Binh Thanh Ta*

Collaboratively pursuing student uptake of feedback through storytelling: a conversation analytic study of interaction in team doctoral supervision

Abstract: Team supervision has become prevalent in worldwide doctoral education programs in the past few decades. Research indicates that one area of challenges involves collaboration between supervisors. However, little is known about how supervisors collaborate in supervision meetings involving multiple supervisors as existing studies mostly draw on participant self-reports. Adopting conversation analysis, this study examines how supervisors can collaborate through storytelling drawing on the corpus of 34 storytelling sequences in 15 triadic supervision meetings. A major finding is that storytelling can be used as a resource for collaboratively pursuing student uptake of feedback. Specifically when a supervisor is providing feedback, and the other supervisor can tell stories in pursuit of student uptake. Another finding involves the production of second storytelling: when students do not show uptake at the completion of the first storytelling produced by one supervisor, the other supervisor may launch a second storytelling to pursue student uptake. In addition, supervisors can collaborate through co-production of storytelling: near the end of a story produced by one supervisor, the other supervisor can add increments, which shape student uptake of the feedback under delivery. These findings are potentially useful for the professional development of supervisors.

*Corresponding author: Binh Thanh Ta, Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Science, Monash University, Wellington Road, Clayton, VIC3800, Australia, E-mail: Binh.ta2@monash.edu. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5252-045X

1 Introduction

This study examines how doctoral supervisors co-construct feedback and advice in team supervision, which is defined as two or more academics supervising one doctoral student. Team supervision has become widely adopted in doctoral education programs worldwide (Johansen et al. 2019; Lahenius and Ikävalko 2014; Olmos-López and Sunderland 2017; Taylor et al. 2019). This has been driven by an increase in interdisciplinary research as well as more stringent quality assurance requirements (Guerin and Green 2015; Halse and Bansel 2012; Manathunga 2012; Pole 1998). Team supervision is believed to work as a "safety net" in response to potential risks of the sole supervisor model (Pole 1998; Robertson 2019). Examples of safety benefits may include accommodating for supervisor absence and reducing workload pressures which may inhibit timely completion.

Other benefits of team supervision have been associated with the possibility of bringing to the team a divergent range of expertise and intellectual perspective. For example, Dysthe et al. (2006) argue that diverging intellectual perspectives might be potentially conducive to production of new knowledge. Likewise, Guerin et al. (2011) highlight the opportunities for students to learn about academic debates when their supervisors display opposite opinions. In the same vein, Kobayashi et al. (2015) describe debates between supervisors as being valuable opportunities for students to learn about scientific argumentation. Kobayashi et al. (2017) highlight the variations in perspectives regarding research methods and forms of content, and claim that these differences in perspective provide learning opportunities for both students and supervisors.

Nevertheless, divergence in perspectives also accounts for disagreement and conflict, which is a common challenge in team supervision (Guerin and Green 2015; Manathunga 2012; Robertson 2019). Conflicting advice and disagreement between supervisors can adversely affect the experience of doctoral students (Taylor et al. 2019). However, divergences in perspective, though inevitable, are not necessarily unproductive as quality of outcome depends on the strategies supervisors and students use to manage potential conflict (Guerin and Green 2015). To manage conflict, supervisors are advised to adopt an open-minded mindset that appreciates diversity (Guerin and Green 2015), establish clear expectations of role (Pang 1999), build trust and have ground rules for managing disagreements (Robertson 2017, 2019). Besides giving practical recommendations, Guerin and Green (2015) point to the necessity of a pedagogy that can "promote collaborative practices" (p. 330).

In order to promote collaborative practices, it is necessary to first understand how supervisors can collaborate in supervision meetings. Existing studies in this

area are mostly based on opinions gained through interviews with supervisors and students, therefore they fail to provide insights into supervisors' actual conduct of collaboration in supervisory interaction. Adopting conversation analysis (CA), which is an empirical research approach that focusses on how social actions are produced and interpreted in interaction, this study will examine how supervisors co-construct feedback and advice through storytelling. The insights gained in this study offer implications for training supervisors in practices of team supervision.

2 Feedback and advice in team supervision

Doctoral students come to supervision meetings to receive feedback and advice that is intended to assist the development of their research work. In studies that focus on doctoral student written work, feedback is generally perceived to include three essential components: feed-up (establishing the goal of feedback), feed-back (referring to evaluating learner performance) and feed-forward (referring to giving advice that assists learners to move to the next level of development) (Carter and Kumar 2017; Stracke and Kumar 2010, 2016). In a study focussing on oral feedback in supervision meetings, Vehviläinen (2009) uses feedback as an umbrella term to refer to activities involving evaluating students' research work, producing counter-statements (disagreement), and providing recommendations for improvement (advice). These conceptualisations of feedback suggest that advice is a component of feedback. However, in some studies, the term 'feedback' is used interchangeably with 'advice' (Björkman 2015; Warner and Miller 2015). This suggests that advice is the essential component of feedback in supervisory interaction. Ta (2003) argues that advice is the key component of feedback. This argument is based on the evidence that advice can stand alone in a feedback sequence; in contrast, evaluation and disagreement work as prefaces to advice or implicate advice. In the present study, *advice* is used to refer to the action of recommending a course of future action while *feedback* is used to refer to actions other than advice (i.e., evaluation of student research written work or research ideas and disagreement with student ideas).

