTs discourse* *Questions CT* Observat° and evaluat° of pupils – AK, PK	PT=US Access to significations Convergent significations
14 (677b-699) Min. 62-63	Professional preparation contract	Professional preparation contract – EK *R of PTs skills*	Professional preparation contract	Convergent significations
15 (700-753) Min. 63-67	Professional preparation contract Teaching concept° and management	Professional preparation contract	Professional preparation contract -EK Teaching concept and management *R of PTs issues*	US>CT, PT Convergent significations

TABLE 2. Summative interview

Sequences and minutes	PT	CT	US	Shared communicative space (patterns)
1 (1-11a) Min. 0-2	*Acceptation*	*Acceptation*	Professional preparation contract IK	US>CT and PT Divergent significations Imposed significations
2 (11b-13) Min. 2-7	*Presents her issue: differenciation Teaching conception*	*Acceptation*	*Acceptation*	US>PT Convergent significations Access to significations
3 (14-30) Min. 8-9	Professional preparation contract	*Acceptation*	Professional preparation contract *R PTs issue NR of PTs discourse*	US>PT Divergent significations Imposed significations
4 (30b-45) Min. 10-12	Professional preparation contract EK-AK-IK	*Acceptation*	Professional preparation contract *NR of PTs discourse*	US>PT Juxtaposition of significations Access to significations
5 (46-58) Min. 13-14	Teaching management EK-IK	*Acceptation*	Interview and professional preparation contract	US>PT Building of shared significations
6 (59-93) Min. 15-19	Teaching conception – EK Teaching management – PK, EK	*Acceptation*	Teaching conception – AK, IK *Tries to lead PTs discourse towards teaching conception R of PTs discourse*	US>PT Building of shared significations
7 (94-143) Min. 20-24	Teaching conception – AK Teaching management – PK, EK	Teaching conception – EK Observation and evaluation of pupil Professional preparation contract *R CTs actions in the classroom*	Teaching conception – AK Professional preparation contract *Prompts PT to interpret the situation* Teaching management *R PTs discourse*	PT=CT=US Building of shared significations
8 (144-185a) Min. 25-28	Teaching conception – EK, AK Teaching management	*Acceptation*	Teaching conception- AK *NR of PTs discourse*	PT<SU Juxtaposition of significations
9 (185b-225) Min. 29-31	Observation and evaluation of pupil – S (?), EK Teaching management – EK Teaching conception	*Acceptation*	Observation and evaluation of pupils *R of PTs discourse* Professional preparation contract *NR of PTs discourse (questions PTs assertions)* Teaching management - IK	S=US Access to significations
10 (226-248) Min. 32-34	Observation and evaluation of pupils	*Acceptation*	Observation and evaluation of pupils *NR of PTs discourse* Professional preparation contract	PT<US Juxtaposition of significations Access to significations
11 (249-262a) Min. 34-36	Observation and evaluation of pupils	*Acc.*	Observation and evaluation of pupils *NR of PTs discourse*	PT<US Juxtaposition of significations Access to significations
12 (262b-340a) Min. 37-43	Professional preparation contract Teaching management Teaching conception Observation and evaluation of pupils	Teaching management and conception- EK Professional preparation contract *R of PTs actions and choices (regarding her issues)*	Observation and evaluation of pupils - PK *R of PTs discourse NR of PTs actions* Teaching conception *Questions CT on teaching conception* Professional preparation contract *R CTs discourse* Teaching management	PT=US=CT Building of shared significations Access to significations
13 (340b-357a) Min. 44-45	Teaching management and conception	*Acceptation*	*R of PTs discourse Invites CT to evaluate the complete professional preparation period*	PT=US=CT
14 (357b-409) Min. 46-50	Professional preparation contract – IK Teaching conception – PK, S (?), EK	Professional preparation and interview contract *Evaluates in a summative way the whole professional preparation period: R of PTs actions + R PTs issues* Teaching conception - EK	Teaching conception – R of PTs discourse	PT=US=CT Building of shared significations
15 (410-444) Min. 51-53	Teaching management – S (?) *Acceptation*	Professional preparation contract	Teaching conception – PK, AK *Questions CT in order to continue the evaluation of the whole professional preparation period*	PT>US and CT Building of shared significations
16 (445-513) Min. 54-58	Observation and evaluation of pupils	*Acceptation*	Observation and evaluation of pupils *R of PTs actions (430, 432)*	Shared significations

KRISTIN BALSLEV (Ph.D. Sciences de l'éducation, Université de Genève, 2006). Maître-assistante. Membre du groupe de recherche TALES. Specialisations: la construction du savoir chez les enseignants à partir de l'intéraction stagiaire-formateur (notamment au regard de l'analyse micro-génétique de l'intéraction).

SABINE VANHULLE est professeure titulaire (Université de Genève, faculté de pyschologie et des sciences de l'éducation) dans le domaine des relations entre théorie et pratique en formation des enseignants. Ses travaux portent sur la question des savoirs professionnels : outils de construction du savoir, analyse du discours (écrits réflexifs, portfolios, interactions orales entre stagiaires et formateurs). Directrice du groupe de recherche TALES (Theories, actions, languages, knowledge) et membre du IRPE-ROIP (Réseau-observatoire international de la recherche sur la professionnalisation).

EDYTA TOMINSKA est assistante de recherche dans le groupe TALES. À partir de sa thèse (septembre 2011) sur l'alphabétisme des enfants sourds, Edyta Tominska developpe des projets de recherche portant sur la formation d'enseignants spécialisés. Elle est également membre du groupe TALES et participe aux projets de recherche en lien avec le savoir professionnel et sa construction à travers l'écriture réflexive et l'interaction sociale avec le formateur.

KRISTINE BALSLEV (Ph.D. Education Science, Université de Genève, 2006), is an assistant professor (maitre-assistante) at the University of Geneva. Member of the TALK/TALES research group, she specializes in: the building of teachers' professional knowledge through interaction between trainees and trainers (especially with a focus on the micro-genetic analysis of interaction).

SABINE VANHULLE is a full professor at the University of Geneva (Faculté de psychologie et de sciences de l'éducation) in the area "Relations between Theory and Practice in Teacher Education." Ms. Vanhulle carries out research projects on professional knowledge, particularly tools of knowledge construction and analysis of discourse (reflective texts, portfolios, oral interactions between trainees and trainers). She is director of the TALK research group (Theories, actions, languages, and knowledge) and a member of the IRPE-ROIP (Réseau-observatoire international de la recherche sur la professionnalisation).

EDYTA TOMINSKA is a research assistant in the TALK/TALES research group. On the basis of her thesis (September, 2011) on the literacy of deaf children (microgenetic analysis), Ms. Tominska is developing research projects for the training of specialized teachers. She also participates in TALK/TALES research projects relating to professional knowledge and its construction through reflective writing and social interaction with trainers.