    There is limited research on how co-supervisors collaborate in giving feedback and advice. Ta (2003) explores how second-speaking supervisors contribute to the on-going feedback activity through anticipatory completion of on-going feedback turns initiated by first-speaking supervisors. This study shows that through producing anticipatory completions, second-speaking supervisors provide assistance in articulating the feedback through a display of agreement with first-speaking supervisors, which works to secure student acceptance of feedback

and to secure the floor to provide independent feedback in an affiliative way. Ta (2003) also examines the practice of inviting collaborative contribution from co-supervisors, and that such invitations are regularly produced at strategic points where students have displayed disagreement or have not shown strong uptake of the feedback in-progress. This suggests that collaborative contribution between supervisors works to strengthen feedback, thus securing student agreement and acceptance. Extending this line of research, the present study investigates another interactional resource for collaboratively pursuing students' uptake of feedback in team supervision: that is storytelling.

3 Storytelling in education and doctoral supervision

Storytelling is defined as an activity where tellers either describe a hypothetical event or recount a past event involving at least two temporally ordered actions (Goodwin 1990; Mandelbaum 2012). Storytelling has been widely used as a pedagogical tool. Teachers are found to use storytelling to deliver curriculum contents (Robin 2008), foster student understanding of theoretical concepts (McDonald 2017) and facilitate application of theories into practice (Holmes and Sealock 2019). Students are also provided with opportunities to engage in storytelling; such opportunities are believed to promote reflection and learning (Alterio and Janice 2003). CA research on storytelling in educational contexts has demonstrated specific functions of storytelling. For example, in the context of second language testing, students have been shown to use storytelling to demonstrate their interactional competence (Sandlund 2022). Dooly and Tudini (2022) found storytelling to serve various functions in a single episode of interaction between two pre-service teachers in a teacher education program: accounting for not completing a certain task; justifying pedagogical decisions; and displaying mutual understanding and agreement between the participants. With regards to doctoral education, supervisors have been shown to use storytelling to establish mutual understanding and secure student acceptance of advice and feedback in supervision sessions (Ta 2021, 2022; Ta and Fillipi 2020).

   CA research has demonstrated that conversational stories are interactive productions which are co-constructed by tellers (Beach 2000; Bercelli et al. 2008; C. Goodwin 1984, 1987; M. H. Goodwin 1982, 1990; Mandelbaum 2012; Stivers 2008). For example, recipients can co-shape the direction of the incipient storytelling by launching questions that draw attention to particular aspects of the stories (Koike 2009; Mandelbaum 1989; Monzoni and Drew 2009). Similarly, recipient responses

may lead to teller elaborations or modifications of the projected stories (Bercelli et al. 2008). Recipients may participate in joint-telling if they share first-hand or second-hand experiences of the events (Koike 2009; Mandelbaum 1987). Recipients can tell a second story about experiences similar to the first story (Arminen 2004; Koike 2009; Mandelbaum 1987; Ryave 1978).

Noteworthily, how a story is brought to a close in a matter of negotiation between the teller and the recipient (Ta and Fillipi 2023). At a possible story completion place, recipients are expected to display their uptake of the story; and responses that affiliate with the teller's affective stance are normatively preferred (Stivers 2008). If responses are not delivered timely or are treated as inadequate, tellers can produce increments, adding further details to pursue more adequate responses (Stivers 2008; Ta and Fillipi 2023). In this way, the story will be expanded until it reaches a new possible completion place. In summary, storytelling is a collaborative activity where recipients can play an important part in shaping the trajectory of the storytelling, and negotiate interpretation of the story. This suggests storytelling is a useful focus for studying how supervisors collaborate in team supervision.

4 The study

4.1 The research methodology

The present study adopts CA, which is an empirical and data-driven research approach that focusses on examining the interactional resources that social members use to construct and interpret social actions (Have 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008). CA is predicate on the assumption that social members share the same methods and procedures of producing and understanding social actions. It is empirical in the sense that it allows readers to validate analysis. This is possible because in any turn of talk, participants display to each other, and hence to analysts and readers, their understanding of what is going on in the previous turn (Have 2007; Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008).

CA is data-driven in that analysts start by considering conversational data with "unmotivated looking" rather than employing any particular theoretical lens, which allows uncovering social practices as they actually occur. The task of an analyst is to discover and describe the singularity as well as the regularities of interactional practices and underlying social phenomena. The regularity of interactional practices can be determined by examining participants' endogenous orientations. For example, with storytelling, CA analysts do not start with assumptions on how stories should be structured but instead demonstrate how participants orient to how the

telling of a story might begin, develop and close (e.g., Goodwin 1984; Sidnell 2006; Ta 2021, 2023). Analysts can establish that a story is upcoming or in the process of closing by investigating how both tellers and recipients regularly orient to it in practice. A story begins when tellers offer to tell a story and recipients align as listeners; or vice versa when recipients make a request and tellers accept to tell a story. If recipients do not align as listeners to a multi-unit turn (which is one of the key features of storytelling as social action), there is no storytelling. Similarly, a story can be shown to be moving towards closure when tellers bid for a close and recipients align with this projected closure. On the other hand, if recipients do not orient to it as closing, tellers may add increments, thereby extending the storytelling. This approach to analysis of story structure makes CA distinctive from traditional linguistic approach, where story structure is generalised out of context (e.g., Labov and Waletzky 1967; Norrick 2005).

With regards to examining functions of storytelling, CA analysts do not start with pre-determined functions but instead examine the sequential context by which storytelling is launched and the ways in which participants link the storytelling to broader activities within which it is embedded. In this way, CA analysts can uncover how a storytelling works within the sequential context of its occurrence. In this respect, CA is distinctive from narrative research which is predicated on the assumption that stories are the means for people to make sense of lived experiences and to construct identities. In narrative research approaches, stories are used as researchers' resource for understanding how social worlds work (Bamberg 2007; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008). In contrast, in CA storytelling is viewed as a participant resource for constructing social actions.

4.2 The research context

This study is a part of a larger study which involves four doctoral students and six supervisors from the Faculty of Education of an Australian university. The students were all completing a doctorate by research degree, commonly known as the PhD. At the time when the data collection started (2016), the university introduced the requirement of completing 120 h of coursework, but assessments of coursework were not required. To be considered for completion of the doctorate program, full-time students had to pass three milestones within three years with each milestone occurring at the end of each 12 month period.

When the data were collected, the students were in their first year and working towards the confirmation milestone. For completion of this milestone, they had to

submit a 10,000-word research proposal and make an oral presentation for 20 min in front of a panel consisting of a chair and two members. The supervisors could attend the session but they were not allowed to defend the students, which was a new requirement added at the same time as the introduction of the coursework requirement.

Students were required to work under the supervision of at least two academics, with one acting as a principal supervisor, who had a greater percentage of the supervision responsibility, and with the others referred to as associate supervisors. Each student in this study had two supervisors. They sometimes had meetings with one supervisor and sometimes with both supervisors.

4.3 The storytelling data corpus

Ethics approval was obtained from the university where the data were collected. The data collection began after the ethics approval had been granted. To avoid coercion, students were recruited before the recruitment of supervisors. A camera and a voice recorder (for back-up) were set up in the supervisory offices at the beginning of each meeting. The researcher left the site after finishing setting up the recording equipment.

In total, 25 supervision meetings were video-recorded (equivalent to 25.5 h). Fifteen meetings are triadic. With regards to storytelling data, 57 storytelling sequences were produced in the environment of feedback and advice. Thirty-four out of 57 stories were produced in triadic supervision meetings. The data was transcribed using Jeffersonian transcription system with two adaptations (Jefferson 2004). First, bold font is used for all interaction, to distinguish from descriptions of embodied actions which are in normal font; second, curly brackets are used to mark the beginning of the overlap between talk and embodied actions (Filipi 2009). It is important to include embodied actions and prosodic features in the transcriptions of the data because they are important resources for speakers to design their turns (Mondada 2013).

5 Analysis

The data selected for this paper involve one triad – Bella, the student, Lisa, the principal supervision, and Ras, the associate supervisor (all pseudonyms). This triad is chosen because they produced the greatest number of storytelling among all of the

triads (15 stories produced by Lisa in meetings with Bella, and 6 stories by Ras). Another reason for choosing storytelling extracts produced by this triad is that their storytellings represent three typical ways in which co-supervisors can collaboratively pursue students' uptake of the feedback and advice under delivery. First, when a supervisor is producing feedback and advice, the other supervisor can tell a first story to account for the feedback and advice in progress, which works to pursue student acceptance. Second, when a supervisor is telling a story, the other supervisor can produce a second story, displaying affiliation and thus securing student uptake. Third, at the end of a storytelling produced by one supervisor, if the student does not show strong uptake of the feedback and advice under delivery, the other supervisor can add increments which function to shape how the story should be interpreted. Note that in the transcripts, arrows are used to indicate the turns where the second-speaking supervisor contributes to the feedback and advice initiated by the first-speaking supervisors.

5.1 Telling a first story in pursuit of advice uptake

In what follows, we examine extract 1a, which illustrates how supervisors can co-construct advice through launching a story to exemplify the advice initiated by their co-supervisors. This extract takes place in the second meeting between Bella and her two supervisors, Lisa and Ras. Note that Bella was an international student who had enrolled two months before she arrived at the university in person. Due to the requirement of her scholarship, she had to enrol within a certain time frame, but for personal reasons she was unable to leave her home country before the due date.

Prior to extract 1a, Lisa inquired about Bella's local address, prior to problematising it. Bella presented an opinion that the bus journey from her accommodation to university was short and convenient; however, Lisa claimed that the bus journey was too short for Bella to do some reading. We join their conversation at a point where Lisa starts to topicalise another issue, which is about coming to university at the weekend. Note that before the talk about the bus journey, when Lisa asked if Bella was able to do some reading at home, Bella said she could not because she found it difficult to concentrate on studying at home.

Extract 1a   *Bella 2 – You can come at the weekend*
                Setting: Lisa, Ras, and Bell are sitting at a small round table in Ras's
                office. Ras is in the middle of the camera screen, and at the far side of
                the table; Lisa is on the right, Bella is on the left.

```
01      LISA:    but then the {other issue you can come in at the
02               weekend?
03      BELLA:                 {((gazes at Lisa))
04      BELLA:    m:m,
05      RAS:     {here?
                 {((gazes at Bella and points down))
06      BELLA:   {u:m not really hih hih hh=
                 {{((upper body bending down))
07      LISA:    =>okay at the momment<
08               you {probably don't need to.=
                     {((gazes at Bella with eyebrow flash))
09               ={but ˈthere will come momments˺ [when you have to.]
10      BELLA:    {((nods))
11      RAS:                                     [{ˈoh yes.]=
                                                  {((gazes at Bella))
12               ={ꜛoh yes.
13               and stay quite late.=
14      BELLA     {((turns to Ras & nods))
15      LISA:     {((shifts gaze back and forth between Ras & Bella))
16      RAS:     ={I mean if you':re late day person.=
                   {((gazes at Bella, hand moving forward))
17      BELLA:   =[{yeh,
                   {((gazes at Ras and nods))
18   → RAS:      =[{>I used to be here until two in the morning
                   {((gazes at Bella))
19               in the last few weeks,
20      LISA:    [mm?
21      BELLA:   [{mm hm,
                  {((gazes at Ras and nods))
22      RAS:     en en then there's others who would come in at five
23               or six in the morning.
24                really early morning people come in,
25               {I've never seen them after five.
                 {((shifts gazes from Bella to Lisa))
26               [{so suite yourself.
                  {((gazes at Bella))
27      BELLA:   [{m:m,
                  {((nods briefly))
28      LISA:    so that you actually did all your work in here?
29      RAS:     I did. yeah.
30               >because< I ha:d e:h my:
```

Lisa's utterance in lines 1–2 is prefaced with "*but the other issue…*", which suggests it is a part of an on-going argument that Lisa is building: there are issues with Bella's progress. After the preface, Lisa advises Bella to come to work on campus at the weekend through a declarative affirmative formulation that is produced with a rising intonation. While the declarative affirmative formulation indicates a strong normativity of the advice, the rising intonation works to mobilize Bella's response (Stivers and Rossano 2010).

Bella does not show strong uptake of this advice, which is indicated through her *m:m* produced in slightly rising intonation (line 4). At this point, in line 5, Ras takes a turn to mobilize a more appropriate response by adding an increment to the previous advice constructed by Lisa. Although Lisa's advice formulation does not

explicitly specify a location, this information can be inferred from the context where the participants are talking about coming to campus. Therefore Ras's increment in line 5 works to secure a response from Bella rather than clarifying the location.

Bella's response in line 6 has a dispreferred turn design: it is prefaced with *u:m,* which functions to delay the production of her disagreement with the advice (Pomerantz 1984), and it is ended with laughter, which works to remedy the disagreement.

Lisa's response to Bella between lines 7 and 9 also has a dispreferred turn design: the agreement component being brought forward and the disagreement component delayed. Lisa first accepts Bella's position through her *okay, and* acknowledges that the advised action (i.e. *coming to campus at the weekend*) is not necessary at the moment (lines 8–9). Next, she makes a claim about its necessity in the future (line 9). This turn design works to maximize affiliation and simultaneously allows Lisa to pursue the advice, and seek Bella's acceptance.

At this point, Ras displays strong agreement with Lisa indicated by the early start of his turn (line 11) and the repetition of *oh yes* (line 12), both produced in emphatic intonation. In line 13, he produces an increment prefaced with *and*, which works as an anticipatory completion of the turn that Lisa produced in line 9. Note this turn construction unit is delivered fluently, and does not show any trouble with word-search. Therefore, Ras's contribution in line 13 does not work to assist Lisa in articulating the feedback/advice as other types of anticipatory completion (see Ta 2023), but rather, works to secure Bella's acceptance of the advice in progress by adding details that intensify and dramatize the necessity of working hard. Together Lisa and Ras have put forward the idea that there are times Bella has to work at the weekend and stay on campus late.

In line 16, Ras produces a self-initiated self-repair, which is prefaced with *I mean.* Here by adding a condition (*if you're a late day person*), Ras reduces the normativity of the advice in progress: staying late is not something Bella has to do if she is not a late day person. Immediately after this, he tells about his experience of staying late until early morning (lines 18–19) and another student's experience of coming to office at 5 am and not staying after 5 pm (lines 22–25). After telling stories about two working styles (staying late and coming early), Ras advises Bella to choose a style that suits her (line 26). At this point, Bella again does not show strong uptake of the advice, indicated by her minimal response token *m:m* produced with slightly rising intonation.

In the absence of Bella's strong uptake, Lisa prompts Ras to tell more about his experience by producing a declarative affirmative formulation with rising intonation (line 28). In response, Ras provides details about his experience of managing his study time and space (starting from line 30).

In the above extract, we have seen how Ras, the second-speaking supervisor, contributed to co-constructing the advice about coming to campus on the weekend and at night. He first displayed strong agreement with Lisa before upgrading the advice, and then launching into a storytelling to illustrate the advice under delivery.

5.2 Telling a second story in pursuit of student uptake

The following extract illustrates a second way co-supervisors can collaborate in feedback and advice activities, that is through producing second storytelling. This extract is a continuation of the same advice sequence as examined above. In this extract, we will examine a second storytelling produced by Lisa, which is followed by a third storytelling produced by Ras. Analysis takes up at the point when Ras moves to closing his storytelling (line 53).

Extract 1b   *Bella 2 – You can come at the weekend*

```
53        RAS:      so we were: much better to come here.=
54        LISA:     =yeh.=
55        BELLA:    ={mm,
                     {((nods slightly and slowly))
56        RAS:      than to do it at home.
57        LISA:     [yeh.
58        BELLA:    [{mm.
                      {((nods slightly and gazes away from Ras))
59        RAS:       yeh.
60                  (0.3)
61    →   LISA:     {I think >I'm trying to remember<
                     {((gazes at Bella))
62                  when I came here I came {in here too.
                                            ((gazes at Ras))
63                  I came {en sat down.
                           {((gazes at Bella))
64        RAS:      mm,
65        LISA:     {then I added to what I did {at home.
                     {((gazes away))             {((gazes at Bella))
66                  {I used to find it
                     {((gazes away))
67                  {easy to write here and go home and re-read it.
                     {((gazes at Bella))
68                  >°but when I was at that stage.°<=
69        RAS:      =[mm.
70        LISA:     =[.hhhh {YEAH so it's worth talking to people=
                            {((gaze at Bella))
71                  about all different working pat{terns.
72        BELLA:                                    {((nods at Lisa))
73    →   RAS:       {do you remember the old eh LMR?
                      {((gazes at Lisa))
74        LISA:     [yeah,
75        RAS:      [not the TLS LMR right?=
76        LISA:     =yeah.
```

Between lines 30 and 52, Ras tells about his own and his friends' experiences with working on campus (data not shown). In line 53, Ras produces an assessment prefaced with *so*. The use of assessment and *so* both suggest the story is about to close. Assessing a state of affair is found to be a canonical way to close a storytelling (Jefferson 1978) while *so* is found to mark a resolution or summary of the preceding the extended turn of talk in a study on academic presentation (Rendle-Short 2003).

At story closing, recipients are normatively expected to display affiliation with the stance that the teller displays throughout the telling (Stivers 2008). Here in extract 1b, we can see that Lisa briefly displays her agreement with Ras through *yeh* produced in falling intonation (line 54). However, Bella's *mm* is produced in a soft voice, with slightly rising intonation contour (line 55). Her head movement is gentle and slow, which does not look like a firm and strong agreement. At this point, in line 56 Ras produces an increment to secure a more appropriate response. In line 58, Bella produces another *mm* with falling intonation, and gazes away from Ras, suggesting she is not about to produce further talk. Ras also indicates that he is not about to produce further talk through his *yeh,* which is produced in falling intonation.

After a micro pause of 0.3 s, Lisa takes up the speakership and tells a second story, which is about her experience of coming to campus and her preference for writing on campus and reading at home (lines 61–67). Her talk in line 68 is produced in fast speed and low volume suggesting it is a quick wrap-up of the story; next she rushes through to give advice about working patterns in lines 70 and 71. Here we see a modification of the earlier advice: "come at the weekend" (lines 1–2, extract 1a) has been modified to "talk to people about working patterns" (lines 61–67). This modification to some extent succeeds in securing a more proper response from Bella: her response has changed from disaffiliative to more affiliative, which is indicated through the nod in line 72.

However, Bella's nod is not treated as adequate by Ras who launches another storytelling in line 73. Here he produces a *do you remember* construction to establish shared knowledge with Lisa regarding a common work space for doctoral students, which used to be known as LMR and now is named as TLS. Establishing and appealing to shared knowledge with recipients is a common way to open a storytelling, which works to build mutual understanding (Ta 2021).

In the above extract, Ras and Lisa collaboratively pursued Bella's acceptance of advice. When Bella did not show strong uptake at the end of Ras's storytelling, Lisa launched a second storytelling and made it relevant to Ras's story. Then at the end of Lisa's storytelling, when Bella's response was still minimal, Ras launched another storytelling.

5.3 Co-shaping how the story should be interpreted at story completion

The above two extracts demonstrate how storytelling is produced as a component of advice activities, and used as a resource for co-constructing the advice in progress. In what follows, we specifically examine story-closing episodes to see how second-speaking supervisors co-shape the interpretations of the stories initiated by first-speaking supervisors.

Extract 2 takes place at the beginning of the same meeting between Bella and her two supervisors which was examined in previous sections. To summarise what happened before the extract: Bella reported that she was unable to come up with a list of headings for her literature review, a task that Lisa had asked her to do in the previous meeting. Lisa responded that this would not be a problem, adding that a literature review is a work in progress. This prompted a story about a student whose research topic evolved into a different one by the end of her candidature. We join their conversation when Lisa is describing the consequences of the protagonist's topic change (lines 1–2).

Extract 2   *Bella 2 – So it's provisional*

```
01           LISA:    >so she's now gonna have to write a new chapter about
02                    curriculum development.=
03      →    RAS:     =based on {new readings.
                                 {((gazes at Bella, hand pointing at Bella))
04           LISA:    yeah. [yeah.
05           BELLA:        [{m:m.
                            {((gazes at Ras))
06           RAS:      after {data collection.
                             {((gazes at Bella, hand pointing at Bella))
07           BELLA:   [{m:m.
                       {((gazes at Ras))
08           LISA:    [yeah.
09                    so ↑always saying that doesn't mean don't bother.
10      →             [>what (it) means it's< {very provisio[nal.=
                                              {((leans towards Bella))
11           RAS:                                           [yeah.
12           LISA:    =but at the moment they're fi:ne,=
13           RAS:     =[yeah.
14           LISA:    =[just keep using them en build up on them.
15                    (.) ((Lisa leans backward))
```

In lines 1–2, Lisa describes the need for the protagonist to conduct a new literature review chapter as a consequence of the change or development in her research. Her turn is prefaced with *so*, which suggests that a resolution of the story is forthcoming. At this point, Ras produces increments to the story (lines 3 and 6) that fit semantically and grammatically with Lisa's prior turn, making them work like incremented components of the on-going story. Through his emphatic intonation, Ras is

emphasizing the action of reading new literature (line 3), and the stage where topic changes may occur (line 6) (i.e., one's research topic can be reformulated after data collection and based on reading new literature).

Ras's utterances in lines 3 and 6 do not work to display his candidate understanding (Antaki 2012) of Lisa's story; he does not gaze at Lisa, which suggests he is not mobilising Lisa's confirmation of his understanding. Instead, he gazes at Bella and concurrently points his hand toward Bella, which works to solicit her responses. Bella responds with a stretched *m:m* twice (lines 5 and 7), produced with falling intonation, which displays her acknowledgement of the point being made. Ras's multimodal actions (i.e. gazing and pointing at Bella in lines 3 and 6) also show that he treats Bella as the recipient and himself as a co-teller of the story.

After acknowledging what Ras has just said through a falling *yeah* (line 8), Lisa provides a summary of the story between lines 9–10, prefaced with *so*. She elaborates what she means, and emphasizes that one's literature review is provisional, which aligns with her earlier claim that one's literature review is a work in progress. She then repeats her earlier assessment of Bella's current work (line 12), and finally gives her advice (line 14).

In the above extract, the advice is produced after the generalised message of the story is made, and the student's acknowledgement is obtained. Both supervisors work to draw out the generalised message. The supervisor, who is not the principal teller, promptly takes a turn at the story completion point by highlighting the relevant points of the story. In this way, he projects himself as a co-teller, and thereby as co-constructor of the feedback and advice being delivered.

The above analysis shows that non-teller supervisors can collaborate in storytelling by adding story increments thereby influencing how the stories should be interpreted. The practice of adding increments have been demonstrated to work to secure student acceptance of feedback and advice (Ta 2023).

6 Conclusion and discussion

In this paper, we have examined three main ways in which storytelling is used as a resource for second-speaking supervisors to collaborate in the feedback and advice activities initiated by first-speaking supervisors. First, second-speaking supervisors can contribute to the on-going feedback and advice activities by launching a storytelling to support the feedback and advice in progress, which works to pursue student uptake. Second, at the completion of the first story, if students do not show

strong uptake, supervisors can launch a second storytelling to pursue student acceptance of feedback and advice. Third, at story completion, supervisors can add increments to the stories initiated by the other supervisors, and collaborate in constructing generalised messages, thereby shaping the interpretation of the stories and securing students' acceptance of the feedback and advice. This finding aligns with other CA studies which suggest that any storytelling involves more or less collaboration from recipients in shaping the trajectories and interpretations of the stories in progress (Beach 2000; Bercelli et al. 2008; Burdelski 2016; C. Goodwin 1984, 1987; M. H. Goodwin 1982, 1990; Mandelbaum 2012; Stivers 2008).

This study has also demonstrated that the supervisor who is not the principal storyteller can actively participate in developing the storytelling and shaping its meaning, thereby, orienting to their role as a co-teller. In contrast, the student's responses were minimal thereby positioning themselves as passive recipient. In addition, the student neither responded to the affective stance conveyed throughout the story nor articulated interpretations of the stories. This is in contrast to everyday storytelling as well as storytelling in certain institutional contexts, where recipients regularly display their affective stance and negotiate their understanding at story completion (Arminen 2004; Bercelli et al. 2008; Burdelski 2016; Jefferson 1978; Stivers 2008).

By demonstrating a common practice for supervisors to co-construct feedback and advice and collaboratively pursue student acceptance, this study provides empirical evidence that having additional supervisors adds value to the supervision work. More importantly, this study suggests that the value of team supervision lies in how multiple supervisors can collaborate in producing feedback advice and pursue student acceptance of feedback and advice. Existing studies support the idea that students benefit from scientific debates that occur due to divergent perspectives. While this assumption may be true, it depends on how supervisors manage potential problems that may arise from their conflicting perspectives. Displaying contradictory views is certainly not the only way additional supervisors add to the team work as supervisors can co-work efficiently through using various interactional resources, one of which, and a powerful one, is storytelling.

References

Alterio, Maxine & McDrury Janice. 2003. *Learning through storytelling in higher education*. London: Routledge.

Antaki, Charles. 2012. Affiliative and disaffiliative candidate understandings. *Discourse Studies* 14(5). 531–547.

Arminen, Ilkka. 2004. Second stories: The salience of interpersonal communication for mutual help in Alcoholics Anonymous. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(2). 319–347.

Bamberg, Michael. 2007. *Selves and identities in narrative and discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bamberg, Michael & Alexandra Georgakopoulou. 2008. Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text & Talk* 28(3). 377–396.

Beach, Wayne. 2000. Inviting collaborations in stories about a woman. *Language in Society* 29(3). 379–407.

Bercelli, Fabrizio, Federico Rossano & Maurizo Viaro. 2008. Different place, different action: Clients' personal narratives in psychotherapy. *Text & Talk* 28(3). 283.

Björkman, Beyza. 2015. PhD supervisor-PhD student interactions in an English-medium higher education (HE) setting: Expressing disagreement. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(3). 205–229.

Burdelski, Matthew. 2016. We-focused and I-focused stories of World War II in guided tours at a Japanese American museum. *Discourse & Society* 27(2). 156–171.

Carter, Susan & Vijay Kumar. 2017. 'Ignoring me is part of learning': Supervisory feedback on doctoral writing. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International* 54(1). 1–8.

Dooly, Melinda & Vincenza Tudini. 2022. 'I remember when i was in Spain': Student-teacher storytelling in online collaborative task accomplishment. In Anna Filipi, Binh Thanh Ta & Maryanne Theobald (eds.), *Storytelling practices in home and educational contexts: Perspectives from conversation analysis*, 283–309. Singapore: Springer.

Dysthe, Olga, Akylina Samara & Kariane Westrheim. 2006. Multivoiced supervision of Master's students: A case study of alternative supervision practices in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education* 31(3). 299–318.

Filipi, Anna. 2009. *Toddler and parent interaction: The organisation of gaze, pointing and vocalisation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, Charles. 1984. Notes on story structure and the organization of participation. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 225–247. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Charles. 1987. Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(2). 115–130.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. 1982. "Instigating": Storytelling as social process. *American Ethnologist* 9(4). 799–819.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. 1990. Retellings, pretellings and hypothetical stories. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 24(1–4). 263–276.

Guerin, Cally & Ian Green. 2015. 'They're the bosses': Feedback in team supervision. *Journal of Further & Higher Education* 39(3). 320–335.

Guerin, Cally, Ian Green & Wendy Bastalich. 2011. Big love: Managing a team of research supervisors. In Vijay Kumar & Alison Lee (eds.), *Doctoral education in international context: Connecting local, regional & global perspectives*, 138–153. Serdang, Malaysia: University Putra Malasia Press.

Halse, Christine & Peter Bansel. 2012. The learning alliance: Ethics in doctoral supervision. *Oxford Review of Education* 38(4). 377–392.

Have, Paul. 2007. *Doing conversation analysis*, 2 edn. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Holmes, Kimberley & Kara Sealock. 2019. Storytelling as a portal to deeper wisdom in the curriculum studies of education and nursing. *Qualitative Research Journal* 19(2). 93–103.

Hutchby, Ian & Robin Wooffitt. 2008. *Conversation analysis*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, Gail. 1978. Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In Jim Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, 219–248. New York: Academic.

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene Lerner (ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Johansen, Bjørn Tore, Rose Mari Olsen, Nina Cecile Øverby, Rudy Garred & Elizabeth Enoksen. 2019. Team supervision of doctoral students: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* 14. 69–84.

Koike, Chisato. 2009. *Interaction in storytelling in Japanese conversations: An analysis of story recipients' questions*. Los Angeles: University of California Doctoral thesis.

Kobayashi, Sofi, Brian W. Grout & Camila Ø. Rump. 2015. Opportunities to learn scientific thinking in joint doctoral supervision. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International* 52(1). 41–51.

Kobayashi, Sofi, Maria Berge, Brian W. Grout & Camila Ø. Rump. 2017. Experiencing variation: Learning opportunities in doctoral supervision. *Instructional Science* 45(6). 805–826.

Labov, William & Joshue Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis. In June Helm (ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*, 12–44. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lahenius, Katja & Heini Ikävalko. 2014. Joint supervision practices in doctoral education–A student experience. *Journal of Further & Higher Education* 38(3). 427–446.

Manathunga, Catherine. 2012. Supervisors watching supervisors: The deconstructive possibilities and tensions of team supervision. *Australian Universities' Review* 54(1). 29–37.

Mandelbaum, Jenny. 1987. Couples sharing stories. *Communication Quarterly* 35(2). 144–170.

Mandelbaum, Jenny. 1989. Interpersonal activities in conversational storytelling. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53(2). 114–126.

Mandelbaum, Jenny. 2012. Storytelling in conversation. In Jack Sidnell & Tanya Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 492–507. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd..

McDonald, Alison. 2017. Using story to teach courage to aspiring administrators in an educational leadership classroom. *Storytelling, Self, Society* 13(2). 249–258.

Mondada, Lorenza. 2013. Embodied and spatial resources for turn-taking in institutional multi-party interactions: Participatory democracy debates. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46(1). 39–68.

Monzoni, Chiara M. & Paul Drew. 2009. Inter-interactional contexts of story-interventions by non-knowledgeable story recipients in (Italian) multi-person interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(2). 197–218.

Norrick, Neal. 2005. Interactional remembering in conversational narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(11). 1819–1844.

Olmos-López, Pamela & Jane Sunderland. 2017. Doctoral supervisors' and supervisees' responses to co-supervision. *Journal of Further & Higher Education* 41(6). 727–740.

Pang, Nicolas S. K. 1999. The plain truth is out there. In Allyson Holbrook & Sue Johnston (eds.), *Supervision of postgraduate research in education*, 157–161. Melbourne: Australia Association for Research in Education.

Pole, Christopher. 1998. Joint supervision and the PhD: Safety net or panacea? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 23(3). 259–271.

Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred and dispreferred turn shapes. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 57–101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rendle-Short, Johanna. 2003. So what does this show us? Analysis of the discourse marker so in monologic talk. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 26(2). 46–62.

Robertson, Margaret J. 2017. Trust: The power that binds in team supervision of doctoral students. *Higher Education Research & Development* 36(7). 1463–1475.

Robertson, Margaret J. 2019. *Power and doctoral supervision teams: Developing team building skills in collaborative doctoral research*. Milton, UK: Routledge.

Robin, Bernard R. 2008. Digital storytelling: A powerful technology tool for the 21st century classroom. *Theory into Practice* 47(3). 220–228.

Ryave, Alan. 1978. On the achievement of a series of stories. In Jim Schenkein (ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*, 113–132. New York: Academic Press.

Sandlund, Erica. 2022. Telling in a test: Storytelling and task accomplishment in L2 oral proficiency assessment. In Anna Filipi, Binh Thanh Ta & Maryanne Theobald (eds.), *Storytelling practices in home and educational contexts: Perspectives from conversation analysis*, 175–200. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Sidnell, Jack. 2006. Coordinating gesture, talk, and gaze in reenactments. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 39. 377–409.

Stivers, Tanya. 2008. Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 41(1). 31–57.

Stivers, Tanya & Federico Rossano. 2010. Mobilizing response. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 43(1). 3–31.

Stracke, Elke & Vijay Kumar. 2010. Feedback and self-regulated learning: Insights from supervisors' and PhD examiners' reports. *Reflective Practice* 11(1). 19–32.

Stracke, Elke & Vijay Kumar. 2016. Exploring doctoral students' perceptions of language use in supervisory written feedback practices - Because "feedback is hard to have". *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 39(2). 122–138.

Ta, Binh T. 2021. A conversation analytical study of story-openings in advice-giving episodes in doctoral research supervision meetings. *Discourse Studies* 23(2). 1–18.

Ta, Binh T. 2022. Giving advice through telling hypothetical stories in doctoral supervision meetings. In Anna Fillipi, Binh T. Ta & Maryanne Theobald (eds.), *Storytelling practices in home and educational contexts: Perspectives from conversation analysis*, 311–334. Singapore: Springer.

Ta, Binh T. 2023. *A conversation analytic approach to doctoral supervision: Feedback, advice and guidance*. New York: Routledge.

Ta, Binh T. & Anna Filipi. 2020. Storytelling as a resource for pursuing understanding and agreement in doctoral research supervision meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics* 165. 4–17.

Ta, Binh T. & Anna Filipi. 2023. Story-closing in PhD supervisory feedback: A conversation analytical study. *Linguistics & Education* 75. 1–11.

Taylor, Stan, Margaret Kiley & Robin Humphrey. 2019. *A handbook for doctoral supervisors*, 2nd edn. Milton, UK: Routledge.

Vehviläinen, Sanna. 2009. Problems in the research problem: Critical feedback and resistance in academic supervision. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 53(2). 185–201.

Warner, Richard & Julia Miller. 2015. Cultural dimensions of feedback at an Australian university: A study of international students with English as an additional language. *Higher Education Research & Development* 34(2). 420–435.

Bionote

Binh Thanh Ta
Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Science, Monash University, Wellington Road, Clayton, VIC3800, Australia
Binh.ta2@monash.edu
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5252-045X

Binh Thanh Ta is a lecturer at the Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health Science, Monash University, Australia, where she teaches communication courses. She has expertise in conversation analysis, video-ethnography and video-stimulated interviews. She is interested in studying social interaction in education and medical care contexts. She has co-edited a book on storytelling in educational contexts, published a book on feedback and advice in doctoral supervision, and several articles on storytelling in doctoral research supervision.